



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0237ME-1 for Auburn School Department

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant has presented a coherent and comprehensive plan. The application sets forth a clear vision for meeting the 4 core assurance areas of RTT by each of the districts. The application articulates an achievable vision that recognizes the need for deep change as they " move into a future yet to be imagined." The outcomes for children by 2015-2016 are not ambitious, given that learning is being personalized. The planners have taken time to ground the new work in lessons they've learned from the earlier work. The lessons are supported by research on school improvement that has lead to deeper learning and accelerated student achievement. Each of the districts has provided the proper assurances to meet the eligibility requirements. Evidence has been provided that the Learning4ME project is grounded in a process of "customized learning" for all students, built on the foundation of the Re-Inventing Schools Coalition(RISC). The RISC system provides a customized curriculum for each student that is based on MAINE college and career ready standards, CCSS, and the student's learning needs. The districts have been involved with RISC from 1-3 years, which gives them a foundation to build on and increases likelihood of success. The key components of the approach in the vision have been shown by researchers to yield significant improvement in student learning. The districts have demonstrated the need to accelerate improvement in student learning and have appropriate plans to meet that need.. Though data is provided about the subgroups of students, it is not clear to this reader that the districts' adequately addresses the issue of equity. 		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant documented an appropriate process used to invite districts to participate in the project. Five districts agreed to work as a Consortium. All 38 schools in the 5 districts will be participating. Thus the targeted students' needs will be addressed. The plan will support high quality implementation at the LEA and school-level. Evidence was provided that the participating schools collectively meet the eligibility requirements. A list of all 38 schools with appropriate demographic information is provided. The number of participating students from low-performing schools and who are high-need meets the required threshold. The planners also provided the required information about participating educators. The Consortium Design Team and the local design teams will serve an appropriate role in supporting high quality implementation at the district and school levels. Information was provided to show that the phases of training for educators and the community will prepare members of the local design teams to implement and monitor progress. There is a sound process that will support collaboration of the Consortium Design Team and the local design teams with the Consortium Design Team having oversight. 		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	5

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- The application includes a high quality plan that will lead to scale up for all the schools in the participating districts. Given that all the schools in the 5 districts are participating in the project, the Consortium allowed early adopters to move through the phases as a pilot so that they could learn and adapt as needed. They will go to scale using lessons learned from the first 3 years of customizing learning.
- There are 5 phases of implementation for both students and educators. Students, educators, and districts will move through these phases based on their individual needs. This approach is appropriate based on a review of implementation in the first 3 years of work with RISC. The application presents a sound theory of change. The theory is based on previous work by RISC that has been successful in deepening student learning and improving educators practice.
- Each district and school has its own design team that will judge readiness to move forward. This idea supports the customization process. There is also a Consortium Design Team that guides the overall process that will provide the needed oversight and support. This team can appropriately guide adjustments as needed. Details were provided through the proposal to give a clear understanding of how the process will work at the Consortium, school, and district levels.
- Evidence was provided that there will be regular monitoring of progress and needed adjustments will be made throughout the project. The overall project will be supported with assistance by RISC, EDUCATE, and IC that have demonstrated success in other places.. This approach is sound.
- They've done an excellent job of scale-up within the participating schools. The planners did not state how they will scale-up beyond the participating schools.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	6
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- Each of the districts presented reasonable goals and outcomes for students. This reviewer did not see data about comparison to State ESEA targets.
- Each of the districts presented data to show the outcome measures they will use to determine if they have reached their goals by subgroups re: summative assessment- improvement of students on the state test; decreasing the achievement groups- shifts in performance of targeted subgroups against the state’s highest performing subgroup; and graduation rates.
- The application lays out a sound plan for improvement. The districts are approaching implementation in different ways. It is not clear to this reviewer that *all* of the districts will be able to meet their goals as outlined in their individual visions., e.g. MSAD plans to have teachers “flip” their classrooms by Dec. 2013. Yet the proposal states that few teachers are using technology now. Also, little was said about how they will go about adding additional instructional days to the school calendar. These two items give pause about the ability of the district to meet its desired outcomes. Auburn is using a pilot process and is starting with high school. They provided evidence that their approach is realistic for their district and will likely lead them to the outcomes they’ve outlined. . RSU#10 engaged a variety of stakeholders in the lead up to the proposal. They provided evidence that the planners used what they heard to refine the plan. This increases likelihood of success. RSU#3 also has an approach that builds on engagement of all stakeholders. They are clear that they have big leaps to make. They will undertake a number of proven strategies to improve student outcomes making it likely that they will meet their goals.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- In several of the districts the growth has been “slow and steady.” In others the growth has been mixed. There wasn’t documentation of growth over the last 4 years.
- The projected targets do not show a significant shift in closing the achievement gaps during the life of the grant. While the gaps are projected to close, they will still be double digit.
- While the graduation rates are projected to increase significantly, there will still be large gaps among the subgroups.
- College enrollment is not projected to make large changes.
- Each district provided information that it has made improving the graduation rate a key accomplishment for the project. The evidence does not demonstrate continued growth over the last few years.
- Student performance data is being made available to students, educators, and families. Each district delineates its method of making data available. They are each working to improve the data systems.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- Maine districts are all required to make this data public. This information is presented at Board meetings that are public. The districts report this information in their annual reports and on their websites.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- Evidence was provided that each of the districts have the necessary conditions and autonomy under the STATE legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environment under Customized Learning. Responses to the application for each district was provided by the SEA. The NCES ID numbers were listed in the appendix.
- These autonomies have been granted to the LEAs through Maine Law Title 20-A.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	9
--	-----------	----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- Each district provided details about the processes they used to inform and engage a variety of stakeholders. The processes were extensive and employed a variety of approaches that were fitting for the different stakeholder groups. Several district directly addressed the use of feedback to refine the application. Recursive methods were used to get feedback in each of the districts. The reviewer did not see specific comments about the application changed after receiving feedback. One can see the inclusion of some feedback from the state in the plan.
- Proof of receipt of the plan was provided for the requisite government partners. Copies of the SEA responses were included.
- The required government and collective bargaining signatures have been provided for each district.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5
---	----------	----------

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

- Each of the Consortium members has noted its current state in using customized learning and the places where deep change is needed. Four of the five districts specifically addressed the use of data to assist them in understanding their current state. They noted that they have teams that regularly monitor the data and use it to make adjustments. Given that these teams have been trained by organizations that are known to be successful in using data to drive action, it is highly likely that the implementation of personalized learning outlined in the proposal will be a suitable approach to meet the needs and close gaps. The use of this high quality approach will assist them in monitoring progress along the way.
- The charts on deliverables presents the guiding questions for the gaps analysis in the future. They can be found in the appendix.

- The Learning4ME Project appears to have an internal logic that will support the schools in the kind of improvement they are striving to make. The Consortium Design Team that oversees the entire project will provide support for each of the districts in looking at their current state and assist them in monitoring progress in the future. The Consortium has an appropriate high quality plan.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maine has adopted College and Career ready standards that will be used in the new personalized learning curriculum. Substantial information was provided that the Learning4ME Project is a personalized standards-based curriculum that will require students to demonstrate mastery. • The applicants provided support to show that the use of including Complex Reasoning and Life Long Habits of Mind as a part of the personalized curriculum should assist students in learning about their own thinking and deepen their learning. • It was not clear to this reviewer that the new curriculum will expose students to diverse cultures, contexts and perspectives. • The application states that the Search Institutes 40 Developmental Assets will be foundational in dealing with social, emotion, and behavioral needs. No information is provided on how they will be incorporated in the same way Complex Reasoning and Lifelong Habits of Mind are being incorporated. • The project will work to develop a learning progression system that can support a student in understanding his/her own learning and drive his/her own learning process. The curriculum has a learning progression with an internal logic that pulls students to engage with the courses and achieve their goals. When completed the students will be college and career ready. • The curriculum is designed to draw on a variety of instructional strategies and environments. There will be multiple pathways including such things as technology, partnerships with the community, and early college. These are sound approaches that move students beyond the old style of classroom lectures. These approaches are personalized for each students. The planners have a reasonable expectation of improving the graduation rate with students ready for career or postsecondary. • Mastery is the expectation. Students who engage with the curriculum and complete a course of study will be college and career ready. • Technology will be an important tool in helping to individualize the curriculum and leverage students understanding of their own learning. The learning progression management system is a sound approach to provide frequent feedback to students, educators, and families to monitor progress toward mastery. • To draw high need students into the curriculum many critical strategies will be used such as student voice, active learning, and real world connections. Though the application noted subgroups of students who will need special attention, little detail was found about how this will be accomplished. • Detailed information was given about how students and families will be trained to use the tools and resources. The strategy is reasonable. 		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	18
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information was provided that the districts can successfully differentiate professional development for adults in the way they have done it for students. They have a feasible plan that is high quality to ensure that all educators will be able to implement the new curriculum. 		

- Training and support will be provided for school leaders. It was not clear if this training will deal with the emotional side of change for teachers. Without some acknowledgment of this, a phase system may be difficult to get started and maintained.
- High quality content will be included in the professional development and technology will be use to assist teachers in helping students achieving mastery
- A reasonable plan has been set forth to engage teachers and school leaders. The planners have been careful to note that schema theory will be used to assist teachers in what will be a dramatic shift of looking at their practice. This lens should prove very helpful in making the needed changes so that educators will become skilled at using high quality learning resources and use processes and tools to help them match the resources to student to support students in continuous improvement based on the students needs. .
- Guided by the Consortium Design Team and the Local Design Team this process enables “just in time” training so that p.d. can be provided as it is needed. Through this training and local design team monitoring of individuals and the school as a whole, all participating educators will have access to tools, data, and resources needed to support students learning goals. They will regularly be measured on effectiveness in using the tools and resources.
- Each educator will have his/her own learning progression management system to guide improvements in practice as they support students in achieving mastery.
- Through peer coaching and feedback it is likely that schools will be able to persuade teachers to engage in the change.
- The p.d. being provided will train teachers to use student data to shape their work with students and thus accelerate the students learning.
- Information from teacher and leader annual evaluations will be used to shape the p.d. being provided and guide needed adaptations to improve individual and school progress in increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps.
- The consortium will do cross training to prepare educators for hard to staff subjects.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal has a high quality plan to support implementation through comprehensive policies and an infrastructure that provides support to students, educators, and all levels of the system. The Consortium will be governed by a board made up of represents of each of the districts. This plan is a realistic approach to enable the districts to be thought partners for each other and learn together as they implement a system of personalized learning for students and educators. . • It is not clear to this reviewer why the Lead district has the privilege of naming the Chair of the Board. This could become problematic, given the chairs role in setting the agendas. • Information was given to show that schools will have the necessary autonomy overs key factors that shape their functions and culture. • A key focus of this project is to ensure that students will move forward based on demonstrated mastery, not seat time. This a requirement in the state’s strategy for improving schools that has been incorporated into this proposal. The work with RISC has planted a strong foundation for this to happen. • Evidence has been provided to show that students will be given multiple opportunities and ways to demonstrated mastery. Multiple opportunities are built into the curriculum. Teaches will be trained to make this shift. • Teachers will be trained to use strategies to make learning accessible to all students, including students with disabilities. The curriculum is being designed to assist teachers in making that shift in practice. No detail was provided about how this would happen. 		

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall plan is of high quality. The piece that is unclear is how accommodations will be made for students with special needs. The application specified reasonable plans for providing all participating students/ families (regardless of income), and educators with access to the necessary resources needed in and out of school. Several examples of feasible strategies were given. The plan also noted that technology will be provided for many students. All of the districts did not provide information to show that they have adequate personnel to support students, educators, and families in learning to use these tools. They were all clear about support for students and educators, but not families. • Each of the districts has student data available electronically. They all note access for students and families, but not whether it can be exported by them. The districts are each working toward an interoperable data system. They are not all there at the moment. • The Consortium as a whole made, it clear that they are all looking to improve the data systems being used. 		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a clear and high quality approach to continuously monitor and improve the plan. The Consortium laid out an appropriate plan to monitor progress and make necessary adjustments at the Consortium, district, and site levels throughout the life of the project. Each LEA will submit to the Consortium Design Team a plan for a cycle of continuous improvement. An internal evaluator will collect data on each of the LEAs. The Consortium Team will meet monthly to review plans, data, and suggest adjustments. There is already a rubric developed to be used for this process. It is highly likely that this plan will support they work because it is based on an agreement to hold each other accountable. • Each district will complete an organizational self-assessment annually. • Data about student success as well as operations will be reported biannually to each School Board with revisions to the plan. This information will be presented on each districts website so that is easily available to all stakeholders. 		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application describes a comprehensive plan for continuing to engage internal and external stakeholders. The ambitious approach to two-way communication is sound. It incorporates several different avenues for internal and external stakeholders to engage with the project and stay abreast of progress. The strategies being used were successful in the planning process. 		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	0
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This question was not addressed in the application. This reviewer did not see adequate information about the selection, use, and rationale for particular performance measures. Some measures were stated earlier without the amplification of the reason for their selection and how they would provide information to improve student learning and the projects as a whole. 		

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	4
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application has a high quality plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the project for students, educators, and families. The use of electronic feedback loops and data regularly drawn from other sources is an appropriate way to monitor the effectiveness of the RTT investments. Planning at the Consortium level is a sound way to gauge what is needed across the projects as they look at individual and aggregated data to make decisions during implementation.. • It was not clear what role, if any, the individual schools will have in influencing the Consortium Design Team. 		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The budgets for the project are reasonable and sufficient . It is important to note that they are personnel heavy for some districts. The supporting funding was identified in detail. • The application noted local and federal funds that could be used. In some LEAs grants from foundations were listed with the exact revenue that they contribute. The LEAs noted that they will seek additional funding, but did not mention where they might look. • The application mentioned some items that might be start-up/one time expenditures. The discussion was not comprehensive. • The budget narrative is presented in the Appendices in chart form. It does not give the rationale for expenditures. 		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application made a convincing case that the project goals will be maintained over time. They are clearly in line with the state level strategic plan and each of the districts has made a commitment to build on what they are learning. Each of the districts stated long-term goals for continuous growth. The goals seem obtainable. • The districts are each committed to learning together as a Consortium, which increases the likelihood that they can buoy each other over time. • Camp Susan Curtis will play a critical role in providing curriculum for social emotional and behavioral learning. A Mobile Program will be developed and delivered by Camp staff. Over time teachers will be trained to use this as a part of the regular curriculum. • Information was provided about how the districts intend to address the needs of all children. There are outreach strategies and supports for students and their families. Little was said about how ALL families would be reached. 		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:		

- The Consortium has a well thought out plan for providing integrating social, emotional, and behavioral skills. They have a long standing partnership with a Camp that will work with the district to develop a mobile program that will initially be taught by Camp staff who will train teachers to take it on later.
- Several of the LEAs have support from foundations. There were many letters of support from students and families. There were not very many letters of support from partners. This reviewer did not see enough letters of support that indicate many partnerships.
- The outcomes that were identifies align well with the overall RTT project goals.
- The Consortium and district level design teams will use the data that is regularly collected to track whether they are meeting the needs of the groups facing significant challenges. Their partnership will engage families in supporting student progress. The outreach to families is a reasonable strategy to ensure that students who are usually underserved with be assisted.
- It is not clear how the strategy will be scaled beyond the current Consortium members. All district were invited to participate, but many declined. No information was given about how others will be enticed to come onboard later.
- A decision-making process is spelled out. There is a decision making process and an Infrastructure. The Design Team is at the hub of the process. Individual district design teams will gather data that will be collected by the internal evaluator. The Consortium Design Team will review this data monthly and use it to make needed adjusts across the Consortium. Individual LEAs will review their own schools data regularly and make recommendations for adjustments. This is a sensible approach to assess the needs and assets of the students individually and in aggregate.
- Families of participating students will be introduced to the CSC curriculum at the beginning of the school year. They will be given assessments of their child’s progress and will have the opportunity to provide feedback. Parents will be asked to complete assessments of their children’s progress, this includes ideas around resolving problems and challenges. This is an excellent idea. It is contingent on strong relationships between the school and families. There wasn’t enough evidence in t he document to determine if such relationships exist.
- Students, families, and educators will have the opportunity to give feedback about the tools they use and the tools they think they need.
- Annual ambitious and achievable performance goals for improving student achievement were identified.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

- The proposal is grounded in a shared experience the districts have had working on customizing learning for each student. The vision coherently and comprehensively captures the 4 core assurance areas of RTT. The new curriculum is based on state standards that are college and career ready standards.
- The new curriculum is centered around uncovering student needs and responding in an appropriate way. With support from teachers students can be guided to accelerate their learning. Students only move forward when they demonstrate mastery. They can tell by the regular results of their assessments whether they are on track to graduate. This should facilitate students meeting the graduation target, ready for college and career.
- Teachers and school leaders will be trained to use strategies and tools to support deep learning through personalization. Support from the LEA and Consortium Design Teams have been built into the plan to assist teachers in improving their practice by using personalized learning for students. The strategies to be used for support are excellent choices that will likely lead to improved shifts in practice of educators and learning for students. The infrastructure supports continuous learning for educators as well as students.

Total	210	162
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0237ME-2 for Auburn School Department

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- The applicant's proposal is supported by a coherent reform vision and presents sources to justify the identified vision.
 - Use of guiding principles to justify vision
 - Incorporates well-established, credible education best practices into vision
- The applicant demonstrates the ability to conduct a self-assessment of current challenges and determine next steps.
 - Acknowledgment of current challenges with student achievement resulting from current school structure
- The general timeframe for implementation is reasonable.
 - One academic year to prepare for initial stages
- Key goals are identified and addressed through identified activities.
- The applicant addresses a comprehensive list of activities, organized in identified categories.
 - Emphasis on student achievement and preparedness in addition to educator success and support
 - Inclusive of students with special needs, English learners, as well as parents and communities
- An appropriate rationale is present for goals and activities.
 - Aligns with current best practices in education
 - Emphasis on increasing and monitoring student achievement and preparedness, in addition to educator success and support

Weaknesses:

- The applicant acknowledges current challenges with student achievement, but supporting data are not present.
- While a general timeline is provided, the applicant does not provide specific timelines per activity in this criterion. However, it is noted that specific timelines per activity can be found in later responses as well as the appendix.
- The applicant discusses the districts' long-time involvement in a transition process related to the vision, but does not provide evidence of any specific progress made during this time.
 - Specific record of progress to further strengthen vision and sustainability
 - The extent to which the vision builds on its work in four core educational assurance areas

Rating and Rationale:

The quality of the applicant's responses falls in the high medium range.

The applicant provides a clear reform vision supported by the literature and goals and activities. However, the applicant does not present some information considered significant to determining the success of the proposal.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Participating schools have been selected.</p> <p>Participating schools collectively meet the competition's eligibility requirements.</p> <p>The applicant presents district selection criteria for participation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of selective, but inclusive process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Invitation to member districts only ◦ Statewide participation • Autonomous process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Districts allowed to self-select and make informed decision to participate ◦ Information-giving process • Consortium districts hold uniformed characteristics and experiences of additional eligibility criteria considered necessary by applicant to ensure the project's success <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ History of collaboration across districts ◦ Vision "buy-in" and commitment • Significant representation of schools across grade levels <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Focus on all grade levels ◦ 100% school participation per participating district ◦ Emphasis on "all" subject areas ◦ Small percentage of participation from LEA or consortium representing the low-income consortium (assuming due to socioeconomic representation of that area) <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information related to information-giving process without supporting documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Discussion of agenda and specific activities beyond informational sessions • Discussion of shared participant characteristics without supporting documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Documentation that details how participating consortium members demonstrate commitment not present ◦ Documentation related to specific collaborative activities not present ◦ Subject areas not listed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Subject areas not listed across levels (Pre-K, elementary, middle, and high school) ■ Unable to determine if subject areas have equal emphasis or if some have greater priority than others (e.g., reading versus music, math versus social studies or art) <p>Rating and Rationale:</p> <p>Overall, the quality of the applicant's response falls in the medium range. The applicant presents a comprehensive list of participating districts and schools representative of the consortium, with emphasis across grade levels and subject areas. There is apparent "buy-in" through the self-selection process. However, significant data to support claims are lacking. Information related to whether or not priority subject areas, such as reading and math, are emphasized over others is not documented. There is no documentation of participants' experience with collaborative activities or commitment as discussed in the applicant's response.</p>		

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

<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The applicant presents evidence of a rationale for plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Includes goals that focus on both the school (creating a customized student learning environment) and across districts (building the capacity of educators and leaders) 		
--	--	--

- Leaders from each participating member district

The applicant presents evidence of a structured plan.

- Includes five-phase sequential plan
- Includes complete description of each phase
- Although flexible in how districts implement plan, required to move through the five phases
- Links plan to student learning
 - Description of how plan will impact student learning (through mastery of components at student, teacher, school, leader, and district levels)

Participants receive continuous support.

- Designated leaders to facilitate the process and provide guidance at every phase
- Individualized to specific needs
 - Teachers receive additional training as appropriate
 - Teams, schools, or districts receive support as appropriate

The proposal documents district wide accountability.

- Focus not solely on students
 - Teachers required to demonstrate mastery at each phase before moving forward
- Focus not solely on individual teachers
 - Grade-level teams, departments, other established teams, schools, and an entire district identified as being at a particular phase as well

The proposal engages students and the community as well.

- Documents parallel phases for students
- Documents parallel phases for parents and the community

Weaknesses:

The applicant discusses success with pilot phase conducted by early adopters, but does not present evidence of those successes.

- Does not present evidence of insight regarding successes
- Does not present evidence of how pilot informs proposal and next steps

Some descriptive statements of individual phases are vague.

- Often, presents a list of professional jargon without a definition of terms

The applicant presents limited evidence on how to scale up plan to non-participating schools.

Rating and Rationale:

The quality of the applicant's response falls in the medium range. Overall, the applicant describes a plan that goes beyond the level of participating schools. It focuses not only on students, but also addresses the perceived needs of educators, teams, schools, and districts to ensure overall student success. While most of the plan is supported with sufficient detail, the applicant does not support some of its statements with evidence or define some the terms listed. Most significantly, the applicant does not present evidence of a specific plan to scale up to non-participating schools,

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	6
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant presents LEA-wide goals that indicate a likelihood of improved student learning and performance

- Goals individualized across participating districts, addressing specific needs
- Goals primarily measurable and supported by descriptions of how goals will be addressed
- Goals address core assurances

The applicant presents evidence of achievable annual goals.

- Evidence of a steady, feasible progression in reading and math proficiency within each subgroup and across levels (elementary, middle, and secondary).
- Evidence of 4% - 7% increase in both reading and math proficiency in general
- Significant increase of 14% in reading (over 1 academic year) with the LEP subgroup at one district

The applicant presents evidence of a modest projection of achievement within each subgroup and across levels

- Projections of 3% - 7% increase in both reading and math proficiency

The applicant presents convincing evidence of plans to improve student proficiency and growth, to close achievement gaps, and increase graduation and college enrollment rates.

- Describes in detail multiple reform initiatives
- Aligns goals with efforts and move toward proficiency
 - Document how achievement data are used, including rationale, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties for action plan items
- Presents information on efforts currently in progress
- Documents self-reflection of the process (successes, challenges, and next steps)
- Goals and plans inclusive of collaborative partnership with parents and the community

Weaknesses:

The applicant presents some evidence of low expectations with a subgroup and decreased likelihood of increased equity

- While a significant increase of 14% in reading (over 1 academic year) with the LEP subgroup at one district, projections for this subgroup falls under, with 6% projected annual increases for the next 5 academic years.

The applicant presents evidence of a decrease in proficiency data.

- Evidence of a 3% decrease in elementary math for the Special Education subgroup in one district

Increases in proficiency are small, not significantly different prior to proposal implementation

- Projections of 3% - 8% increase

Score rating and Rationale: The applicant's response falls in the medium range. Goals are feasible, but not ambitious, given the expected impact on growth by the proposed plan.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant documents gains in improving student learning outcomes.

- Slow growth documented, but acknowledge by applicant
- Student achievement incorporated in teacher appraisal system
- Narrowed achievement gaps at elementary and high school levels
 - 2 and 3% reduction, respectively, over span of 2 academic years
 - Approximately 8% increase in high school graduation rate over span of 3 academic years
 - 1.25% decrease in dropout rate over span of 1 academic year

The applicant demonstrates a track record of minimal growth.

- District assessment results by state and external leaders confirm record
- Schools moved out of continuous improvement status
- Schools previously with continuous improvement plans meeting AP (proficiency standard)
- Partnerships with math and science college faculty
- Including parents in college preparation activities
- Soliciting community feedback
- Engaging in various forms of professional development

The applicants documents evidence of making student data available to students and parents via traditional and technology-enhanced means.

- District's report card
- Parent and student-led conferences
- Assessment results
- Online web portals

Weaknesses:

The applicant demonstrates limited increases in achievement. Success is slow, but steady.

Goals are not ambitious.

- 2 and 3% reduction, respectively, over span of 2 academic years

Grant activities are not tied into student learning and achievement.

Rating and Rationale:

The quality of the applicant's response falls in the medium range. The applicant documents evidence of success. However, gains in achievement are slow and limited.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant presents evidence of transparency processes, practices, and investments via a variety of ways.

- State-required submissions of educational expenditure
 - Information accessed by public via web links
 - Posting the budget on websites
- Recorded and televised board meetings
- Town hall meetings and parent-focused forums
 - Involving parents as partners in the development, review, and revision process
 - Involving students in leadership and partnership activities

Rating and Rationale: The quality of the applicant's response falls in the high range. The applicant provides a general description of the extent to which the applicant already makes available the required four categories of school-level expenditures from State and local funds.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	9
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The applicant demonstrates convincing evidence to support claim of successful conditions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State-mandated efforts for schools to develop and implement system of interventions to improve achievement and raise graduation rates • State's plan is in close alignment with vision and goals described in applicant's proposal • State guidance and support provided to districts in Consortium <p>The applicant demonstrates evidence to support claims of sufficient autonomy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State legislation requirements to implement the personalized learning environments <p>Rating and Rationale: The quality of the applicant's response falls in the high range. Claims of successful conditions are supported. While the applicant does not specifically describe autonomous conditions, the applicant presents evidence of autonomy that results from State-mandated requirements.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The applicant presents an extensive list of meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of and support for the proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Posting information online (website and email), mailing certified letters, establishing a community group, addressing team agendas, hosting public forums, holding televised meetings, and conducting online surveys to solicit feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Feedback solicited from union representatives, parents, students, teachers, staff, administrators, and community stakeholders ◦ Direct input into writing of the vision, mission, and feedback on proposal • Documenting an exhaustive list of letters of support from university faculty, educational and community organizations, students, town boards, school staff, teachers, related services professional, principals, parents, community residents, parent/teacher organizations, state representative, state senator, and county sheriff. • Established MOUs • Established informal consensus to move forward with proposal <p>Rating and Rationale: The quality of applicant's response falls in the high range. The applicant details extensive multimodal ways in which stakeholders were engaged in the process.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The applicant provides justified evidence of a high-quality plan for an analysis of current status.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data-driven analysis and decision making • Specific appropriate needs and gaps identified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Aligns with vision ◦ Limited improvement, particularly for subgroups ◦ Drop in graduation rates 		

- Need to examine instructional strategies
- Need for foundational and structural changes
- Technology-enhanced curriculum
- Overcoming obstacles in college enrollment
- Presents a feasible plan (discusses how) to address gaps
 - Ongoing professional development
 - Continued collaborative efforts
 - Specific restructuring efforts
 - Program evaluation

Rating and Rationale: The quality of the applicant's response falls in the high range as characterized by identified needs and gaps that are supported by a feasible plan that will address these areas.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant presents evidence of a high quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment.

- Comprehensive list of goals for moving forward
 - Aligned with activities, rationale, timeline, deliverables and responsible parties
- Describes an approach that focuses holistically on the whole child
 - academic achievement, development of "soft skills" and other personal characteristics necessary for socioemotional growth, empowering students and building ownership of one's learning through decision making and problem-based learning
- Demonstrates evidence of providing students with a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments
 - Incorporates well-established research-based best practices in the field
 - Addresses state learning standards that identify knowledge and skills essential for college, career, and citizenship in the 21st century
 - Proposed plan to use Robert Marzano's curriculum organization framework to break each content area into a group of Measurement Topics
 - Use of the Lifelong Habits of Mind Curriculum to address "soft skills"
 - Approach looks at intersection of Content Knowledge, Complex Reasoning, and Life-Long Habits of Mind to allow students to not only master critical academic content, but to also develop skills and traits important to proposed program, such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving
- Enhancing student learning through a technology-enhanced curriculum
 - Learning progress management system
 - Provide 24/7 access to teachers, students, and parents
 - Maintain database of the curriculum and each student's mastery level of each learning target
 - Allows uploading of artifacts and evidence of learning, assessments of correlated learning targets, and creation of individualized data-driven learning plans, transcripts, and reports
 - Used to set goals and create and monitor each student's Individualized Learning Plan, or Pathways (a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable student to achieve his or her individual learning goals), and Individualized Graduation Plan (to ensure "on time" graduation)
 - Utilize database of learning resources and activities that correlate to each learning target

- Links to digital content and references to common resources, such as texts
- Allow students multiple pathways to demonstrating mastery of learning target
- Would facilitate teachers and students selecting activities that appeal to their learning styles and interests
 - Motivating students and deepening individual learning
- Presenting multiple options and personalized supports for college and career-readiness
- Addresses the needs of a variety of student learners, including specific vulnerable populations, and provides extensive details on customizing learning

Weaknesses:

The applicant presents vague information related to student support.

- Does not provide evidence related to how plan will engage parents to support students
- Does not provide evidence related to how plan will provide students access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning

Rating and Rationale: The quality of the applicant's response falls in the low high range. The applicant provides a high quality plan that details an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students. The specific role of parents in supporting students is unclear. The applicant does not specify how students will be exposed to cultural and linguistic diversity, and multiple perspectives.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	17
--	-----------	-----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant presents evidence of an innovative and comprehensive high-quality plan.

- Multifocus foundational goals to guide plan
- Structured sequential learning progression to professional learning
- Restructuring of status quo that includes collaborative problem-solving and thinking "out of the box"
 - Presents specific innovative examples, both in and out of the classroom
 - Aligned with college and career ready standards
- Checks and balances system
 - "Plan, Do, Check, Adjust" goal setting tool to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps
- Demonstrates evidence of supporting the effective implementation of the proposed plan
 - Presents both traditional and nontraditional innovative examples for ongoing professional development
 - Experiential learning for teachers
 - Connecting with other educators doing similar work (both traditional and nontraditional ways)
 - Virtual and traditional classroom visits
 - Central Resource Clearinghouse
- The collaborative work of the Consortium as a resource
 - Often serves as parties responsible for plan activities
- Presents evidence of training, policies, tools, data, and resources for all participating school leaders and school leadership teams that enable them to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and accelerates student progress through common and individual tasks toward meeting college- and career-ready standards
 - Equal emphasis on faculty/staff growth as on student growth and readiness
 - Leaders (and teachers) held accountable
 - Provide teachers with a combination of key clear expectations, support, and resources to ensure success
 - Removing barriers and running interference

- Use of "Plan, Do, Check, Adjust" goal setting tool and Educate to help educators establish their own professional learning pathways, inform leaders about staff development needs, help leaders respond with training and support based on data from teacher evaluation system, allow leaders to provide ongoing feedback to educators, and document teachers' and leaders' professional growth
- Presents evidence 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).
 - Innovative examples for hard to staff content areas
 - Cross-training
 - "Growing our own" special education, science, and math teachers
- Describes structured plan over the life of the grant and post-grant year
 - Over the span of 5 years
 - Goals aligned with activities, rationale, specific timeline for particular activity, deliverables, and parties responsible

Weaknesses:

The applicant presents ambiguous statements regarding some specific innovative examples listed.

- Does not describe HOW the use of report cards and grades to communicate with parents will be changed
 - However, presents a plan to establish a study group to identify problem-solving and entrepreneurial thinking strategies and approaches
- Does not describe HOW lines between grade levels will be blurred
 - However, presents a plan to establish a study group to identify problem-solving and entrepreneurial thinking strategies and approaches

Rating and Rationale: The quality of the applicant's response falls in the high range. The applicant presents a comprehensive and innovative plan. While a few ambiguous statements exist, the applicant presents a clear plan for pulling pieces together.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	11

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant presents an extensive list of structured practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning by:

- Ensuring joint accountability of the Consortium members
- Establishing an MOU
- Establishing a lead LEA
 - Will serve as fiscal agent
- Establishing a Consortium Board to manage the grant project
 - Representation from each member district
 - Required participation in governance, granted voting rights, responsible for carrying out decisions and ensuring adherence to adoption and implementation of grant activities in respective district
- Establishing a consistent and frequent meeting schedule and format (face-to-face or electronic)
- Establishing voting rules (majority vote) and requirements for participation and continued membership (adherence to proposal application)
- Providing assurance that every district's voice is heard, even in the absence of a board member
 - Designate a proxy in one's absence
- Establishing guidelines for joining and leaving the Consortium

- Supporting and establishing an inclusive school leadership team
 - Ongoing trainings
 - Inclusive of students, teachers, administrators, parents, and community members
- Establishing an autonomous process
 - Collaborative efforts at local district level between district Grant Liaison and Design Teams
 - Autonomy over local decisions related to school schedules, staffing models, personnel, etc. (in collaboration with school administrators)
 - Autonomy to establish additional policies
- Evidence of providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners
 - Accessible and adaptable learning resources and instructional practices through an established sequential, structured phased implementation plan

Weaknesses:

The applicant presents ambiguous statements regarding the following subparts:

- Giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic
 - Presents state legislation that guides district policy and establishes new standards for the awarding of a high school diploma, "standards-based diploma", and that all districts in Consortium working with guidance from state to develop and implement district RTI systems in line with this legislation
 - However, does not describe current status or specific details related to what RTI systems look like or how it specifically addresses this subpart
- Giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways
 - Presents state legislation that will guide practices, LD 1422, *An Act to Prepare Maine People for the Future Economy*, but vague description of how this will be achieved
 - However, does not present specific practices and policies for "out of school" opportunities for learning and demonstration of proficiency

Rating and Score: The quality of the applicant's response falls in the high medium range. The applicant's policies, practices, and guidelines are extensive. While the applicant presents details on state legislation that aligns with the requirements of the criterion, there is no specific description for providing students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant presents details of a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator (as defined in this notice), and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.

The applicant describes specific access to resources, levels of technical support, information technology systems, and interoperable data systems.

Evidence:

- Provides specific examples with accompanying descriptions of use of information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format (as defined in this notice) and to use the data in other electronic learning systems
 - Presents evidence of an established technology plan that specifically addresses access for teachers, students, and parents
 - Student access to iPads and laptops for personal use

- Teacher and student access to collaborate within district, across the state, nationally, and internationally
 - Ongoing technical support for faculty, students and parents
 - Face-to-face workshops for parents and parent training
- Presents evidence for ensuring that LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems
 - Use of software for data management and to access information
 - Variety of data systems for multiple purposes
 - Tracking student progress of proficiency and access to budget and longitudinal data, assignments, attendance, grades, human resources, early literacy and mathematics, behavior data management
 - Including, but not limited to: Powerschool, Pearson Inform, Transfinder, Nutrikids, Google Docs Edu Domain, Edline
 - Longitudinal data available using statewide data system

Rating and Rationale: The quality of the applicant's response falls in the high range. The applicant presents evidence of a clear and convincing of a high-quality plan to support project implementation. The applicant describes the infrastructure in place, as well future plans to support project implementation.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant describes a systematic strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant.

- Utilize "Plan, Do, Check, and Adjust cycle to guide process
 - Will include monitoring student data correlated to stated project goals, collecting and reviewing feedback from all constituents including staff, students, parents, and community members
 - Revising plans based on input
 - Plans to develop a protocol for modification and revision of curricula and resources using data system
 - Quarterly review of data system
- Conduct monthly review of data, plan professional development needs, and revise plans based on data collected
 - Track progression of professional learning and provide personalized professional development feedback as needed
- Reporting revised plans to individual schools boards biannually
- Requiring annual self-assessment and sharing with consortia board

Weaknesses:

The applicant presents ambiguous statement related to monitoring curriculum data.

Does not provide evidence of specific plans to develop a protocol for monitoring and publicly sharing information related to this area

Rating and Rationale: The quality of the applicant's response falls in the low high range. Overall, the applicant presents extensive evidence of a systematic strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process. The applicant presents evidence of timely and regular feedback (quarterly, annually, and biannually). However, the applicant's limited description for monitoring and publicly sharing information on curriculum data prevents the applicant from earning full points in this criterion.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The applicant presents multiple strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint access to a shared website across all Consortium LEAs • Various modes for communication and engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Virtual, face-to-face, and hard copy documents • Engaging and empowering students through an established student leadership team • Autonomy to develop additional methods of communication and engagement • Continuous response to feedback received <p>Rating and Rationale: The quality of the applicant's response falls in the high range. The applicant presents a complete list of strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	0
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant did not provide a response to Criterion E3.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes a plan to evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities through the development of an electronic feedback loop.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participants in professional development activities will be asked for feedback. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Formative feedback will be used at the district and Consortium levels to make adjustments as needed and to inform the overall goals of the grant. • The applicant does not specify what participants will participate in professional development and what professional development will be offered that will specifically address effectiveness. <p>The applicant's response does not describe specific strategies related to the use of technology, community partners, compensation reform or modification of school schedules and structures to evaluate the effectiveness of the plan.</p> <p>Rating and Rationale: The quality of the applicant's response falls in the low range. The applicant presents evidence of an ambiguous plan to evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The applicant presents an extensive budget summary table.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies all funds that will support the grant • Provides a description of itemized project costs by category and year 		

- Describes annual salaries, what supplies are being purchased, meeting mileage, per diem rates, and estimated travel costs
- Presents total expenses per budget categories
- Aligns expenses with primary associated criterion

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not present evidence of a written budget narrative. Information presented is based on budget tables. While tables provide descriptions within each category, they do not necessarily provide a rationale.

- While the budget table presents information related to total number of years of service on the project for personnel, the applicant does not document what specific years each position will serve (e.g., 2013-2015).
- The applicant presents information regarding classroom visits and observations as an opportunity for professional development, but does not include the itemized cost for travel in the budget table.

Rating and Rationale: The quality of the applicant's response falls in the high medium range. Although the applicant presents a budget summary table, some information is missing. Perhaps, information found in a narrative would have identified gaps for the reader. .

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
---	-----------	----------

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant describes a feasible high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant.

- Evidence of continued support from State and Consortium districts
 - State-sponsored initiatives
 - Budget plan for three years after term of grant
 - utilizing local funds, state and federal formulas, as well as Title 1, Title 2, and Title 6 awards
 - Consultation services of State DOE coordinator of standards-based education
- Existing funds contributed by districts dedicated to professional development and training
- Continued professional development for current staff and new hires
- Cross-district sharing of successes
- Building policy and infrastructure to result in long-lasting changes
 - Curriculum design, graduation requirement policies, expanding technology infrastructure, assessment work, and software development
- Continued outreach and partnerships
 - Investing in community, student leadership development, and advocacy efforts
- Seeking additional grant funding and partnerships

Weaknesses:

The applicant presents limited information regarding additional grants and partnerships beyond the life of the grant.

- Does not present examples of additional possible grants in which funding will be sought
- Does not present examples of potential partnerships

Rating and Rationale: The quality of the applicant's response falls in the low high range. The applicant presents evidence of a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant, with sparse information concerning additional grant funding opportunities and potential partnerships.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	6

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

The applicant presents evidence of a proposal to integrate public or private resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students (as defined in this notice), giving highest priority to students in participating schools with high-need students (as defined in this notice).

- Longstanding (more than three decades) partnership with established community-based organization described in proposal
 - Augments the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students
 - Key areas of focus: teambuilding and leadership
 - Build critical skills through experiential learning and sequential group activities
- Focus on high needs population/Special emphasis on students facing significant challenges
 - Economically disadvantaged (100%)
 - Students with disabilities (95%)
 - Students in grades 5-11
- Evidence of appropriate desired results
 - Emphasis on building skills necessary to modify performance or behavior
 - Addressed the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students (as defined in this notice)
- Ongoing teacher trainings, technical assistance, assessment, and follow up
 - Four-year series of trainings and annual refresher training
- Identification of qualifying students
 - training peer leaders
- Tracking selected indicators through teacher observation and assessment, parent assessment, student assessment, and community observation
 - Identified measurable goals (teacher, parent, and student assessments)
- Structured strategy to scale beyond participating students
- Parental notification of program, goals, and opportunity to participate in assessment
- Yearly analysis of previous year's results conducted by teachers and in collaboration with community-based organization partners

Weaknesses:

The applicant does not provide a response to 5 (b), Identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community that are aligned with those goals for improving the education and family and community supports (as defined in this notice).

The applicant does not present evidence of a measurable goal for school community observation.

While the applicant describes population-level desired results for students focused on other educational **outcomes** (reflective learners, self-directed learners, and collaborative workers), there is no evidence related to educational **results** that focus specifically on academic achievement, graduation rates, or graduating college and career ready .

Rating and Rationale: The quality of the applicant's response falls in the medium range. While the applicant presents evidence of a proposal to integrate public or private resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students, it does not address all required areas of this criterion.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not respond to all required sections in multiple criteria or direct the reader to the appendix area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No response to criterion E3 <p>However, the applicant coherently provides extensive information to document how it will build on the core educational assurance areas. Overall, the applicant's proposal demonstrates a commitment to how it will specifically build learning environments that improve teaching and learning through personalization.</p>		
Total	210	151



Race to the Top - District Technical Review Form

Application #0237ME-3 for Auburn School Department

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Learning 4Me provides evidence of a vision of reform within the LEA's. The foundation of this reform is the customized learning approach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers and students work together to match students strengths and learning preferences. The applicant describes how students and teachers will work together to develop a curriculum that best fits the students needs. Students learn in different timeframes and in different ways. The variable in Customized Learning is time. Students will work at their own pace to master concepts. Personalized learning - is designed to accelerate student achievement as students approach learning tasks in a variety of methods working at their own pace. <p>However, the applicant does not provide sufficient evidence of all four core educational reforms. A brief listing is given in the application but lacks detailed information particularly in the areas of student data systems and college and work ready standards. There is no evidence of data to support accelerating student achievement or deepening student learning by using Customized Learning. The overall vision is not fully grounded in the core concepts. Overall this places the applicant in the bottom of the medium range.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant uses a school wide approach to implementing reform involving five school districts in a consortium approach. The consortium approach is an attempt to restructure schools as a way to implement reform.

A (2) (a) Learning 4Me provides clear evidence of the plan to implement reform. Schools from several LEA’s were asked to participate. Schools and students who have expressed an interest are identified. Schools participating in the Consortium meet eligibility requirements. The open invitation approach by the applicant is an indication that they believe reform is not a top down approach but a bottom up one where buy in is needed for full implementation.

A(2)(b)(c) The applicant provides a list of schools (36) that will participate in grant activities. The applicant also provides the number of students participating in grant activities (13226) and the percentage of students who are high need and from low income families. Overall this places the applicant in the high range.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not provide sufficient evidence on how the reform proposal will be scaled up over time to support district wide change beyond the participating schools. The applicant provides a list of goals to create a customized learning environment and for building capacity among educators but does not provide a high quality plan describing a way to support district wide reform. Additionally, there is limited evidence to support reform beyond participating schools.

- The applicant acknowledges the need for district wide and consortium wide structural change but fails to describe in detail the change needed and the plans to implement the necessary changes.

This places the applicant in the bottom of the medium range

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not document a clear vision that is likely to result in improved student learning and performance.

A (4)(a) The Consortium shows growth in summative assessments but gaps still exists between majority groups and African Americans, special education students and economically disadvantaged groups. Gaps range from 15% to 30%.

A(4)(b) The applicant shows steady increase from 2011- 2017, however, gaps in achievement still exist in both reading and math among subgroups. The applicant does not show an aggressive approach to closing the achievement gap among sub groups across the Consortium.

A(4)(c) The applicant shows steady increase in graduation rates overall and among various sub groups in the Consortium but does not identify State ESEA targets for each LEA.

A(4)(d) The applicant shows a slight increase in college enrollment. The increases are conservative and are not aggressive in increasing college enrollment across the Consortium.

Overall this places the applicant in the bottom of the medium range.

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	6

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

B(1) The applicant does not demonstrate a clear record of success in the past four years as it relates to student learning and achievement. The applicant describes various grants received but does not tie this documentation to student learning or achievement. It is not clear how the supervision plan and teacher self assessment are tied to student learning and achievement. The applicant does not provide evidence that show increasing equity in learning. Charts, graphs and raw student data was not presented.

B(1)(a) Consortium members provide some evidence on improving student learning outcomes with data to reflect growth and robust partnerships that have the potential to raise high school graduation rates and college enrollment.

- RSU 57 growth in math & reading in 3-8 grades
- RSU 10 21st Century Program
- RSU collaboration with IHE
- Membership with Reinventing Schools Coalition

Grants received by various Consortium members have been used to increase college enrollment:

- Gear Up Grant
- Collaboration with various IHE.

B1(b) The applicant provides limited evidence of reforms in low-performing schools. Various schools in the Consortium moving from school improvement to CIPSI-on hold or losing CIPS designation

B1(c) The applicant presents evidence of the availability to provide performance data to students, educators and parents. Consortium members use PowerSchool to inform teachers, parents and students. The applicant does not provide sufficient evidence to support that this tool is used as a means of improving participation, instruction or services.

Overall this places the applicant in the low range of medium.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

B2(a)(b)(c)(d) The applicant provides strong evidence of transparency in processes, practices and investments. A complete description is provided for locating actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff, instructional staff, teachers and non-personnel expenditures. Consortium members submit educational expenditure data to the State organized in 11 categories including regular instruction (K-12), Special Education, School Administration, Student and Staff Support and other instruction. Data is disseminated through:

- a. Department of Education website
- b. televised meetings
- c. annual reports

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

B(3)
 The applicant demonstrates evidence of sufficient autonomy to implement Customized Learning. The applicant is in a local control state, providing all the LEAs in the Consortium autonomy under State of Maine Law 20-A. This law, beginning fall 2012, requires LEA's to develop and implement a system of interventions for K-12. The interventions must be specific, timely and based on ongoing formative assessments. The applicant also has support from the DOE to implement Customized Learning in Consortium schools. LD 1422, An Act to Prepare Maine People for the Future Economy was passed further providing autonomy. This act has established new standards for a high school diploma;

- demonstrate proficiency in all eight content areas
- students have multiple pathways to show proficiency

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	8
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a detailed description of notifying stakeholders as a way of engaging parents, community members and others in the initiative through town meetings, email and public forums. However, there is no evidence in the application to describe stakeholders in the development of the proposal.</p> <p>B(4)(i) The applicant has support from the collective bargaining representative from each LEA in the Consortium through signatures on each LEA's signed MOU.</p> <p>B(4)(b) The applicant demonstrates evidence of support from a variety of stakeholders including a State Representative, parents, town managers, Board of SelectMen, teachers, students, staff, institutions of higher education and community based organizations.</p> <p>Overall this places the applicant in the top range of high.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides documentation supporting the Consortium's current status in implementing Customized Learning. The applicant provides a focus on professional development for teachers and sustained support from Re-inventing schools . The applicant identifies a high quality plan to address the following gaps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • plateau of test scores - used The Art & Science of Teaching as a framework for instruction, peer-coaching model to support staff with improving instruction; transitioning to a proficiency based learning environment • acheivement gap between regular education and special students - review and revise system of intervention to insure adequate support for special needs students • need for a system wide management system - implement a system and provide training on system use <p>Needs among Consortium members are diverse and are in different places along the continuum implementing a personalized learning environment. Not all Consortium members provided sufficient documentation identifying their individual needs and gaps or how the plan will be used to address those gaps. One Consortium member provided documentation on their Design Team that plans, monitors and implements customized learning at the high school level. One Consortium member identified gaps but did not provide sufficient evidence on a plan to address the needs. Overall this places the applicant in the medium range.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	10
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>C (1) The applicant does not consistently provide evidence of a high quality plan. Sufficient evidence of a high quality plan can be found in the analysis including goals, activities, rationale, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • revised curriculum with a focus on standards -based and graduation requirements 		

- an expanded curriculum organized around Marzano's framework with critical reasoning
- on going professional development for teachers (use of electronic management system, increase awareness of standards based curriculum)
- increase strategies to works with vulnerable students and families (review/revise current system for meeting the needs of special education students, establish a system for early childhood education)

Consortium members, volunteer coordinators, curriculum coordinators and partner organizations work together to implement activities during the course of the grant.

The applicant does not provides sufficient evidence of a high quality plan in preparing students for college and career ready standards or college and career ready graduation requirements. The applicant describes multiple pathways to graduation honoring how each student learns. The applicant includes expanding learning opportunities outside the classroom (ie. internships and apprenticeships), however, C1b - C1h are inconsistent with the application guidelines and it is unclear how these sections address the selection criteria.

C(1)(a)(i) The applicant has provided data to show students understand what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals. The applicant provides a limited discussion on voice and choice in support of students understanding what they are learning. "Voice and Choice" can be achieved through a variety of strategies

- teachers allowing students to share in decision making
- students participating in planning
- project based learning

The Life-Long Habits of mind curriculum provides a framework for building skills such as resilience and self confidence.

C(1)(a)(ii) The applicant does not provide evidence to support student goals are linked to college and career ready standards or college ready graduation requirements.

C(1)(a)(iii) The applicant does not provide evidence to support deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest. The applicant provides a limited discussion on student choice relating to curriculum.

C(1)(a)(iv) The applicant does not provide evidence to support that Customized Learning will allow students to master critical academic content, goal setting or perseverance. There is limited documentation on critical thinking (found in the Complex Reasoning Curriculum), teamwork and problem solving (found in skills taught through Camp Susan Curtis).

C(1)(b)(i) There is no evidence in the application that identify a personalized sequence of instructional content. The activities chart lacks documentation on student learning goals. Data provided focus on consortium members, teachers or coordinators.

C(1)(b)(ii) The applicant provides sparse evidence on high quality instructional approaches; higher order thinking skills and Life Long Habits of Mind. The applicant does describe time as the variable and learning as the constant but does not provide evidence to document what this means in classroom practice.

C(1)(b)(iii) The applicant provides evidence that some of the Consortium districts are on the cutting edge with digital learning- 1:1 initiatives at the high school level and tablets in elementary schools. The applicant does not connect the digital learning tools with career and college ready standards or college and career ready graduation requirements.

C(1)(b)(iv)(A) The applicant provides evidence of a learning progress management system that can be updated and used to determine progress toward mastery.

C(1)(b)(iv)(B) The applicant does not provide documentation of personalized learning recommendations based on student's current knowledge and skills.

C(1)(b)(v) The applicant describes accommodations for high need students (special needs, ELL, early learners, students and families in poverty). Some schools in the Consortium are exploring ways to ensure special need groups are on track for college and career graduation requirements.

C(1)(c) The applicant does not provide evidence of training for students to ensure understanding of Customized Learning.

The applicant does not provide consistent documentation of a high quality plan putting them in the medium range. The applicant has a plan that is achievable and the plan includes goals and deliverables. The applicant does not provide clear evidence that the personalized learning approach will allow students to master critical academic content or identify a personalized sequence of learning instructional content. The applicant does not provide data to support student goals are linked to CRRS or college ready graduation requirements and there is no evidence to support deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest.

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

20

12

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment, however, parts of the plan are unclear and lack sufficient documentation. The teacher professional development component is well developed providing documentation including goals, activities, rationale, timeline, and deliverables.

- create a professional learning curriculum with scope and sequence
- provide training and support to teachers
- customize PD for implementation
- developing a cadre of local trainers

The plan shows a strong commitment to shift education program goals to ensure that every student is successful but does not develop a clear plan for implementation. The applicant does not provide sufficient evidence that this plan provides rigor or are aligned to the college and career ready standards and college and career ready graduation requirements.

C2 (a)(i) The applicant provides sufficient documentation to support professional development over time based on the five phases of implementation. Embedded in the implementation are personalized learning environments and strategies to ensure students graduate on time.

C(2)(a)(ii) The applicant lacks a clear plan for teachers to adapt content and instruction. The idea of “working in the moment” is vague and does not describe how teachers will respond to students academic needs, interests or optimal learning approaches.

C(2)(a)(iii) The applicant provides documentation on frequently measuring student progress. Plan, Do, Check, Adjust model will allow for continual adjustment and feedback.

C(2)(a)(iv) The applicant provides documentation of an evaluation system but does not provide evidence on how this improves teacher’s and principal’s practice. There is no evidence on frequent feedback regarding effectiveness, recommendations or interventions needed for improvement.

C(2)(b)(i) The applicant provides limited documentation to support actionable information that helps educators identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests.

- Consortium members review and revise system of interventions as a way to provide support for *special needs* students

C(2)(b)(ii) The applicant provides limited documentation to support high-quality learning resources that are aligned with CCRS.

- establish a system of early childhood education (PreK options to ensure students are prepared for Kindergarten)

C(2)(b)(iii) The applicant provides documentation to support process and tools to match student needs.

- create and implement multiple pathways to proficiency

C(2)(c)(i) The applicant provides information from the districts evaluation system that takes steps to improves teacher effectiveness.

- teacher rubric includes guiding questions for improving practice
- classroom design and delivery to successfully implement proficiency-based pathways

C(2)(c)(ii) The applicant documents professional development activities (school visits and teacher networking) as a way to support teachers in adapting content and instruction.

C(2)(d) The applicant provides evidence on how this plan will increase the number of student who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers. For example, the applicant will build from within by providing cross training in the hard to staff content areas.

The applicant provides a high quality plan that includes a shared vision, mission, growth mindset and a continuous plan. One strength of the plan is the professional learning model where teachers learn from each other (visiting classrooms and networking). The applicant does not provide sufficient evidence that this plan provides rigor, or a plan for teachers to adapt content and instruction. There is not sufficient evidence that this plan has frequent feedback regarding effectiveness, recommendations or interventions needed for improvement. Overall this places the applicant in the medium range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes a high quality plan that supports project implementation. Project implementation include ongoing personalized professional and leadership development for teachers and administrators, partnership with agencies that provide support for students and families, and curriculum development.</p> <p>D(1)(a) The applicant provides strong evidence to support a governance structure through regularly scheduled meetings and as well as a process to develop, review and revise local policies within the law.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board of Directors (members from participating schools) • Regularly scheduled meetings with input from Board Members • Support and services to consortium members through ongoing personalized professional development, agency partnerships • Staff including a project director and internal evaluator <p>D(1)(b) The applicant provides evidence to support school leadership teams and flexible scheduling. Shared Leadership/Design Teams are located in each consortium school. The applicant provides a detailed description of Leadership Team responsibilities including the flexibility and autonomy for implementing all aspects of Customized Learning. This includes collaborating with school administration to design school schedules, calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing.</p> <p>D(1)(c) The applicant provides evidence of the district policy through state legislation that give students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on mastery. The consortium district policy is guided by state legislation that allow students to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not amount of time spent on a topic.</p> <p>D(1)(d) The data giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways is incomplete. The applicant provides a brief statement but does not provide evidence to support this claim.</p> <p>D(1)(e) The applicant describes accommodations for high need students (special needs, ELL, early learners, students and families in poverty). Some schools in the Consortium are exploring ways to ensure special need groups are on track for college and career graduation requirements. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • realigning IEP goals to reflect learning targets • provide customized learning for ELL guaranteeing access to appropriate learning targets at the appropriate time • increase PreK programs for low income families <p>Overall this places the applicant in the high range.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides evidence that the consortium infrastructure supports personalized learning. The applicant provides a clear approach in their plan to establish peer coaching and to develop leadership within the consortium.</p> <p>D(2)(a) The applicant provides appropriate documentation that the consortium ensures that all participants have access to content, tools and other learning resources regardless of income. Consortium members provide</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • laptops, ipads • after-school intervention programs • K-6 laptop carts • after-school transportation • Alternataive education, vocational education and Advanced Placement classes 		

D(2)(b) The applicant provides appropriate documentation that the consortium ensures that all participants have technical support and the support is provided through a range of strategies.

- Family nights
- student technology teams
- PLATO lab
- Technology Coach
- Common Planning for shared courses on Tanberg

D(2)(c) The applicant provides appropriate documentation to support the use of information technology systems. Several systems are used throughout the consortium:

- EDUCATE
- Powersool
- INFORM
- NutiKids
- SWIS

D(2)(d) The applicant provides appropriate documentation that the consortium uses an interoperable data system. Several systems are used throughout the consortium:

- InfiniteCampus
- Pearson Inform,
- EDUCATE

Overall this places the applicant in the high range.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides strong examples on ways to monitor and measure investments funded by RTTD. The data includes strategies used to monitor and measure investments funded. Evidence is provided on student data systems used to inform teacher practice and on professional development for teachers in the consortium. Data is provided on ways to publicly share information using biannual reports and LEA's websites. Revised plans and updating professional development was presented in the application. The applicant provides data on investing in staff by providing coaching for classroom teachers.</p> <p>The applicant documents a continuous improvement cycle that includes monitoring student data correlated to stated project goals, collecting and reviewing feedback from all constituents including staff, parents and community members and revising plans based on input.</p> <p>Overall this places the applicant in the high range. The applicant has convincing documentation for implementing a rigorous improvement plan by meeting monthly to review data, plan professional development needs and revise plans based on the data collected.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides convincing evidence for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.

- shared website
- public forums
- Student leadership teams
- bi annual reports

Overall this places the applicant in the high range.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	0
---	----------	----------

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

There is no documentation.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides sufficient evidence of a plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the RTTD funded activities. The description includes plans to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of professional development (formative feedback). The applicant plans include an internal evaluator to coordinate data collection for all consortium member districts to conduct ongoing data analyses and to report results regularly to consortium districts. The applicant plans to share resources across the consortium to have the most effective use of tools. The applicant plans to provide instructional coaches to help teachers implement Customized Learning in their classroom.

Overall this places the applicant in the high range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not provide a budget narrative. A chart with the proposed budget is provided for each consortium member. The budget provided by the applicant supports the proposal.

F(1)(a) Identified in the budget are funds to support the project for each consortium member including project level expenses, professional development, instruction, curriculum, policy & infrastructure and vulnerable populations.

F(1)(b)The budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of Customized Learning. The budget falls within the range of the grant guidelines for the number of students impacted by the grant.

- Consortium members will share personnel (instructional technology staff)
- Technology- increase hardware/software at a cost of \$4.00 per student per year
- Vulnerable populations
 - increase in early childhood teachers
 - provide consultation for families
 -

F(1)(c)(i)(ii)The applicant provides a listing of funds and a clear rationale for investments and a description of all funds are included. The applicant identifies the rationale for the project director, assistant curriculum coordinator, internal evaluate, travel expenses, equipment, supplies and contractual. The budget provides documentation for ongoing operational costs.

Overall this places the applicant in the high medium range.

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

10

10

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides documentation for sustainability of the project after the term of the grant. Local, state and federal funds will be utilized for sustainability from each LEA in the consortium.

- there is an existing commitment to use Customized Learning
- a commitment to build capacity and train professionals to provide training in Customized learning beyond the grant funding period.
- existing partnerships

Overall this places the applicant in the high range.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of documentation for the competitive preference priority with a partnership with Camp Susan Curtis. This partnership is designed to augment the consortium's resources by providing additional student and family support. The partnership currently serves students with high needs (95%).

1. The applicant provides evidence of a strong partnership between Consortium Schools and Camp Susan Curtis.
 - partnership developed in 1974
 - 1,500 economically disadvantaged children have participated
 - 95% of students have special needs
2. The applicant identifies four population results- teacher observation and assessment, parent assessment, student assessment and school community observation. These results include both educational and other educational results.
 - 80% of students show progress in 8 out of 10 target areas
 - each classroom served will function with increased effectiveness
 - each school community will demonstrate greater incidence of leadership
3. The applicant provides evidence on this criteria. The population currently served by this partnership are economically disadvantaged with special needs making up 95% of the population. Participants will be increased to include grades 5 -8 over a four year period. Consortium teachers will receive training who will then be able to replicate training in the local schools. Over time more students will receive training. Students will also be involved in turn around training to younger students.
4. The applicant provides evidence on how the current partnership will be expanded to all participating students by developing partnerships across multiple settings (not only at Camp Susan Curtis).
5. The applicant provides evidence on how the partnership and consortium will build capacity over a period of four years.
 - teacher training
 - teacher integration of curriculum

The applicant does not identify the needs and assets of the school and community and how they are aligned to goals for improving education.

The evidence is vague on the number of students who will participate in the partnership and the tools for assessing participation is limited. The applicant does not provide a definitive way to determine participation by 5th and 8th grade students.

The applicant provides evidence to engage parents by providing notification and there is evidence to support progress through faculty and staff observations.

The goals set forth in this partnership are ambitious and achievable. All students in consortium schools are invited to attend, therefore, not limiting participation. Student outcomes (reflective learners, self directed learners and collaborative workers) are achievable over time.

Overall this places the applicant in the high range.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of a personalized learning environment through Learning 4Me and the customized learning approach. The customized learning approach creates a learning environment that is designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through personalized strategies. The consortium has addressed strategies that include College and Work Ready Standards. The plan presented provides a review and revision process in developing a standards based curriculum. A variety of student data systems have been identified as being used in this plan. Among them are PowerSchool and Inform. These data systems allow parents and students access to grades. The Customized Learning system allows students the opportunity to accelerate their learning. On going professional development aligned with teacher needs, peer coaching and technology specialist address increasing the effectiveness of educators. The teacher evaluation provides a way for teachers to improve on their practice. Consortium members have low performance rates (ie "Only 40% - 50% of students in RSU 10 are academically successful") and the applicant provides evidence to increase achievement and graduation rates by developing learning targets, establishing common grading practices and expanding collaboration with vocational schools.

Total	210	148
--------------	------------	------------