



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0459IN-1 for Beech Grove City Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This applicant is highly responsive to the criteria and provides a coherent vision that outlines extensive details in support of this vision, however there are a few areas that are a bit vague. Specifically, the LEA describes being committed to preparing all students college/career, however the only supporting evidence is that their state adopted college/career ready standards (as did most states) and they administer assessments to measure technical skills. These two components do not really speak to "preparation" (as specified in the NIA), but rather to context. The applicant provides strong evidence of their ability to maintain robust data systems that track students longitudinally. For example, the teacher identifier and teacher-student match will facilitate the process quite a bit.</p> <p>The approach to accelerating student learning is supported with a comprehensive list of strategies and convincing evidence of the extensive planning that has gone into this approach. Specifically, several publications are cited that demonstrate the goals of deepening students learning and support. In addition, the description of the "three primary ways" the applicant will deepen student learning is particularly strong. The applicant also describes a long-standing relationship with area social service agencies (e.g. hospital and YMCA) that will facilitate the implementation of personalized support.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant presents a comprehensive approach that seems to have been "in the works" since the current Superintendent joined this LEA five years ago as evidenced by their statement that back in 2008 "he shared a vision for the creation ...of an early childhood center to serve the community" and has devoted adequate resources to laying the groundwork for implementation.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This is a fairly small urban LEA so their rationale for including all five schools in their district is strong and is supported with examples of how the proposal can provide assistance, long-term, to the upper grades even though it is focused on early childhood intervention. Thorough details about the student population and subgroup membership are also provided. Specifically, all of their schools are already benefiting from a partnership with a hospital to provide nursing services and all schools try to coordinate activities with area agencies like YMCA and United Way so it makes sense they would include all schools in this proposal since it is designed to "serve the community".</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant clearly specifies four program goals that outline meaningful reform for all members of the community. Since the proposal already includes all 5 schools in this district the only way to scale it up beyond those schools is to include families of the children. In particular, focusing one of their goals on "family functioning" can provide the support many students often need and has the capacity to truly reform conditions that adversely affect student achievement. However while this section does provide a solid rationale for LEA-wide reform specifying expected outcomes, it does not specify a timeline or deliverables regarding those goals and objectives. (e.g. decrease the total # of teen pregnancies, or increase the total # of licensed full-day quality preschool program) There is sparse evidence that this proposal can realistically reflect <u>all</u> of the ambitious objectives outlined under each of the four program goals listed. Further, a significant portion of the proposal (in later sections) discusses interventions with high school students and this is not addressed in the "vision" section which is a little confusing.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	6

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA-wide goals are definitely achievable though not particularly ambitious. For example, the target is a growth of one percentage point per year in the % of students proficient in Rdg/Math in grades K-1, but these goals are not the same for all grade levels. This results in a net increase of 5 percentage points in K-1st by the end of the grant. However, this is a small school system with roughly 200-220 children per grade level. An increase of 1% is approximately two additional children that will demonstrate proficiency each year. That should not be hard at all to achieve given the extensive plan for early childhood intervention described in another section. Oddly enough, the goals for growth in the higher grades are, for the most part, larger than the growth targeted for K-1. (e.g. 5th-8th grades are targeted to grow 7-8 percentage points in proficiency rates during the grant) This is inconsistent with the overall focus of the proposal on early childhood. Specifically, intervening during the preschool years would allow them to receive more return on their investments in the lower grades at first, with this substantial reform not reaching the middle/high school students as significantly until later years as the better-prepared preschool students advance through school.

The goals for decreasing the gap between ED and non-ED students is achievable and fairly ambitious, though it assumes no growth for the non-ED students. For example, the table only demonstrates how an increase in the pass rate for ED students will decrease the overall gap but this would only be true if the pass rate for non-ED students remained the same for 5 years.

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:

The applicant does provide evidence they've improved learning outcomes in recent years, however the evidence is sparse. Further no track record of success is presented for K-2nd students who are most likely to be affected by an early childhood intervention. The track record presented for grades 3-8 is a bit obscure since exact figures are not presented, only a 4-year average pass rate that is slightly higher than the state average for each grade. It is unclear whether this 4-yr average indicates a consistently positive trend, or involves both positive/negative fluctuations from year to year which only resulted in a net increase since 2008. In fact, based on the information presented, it's possible the "increase in percent passing" since 2008 could be as little as 1% or 2% and the bar charts presented without any specific values for each year make it difficult to determine. For example, for 7th and 8th grade, looking at the bar chart, it appears there was no change from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012. There is no data for high school assessments presented from the most recent school year, 2011/12.

The applicant acknowledges there is still work to be done in the area of closing achievement gaps, but since the proposal only includes data about gaps present in the 2011-2012 school year it is not possible for the reviewer to determine the track record of success in this area.

The applicant describes several key strategies for providing data to stakeholders to improve instruction and services. One solid example is the "data binders" used by all students to encourage them to interpret their own data and take responsibility for their growth. This strategy demonstrates a track record of involving students in setting learning goals personal to their circumstances. However, it seems a proposal focused primarily on early childhood intervention would include more detail about how that population, or even the K-2nd gr population has been served in recent years.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides sufficient detail about where information can be located for salaries (e.g. personnel handbook) and LEA policies and procedures (e.g. Board meetings and district website). However, the evidence for transparency in non-personnel expenditures is limited to district-level tracking of expenditures and tracking this information in an internal data management system does not equate to transparency.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Overall, the applicant provided very little detail about the state context in which this project will be implemented. Other than a

description of the state teacher evaluation system they are utilizing, the proposal is lacking evidence about how state regulatory requirements may or may not affect their ability to implement this project. In fact, the applicant's narrative for section B(3) does not even include a mention of the state of Indiana regulatory agencies related to education or health/human services which would be the primary agencies providing state-level oversight to the Early childhood Center they're proposing. The narrative simply explains how the conditions within this LEA are conducive to successful implementation of their proposal (no the state context). However, the narrative does explain that a type of planning team has been in existence for about two years, researching best practices in the area of early childhood intervention, and there is some limited evidence that this committee has investigated state regulatory requirements as part of their planning process. (e.g. the Early Childhood Center team created during the 2009-10 school year to study 'model' programs in their state)

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

10

8

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does provide examples of how all stakeholder groups were involved but the details are not extensive. For example, the "planning team" included a "variety of stakeholders" but it does not provide information on how representative this team was, how large the team was and whether it included stakeholders from varying grade levels. Though, applicant does specify the steps the planning team completed to assist with proposal development. Applicant provides evidence of involvement from their collective bargaining representative (one person who was part of the planning team). The applicant also references a "team of teachers" from their K-1st school however it is unclear whether this team was part of the overall "planning team" or was separate. There is convincing evidence for why teachers in the K-1st school would strongly support the development of an early learning center.

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

5

3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

In this section of the proposal, the applicant only says they "will analyze the current status" but goes on to describe, in great detail, the rationale behind the use of Individualized Learning Plans (ILP's). This seems inconsistent with the NIA that asked applicants to provide a plan for analyzing needs and gaps this proposal is intended to address. Other than a mention of "data binders" elsewhere in the proposal, very little detail is provided regarding applicant's current status with the use of these ILP's described in this section. However, elsewhere in this proposal, the applicant does provide a solid description of their analysis of gaps in early learning services for their students. Since applicant states the primary goal of this proposal is an early childhood center, an analysis of outcomes associated with early learners who fail to receive services (currently) is an appropriate way of identifying this as a need.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	7

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section is very confusing and even though the applicant describes some well-designed strategies to improve learning, it does not seem to fit well with the other parts of the proposal. Almost all of the text that addresses the applicant's plan to improve learning through PLE's specifies secondary-school interventions. Yet, very early in the proposal, the applicant explicitly states "*The goal of this grant proposal is the development and implementation of a universal early childhood and family health center that will serve the community*". Then, they explicitly state 4 program goals of (1) *Family Functioning*, (2) *Child Health* (3) *Child Development* and (4) *Systems of Care*, but none of these program goals seem to be aligned with their plan to improve learning. There is no evidence of interventions with early learners. In fact, their primary examples of personalized learning are their career pathways, their one-to-one initiative (where "all students" have an Android tablet) and their alternative school (the Hornet Enrichment Academy), all of which appear to target high school students. The proposal does not contain convincing evidence that providing an Android tablet to Kindergarteners and 1st graders would improve and personalize their learning.

The applicant extensively describes the TAP process (which is funded through their state DOE and implemented in 43 other districts in their state). This process certainly does have the capacity to improve teaching and learning and seems like a system that would contribute quite a bit to personalizing the learning environment. However, it is unclear how this process is substantially linked to their proposed Early Childhood Center. They committed to this TAP process/implementation back in 2010 and received funding from their state, so while it can certainly support their goals of improving education for early learners, this proposal is lacking additional information about strategies targeting younger students.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	14
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides an exhaustive list of instructional and leadership practices that are very likely to improve teacher effectiveness throughout the district and enable leaders to provide targeted feedback to teachers allowing them to improve their practice.</p> <p>* For example, a thorough description of the TAP process is provided outlining activities such as observation rubrics, CORE Training, agendas for cluster teacher meetings, and provisions of digital resources for teachers and students.</p> <p>However, the applicant does not explicitly state how these various forms of teacher training will support their overall goal of developing an early childhood center. There is little evidence of how the TAP process described will further develop teacher capacity to work with families of early learners. Specifically, a stated component of the early childhood center includes parent training and support (e.g. family functioning) but this component is not addressed in terms of training teachers and leaders to effectively work with parents to accelerate student progress. In addition, their plan includes only goals and activities and does not include a timeline or deliverables as specified in the NIA.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	11
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Overall, the proposal demonstrates this LEA has established an environment of shared leadership. However, the narrative is somewhat fragmented in this area making it a bit confusing how they "plan to support project implementation through policies and infrastructure" as stated in the NIA. The proposal does not explicitly state what policies are/were put in place to support the early childhood center, though an adequate infrastructure is described (e.g. 2 yr long planning/research process) that will certainly support project implementation.</p> <p>For example, throughout sections A and D of the narrative, the applicant describes the culture of the LEA in that, the Superintendent supports school-level decision making and examples are provided of how he seeks input from school-level personnel. Granted, allowing students to "earn credit based on mastery" is not applicable to an early childhood center, but the applicant still describes a process through which mastery learning is encouraged and developed in younger grades. (e.g. retesting opportunities; 8-Step Instructional Process)</p> <p>One other inconsistency is the applicant's description of "learning resources that are adaptable and fully accessible" (e.g. section D(1)e). Specifically, the applicant only describes how IEP's are developed and accommodations are made for ELL but there is no mention of how instructional practices are adapted for early learners from disadvantaged families - which is the primary target population for this proposal.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	9
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does an excellent job of addressing how students will have access to content in/out of school and how they will receive technical support, but the portions addressing the information technology systems and interoperable data systems are more vague. However, these latter two criteria are less applicable and vital to the success of an early childhood center. Preschool children will not utilize "electronic learning systems/tutors" as often as older children since these resources wouldn't all be developmentally appropriate for them. Yet, exporting data will become important later, as students from the early childhood center transition to the K-1st school and beyond.</p> <p>Specific examples of how the school/LEA infrastructure will support personalized learning include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * transporting students to/from the early childhood center * specific outreach activities (e.g. local housing developments) to encourage participation from the target population most in need of these services * technical support provided to parents through needs assessment, and flexibly scheduled in-person training sessions educating parents on how to provide learning support outside of the school day 		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	8
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>While the applicant provides a very detailed description of their continuous improvement process, it is lacking evidence of how this process will fit with the goals for this proposal. (e.g. developing the early Childhood Center) Further, the large component of this project is devoted to construction costs so it would be reasonable to include some specificity about how the construction process will undergo continuous review and monitoring, yet applicant does not explicitly state this anywhere. Additionally, the applicant does not specify the timeline within which this continuous improvement process will occur,</p> <p>For example, the CQI process described includes a solid rationale and the "Core Steps" provide specificity about how goals will be monitored and measured. The applicant also provides examples of where they've used the CQI process which provides some evidence that they are accustomed to engaging in ongoing opportunities for corrections. However, these examples and steps aren't specifically linked to the project's goals related to their early childhood center, therefore the proposal for continuous improvement is a bit generic.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant clearly specifies all of the relevant stakeholder groups, but does not specify any strategies for how communication and engagement about the improvement process will occur. Elsewhere in the proposal, the applicant addresses communication with stakeholders regarding the existence of, and services provided by, the Early Childhood Center, however, this is different than engaging one's stakeholders in the improvement process. Specifically, the applicant provides a "stakeholder matrix" which includes a list of all stakeholder groups aligned with an exhaustive list of the expectations held by that particular group. However, this does not provide the reviewer with any information about how/when these groups will be engaged in the continuous improvement process.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>While the applicant provides most of the required information, the proposal lacks convincing evidence these measures are rigorous enough and timely enough to provide feedback that allows applicant to gauge implementation progress and the applicant does not state their rationale for selection of these measures. Further, their targets are ambitious and in most cases achievable, with a few notable exceptions.</p> <p>For example, the applicant suggests all participating students (100%) will be taught by highly effective teachers/principals this school year (2012-2013) and this will remain true throughout the grant. If all teachers were highly effective right now, a further measure would be needed to gauge implementation progress with the TAP program which is designed to improve teacher quality. No additional teacher effectiveness measure is included though. In addition, these tables also list the total # of participating students as 85 (showing 55 FRL students and 35 paid lunch which does not add up to 85) and it is unclear where this number comes from since it is not explicitly stated.</p> <p>The performance measures for the PK-3rd grades are the most relevant to this proposal and all of these are ambitious and achievable, providing convincing evidence of very clear targets addressing the needs specified elsewhere in this proposal. However, the performance measures specified for the higher grades are vague. Specifically, the applicant does not provide any numbers for the "all participating students" row for grades 4-8 college/career readiness measure and never explicitly states what their "on-track indicator" is for these grade levels. Presumably the "on-track" indicator for the high schools is students' progress toward completion of graduation requirements, however it is unclear for grades 4-8.</p> <p>For the high schools, their measure of career-readiness is based on students' ability to earn an 85 or better in a career preparation course. This does not provide strong evidence of an ambitious goal since elective courses are typically less rigorous than academic courses and it is reasonable to assume that students will be able to easily meet this target. However, the goal of increasing the 10th grade English pass rate for FRL students from 56% to 80% is highly ambitious.</p>		

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a very strong rationale for their evaluation model to be used for this project and they explicitly state the goals of this evaluation. However, their plan for evaluation does not provide specificity regarding the timeline, deliverables or responsible parties included in this evaluation. Elsewhere in the proposal, the applicant does provide evidence of using feedback from more formative (e.g. informal) evaluations to improve service delivery.</p> <p>For example, the applicant proposes use of the "ECERS" which is definitely the most appropriate tool to use for evaluation of the early childhood center since it is aligned to rigorous national standards set forth by the NAEYC. Exhaustive details about this instrument and the various aspects it is designed to measure are provided but the applicant does not specify <u>how often</u> the ECERS will be completed or <u>who</u> will complete it.</p> <p>Yet, another portion of this project (described in great detail elsewhere in the proposal and to which they're devoting a portion of the funding) includes Career Pathways and Individual Learning Plans with the older students. These aspects of the proposal are not mentioned anywhere in the evaluation section so it is unclear whether these components of the project will be evaluated at all.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	3
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In some places, the budget provides a thoughtful rationale for the investments, however many inconsistencies exist throughout the tables provided. Nonetheless, the budget is reasonable and will be sufficient to support the construction of their early childhood center and their early staffing needs during the term of the grant.</p> <p>Some examples of inconsistencies include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Table 2-1 references Page 32 for the project explanation but this information is not contained on page 32 2. The applicant mentions "pricing will be set so that all families are able to access the services" however this is the only place in the proposal that mentions charging families for services. 3. In Table 4-1, the applicant itemizes salaries. All coordinator positions are funded at \$50,000 but the 4 Pathway Coordinators are funded at only \$5000. It is uncertain whether this is a typo. The Pathways Coordinator's role is extensive and they work 190 days/yr so the funding of \$5K obviously isn't sufficient. 4. The sum of the personnel salaries for Years 1 & 2 in Table 4-1 does not match the sum shown in Tables 3-1 and 1-1. Specifically, funding 1 ECC Coord at \$50K, 6 staff for the ECC at \$35K each, 1 STW Coord at \$50K and 4 Pathways Coordinators at \$5K each equals \$330K, not the \$340K shown elsewhere in the budget. 5. The budget states 33% for fringe benefits, however the amount shown elsewhere in the budget reflects only 32.4% in Years 1 & 2 and 32.8% in Years 3&4. 6. The budget does not include <u>any</u> funds for Equipment or Supplies. It would seem a brand new early childhood center would require furniture, toys, books, etc but this is not explicitly included anywhere in the budget. 		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	4
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides very little evidence of a high-quality plan for how the project goals will be sustained. There is a brief mention of the early childhood center becoming "self-sustaining" by charging families. In addition, the proposal states the Superintendent is committed to retaining the positions of the School to Career Coordinators and Pathways Coordinator but also states they'll rely on business partners to do so. It is not particularly realistic to think that a relatively small community served by a relatively small school system of a few thousand students will be able to fund these positions at ~ \$93K+ annually for the salary/benefits for these 5 positions (STC Coord at \$50K and four Pathways Coord at \$5K/yr) and no examples were provided of well-funded business partners.</p> <p>The primary goal of this proposal is the development of the Early Childhood Center and their plan requests a reasonable and</p>		

sufficient amount of funding for the construction of the building and staff salaries for the 1st four years. After that, the applicant only states partnerships with the YMCA/United Way/Hospitals as methods for funding the Family Health portion of the ECC, and will attempt to fund the early childhood portion of the center by charging students who attend (many of whom come from families of poverty). Further, the budget narrative includes 6 ECC staff members and elsewhere in the proposal it is stated that each classroom will have a teacher and an assistant, with ~ 2:15 ratio of teachers:students. This allows them to serve 90 students whose families are not likely to be able to sustain all of the salaries, supplies and equipment that will be needed. This does not constitute convincing evidence the applicant will be able to sustain several hundred thousand dollars per year in expenses after the grant ends.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	3

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Applicant did not specifically address the Competitive Preference Priority in a separate section of their narrative. However, a significant portion of their plan for the Early Childhood Center is based on existing partnerships with the United Way, YMCA and an area hospital. For example, their area hospital has already donated nursing services to all schools in the LEA without charge to the district. The applicant also provides convincing evidence of how their ECC will address the social emotional needs of children and their families and plans to contract with YMCA for provision of some of these services. There is no mention of how their partnering social service agencies will track progress and implementation over time. Overall, the applicant did not explicitly address most of the items included in the NIA for this priority.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

This proposal describes a program that will personalize learning for many preschool children and provides a substantial amount of research to support the fact that early intervention with this age group can lead to many positive long-term outcomes for the community, particularly when it is combined with health/wellness/parenting education as is specified here. Having access to early learning opportunities will accelerate student achievement as these young students progress through the remainder of their elementary education. There are also portions of this proposal that include strategies to improve career awareness and readiness among older students.

Total	210	121
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0459IN-2 for Beech Grove City Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
--	-----------	-------

(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant did an excellent job articulating a comprehensive and coherent vision that supports the four core educational assurance areas.</p> <p>First, the applicant addressed recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals where they are needed most. The district presented their new teacher, principal and superintendent evaluation system. The descriptions provided sufficient details (e.g., areas where data will be collected, use of summative and formative evaluations, etc.) to grant credibility to the plan. The applicant explicitly stated that the new evaluation system will affect high-need schools and hard to staff subjects.</p> <p>Second, the applicant addressed college and career ready standards. The applicant not only described the courses high school students have to take to be college and career ready, but also detailed how they ensure the accountability of this practice (e.g., end of course assessments).</p> <p>Third, the applicant ensured that they have a robust data system that measures student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals to improve instruction. The system provides an individual teacher identifier with a teacher student match, and the state department ensures timely transfer of student data to teachers and principals.</p> <p>Lastly, the goal of this proposal was very clear from the beginning of the application. As the applicant was describing the goal of the proposed project, development and implementation of a universal early childhood and family health center, it was clear how the goal is related to accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support. Using research findings, the applicant demonstrated the links between quality early childhood education and student achievement in the later years.</p> <p>Overall, the narrative was to the point, succinct, and well organized. However, the proposed project as a whole could not be determined as strongly supporting this reform vision. 74% of the budget was allocated for the construction of an early childhood center. Although the early childhood center is one of the focused project activities, it is not considered as sufficient to improve other core areas, including the school data system or student achievement. Therefore, a medium range score is given to this section.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant described how the district has formed partnerships with community organizations in preparation of the proposed project. All schools in the district have been selected to participated in the project because the community partners are already placed in each school building. 63% of the participating students are coming from a low-income families across schools. Therefore, the district met the eligibility criteria (over 40% of participating students who are from low-income families). The total number of participating students is over 2,000, which was another eligibility criteria. The applicant listed all schools that will participate in the grant activities, with the grade levels served, the total number of participating students and teachers, and the total number of high need students at each school. For the pre-K level, only approximate counts of the numbers were provide since the construction of an early childhood center will be part of the project implementation.</p> <p>The applicant met all the requirements of this part of the selection criteria. Therefore, a high score was given to this section.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>While the applicant provided goals, and specific measurable deliverables (e.g., the number of trainings, the number of parents receiving services, and etc.), the plan lacks activities, timeline, and designated persons for each activity. Therefore, this section did not provide a high-quality plan. The district's logic model was mentioned, and the applicant described that the logic model is research-based. However, the referenced logic model was not included in the narrative, therefore, it was not possible to evaluate how the logic model applies to the applicant's district. For these reasons, a low range score is given to this section.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant addressed all the required subcategories, (A)(4)(a) - (d) of the selection criterion. However, the selection criterion was only partially met.</p>		

Annual performance goals on summative assessments for grades K-8 were presented. The applicant specified that locally crafted end of course assessments will be used for high school students' performances, but the annual targets were not found in the table.

Achievement gaps were addressed only for those students who receive free or reduced priced lunch, against those who receive paid lunch. Other student subgroups, including culturally/linguistically minority students, students with disabilities and English learners were not addressed. The rationale that explains why students who receive paid lunch were selected as a comparison group was not provided.

Graduation rates did not address student subgroup goals.

College enrollment goals also did not include subgroup goals.

Overall, 5-6% increases were proposed for all student groups over the grant period. However, it was not clear from the provided data, what the State ESEA targets for the applying districts were. Therefore, it could not be determined whether the proposed targets are ambitions or achievable.

For these reasons, a low range score is given to this section.

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	5
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The evidence that was presented to support improved student learning outcomes and decreased achievement gaps was not adequate. Student achievement data over the past four years did not display sufficient growth across years. The growth rather fluctuated over the years. High school data was provided only for the past two years.</p> <p>The district does not have persistently lowest or low performing schools. The applicant introduced their reform initiatives, the TAP model, attributing their achievement growth to the new initiative. However, there was not sufficient information detailing how the new initiatives brought the success.</p> <p>The charts that were presented to demonstrate narrowed achievement gaps are not appropriate to prove growth over the past years. The charts simply compared the rates of students who "passes" and "did not passed" in 2010-2011.</p> <p>The narrative that explains how the school district is making student performance data available to students, educators, and parents is reasonable. Traditional and electronic methods to communicate student data were explained (e.g., report cards, parent-teacher conferences, and Parent Connect System).</p> <p>Provided information was insufficient to meet the selection criterion. Therefore, a medium range score is given to this section.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district's commitment to a high level transparency was expressed and supporting evidence was provided. The applicant stated that all business decisions are made during school board meetings that are broadcast on the local cable channel. The district budget is published on the district website. The administrative salaries/contracts are also published on the district website. The district website provides access to the Classified Personnel Handbook that included pay rates, fringe package and work schedule for instructional positions in the district. Certified teacher contract contains information on teacher salary and benefits. However, it was not clear in the narrative who can access the Classified Personnel Handbook and the teacher contract. Also, there was a typo in the narrative ("The Classified Teacher Handbook <i>in</i> posted on the website...."). For these reasons, a medium range score is given to this section.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	2
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant described how the implementation of the proposed project will support personalized learning environments. However, the provided information did not meet the selection criterion. No descriptions regarding state level initiatives or</p>		

district/school level autonomy that will support the implementation of the project were provided. Therefore, a low range score is given to this section.

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

10

7

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided information regarding how key stakeholders were involved in the formation of the proposal, and their letters of support as supporting evidence. However, no support letter from a parent organizations was included. Although the applicant clearly stated that families and parents had opportunities to provide input in the proposal formation process, it was unclear how families and parents were invited in the process. For these reasons, a medium range score is given to this section.

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

5

1

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Although the applicant proposed a very specific plan, the development of an Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) for every student, this plan could not be determined as a high quality plan for the following reasons.

It was not clear if the ILP is a goal or an activity for a bigger goal. Also, a timeline, deliverables, and responsible parties were not specified.

The plan was focused on the individual student level. Analysis of the current needs and gaps on the school and district levels (e.g., teacher capacity, curriculum, leadership, data systems, etc.) will be critical for successful implementation of the project.

A poor grammar was found in the first sentence of the narrative.

For these reasons, a low range score is given to this section.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	5

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided responses to each sub-category of the criterion. However, in many cases, the responses were equivocal or addressed the criterion only partially.

The applicant stated that the Individualized Learning Plan will be a key component to enhance student understanding of their own learning. Engaging students in the planning of their own learning is a good way to help students understand the importance of their learning. However, parents and teacher roles in this process were not described.

The applicant described the district's supports for career preparation and work-based learning experiences to address the college-and career ready requirements. However, the description did not address how students are supported to identify and pursue college ready standards.

In response to some of the sub-categories, the applicant addressed their approaches only in high school level: (a)(iv), (b)(v).

To address students' exposure to diverse culture, contexts, and perspectives, the applicant described how the district is committed to developing youth leadership. The response does not address diversity.

The new teacher evaluation system, the TAP was described to address how the district ensures that students master critical skills (a)(v), and have access to high quality content, and instructional approaches (b)(ii), (iii). Although the TAP may address critical teacher skills in providing high quality instruction and content, the description of the TAP cannot replace the district's approach to supporting student learning. Important factors, such as teacher development, leadership, district support, and parent involvement should be part of the district's approach to supporting student learning.

Student support mechanisms to enable them to track and manage their own learning (c) is too generic. Adult roles, such as "have high expectations," or "remain involved" are not an adequate mechanism to provide specific training and support.

The narrative lacks a high-quality plan that summarizes goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. The language used was often not action-based and provided vague responses to the requirements. Therefore, a low medium

range score is given to this section.

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

20

14

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district's teacher evaluation system, the TAP model, was extensively described in this section to detail their approach to effective teaching and leading.

(a)(i) was adequately addressed. The district's teachers engaged professional community activities to implement personalized learning environments that met each student's needs. Those activities included a weekly, 60-minute team meeting (TAP model). In this meeting, teachers and administrators discuss individual student needs, and identify effective strategies.

(a)(ii) was adequately addressed. Teachers in the district have also been trained in Project Based Learning to support personalized learning environments. Teacher skills in grouping students according to their individual needs, abilities and interests are emphasized in this teaching model.

(a)(iii) was adequately addressed. School counselors are responsible for continually measuring, monitoring, and communicating student progress toward meeting the college and career ready standards or graduation requirements. Guidance counselors meet with students once a year to review their progress and they also meet proactively when students are at risk of not meeting their goals.

(a)(iv) was adequately addressed. The TAP model was used again to address this criterion. The evaluation system includes observation, frequent feedback (4 times a year), and support (pre-post conferences).

(b)(i) The applicant stated that actionable information that helps educators to improve instruction is provided through the TAP system. The rubric provided sufficient evidence for this statement.

(b)(ii) To address high quality learning resources, the applicant described the district's instructional technology capacity (e.g., student tablets, iTouch technology). However, technology in and of itself does not automatically grant high quality to learning resources. Therefore this section was not adequately addressed.

(b)(iii) Processes and tools to match students needs with specific resources were described for grades K-8. Once a week department team meetings involved analyzing student data, and intervention design.

(c)(i) was adequately addressed. The applicant stated that the district evaluation system provided both formative and summative data that helps school leaders to improve educator effectiveness.

(c)(ii) was adequately addressed. The applicant stated that ongoing, job-embedded professional development is provided through site based, "cluster" team meetings based on the information yielded from the teacher evaluation.

(d) was miscoded in the narrative as (e). Although the applicant provides some specifics that could be considered as goals, activities, persons responsible, and deliverables, each goal or activity lacked a timeline. Therefore, it was not determined as a high-quality plan. A high-medium range score is given to this section.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	4

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

First, a high-quality plan that delineates goal areas, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties to support project implementation through LEA policies and infrastructure was missing in the narrative.

The applicant's response to many of the sub-categories of the criterion was inadequate.

The names of the key officials of the LEA was listed in response to (D)(1)(a). However, information regarding how the listed officials will provide direct support to schools was missing.

The applicant provided information about building level autonomy. School autonomy was explained in terms of school schedule, personnel, and the budget. However, autonomy over roles and responsibilities for educators and noneducators was not explained.

The applicant admitted that the district is not consistently implementing practices to provide students with the opportunity to

progress and earn credit on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic. The applicant described the "8-step process" as a way to ensure that students will have those opportunities. Although the 8-step process seems like a sound instructional approach that emphasizes data based instructional decision making, and multiple opportunities for students to demonstrate mastery, it does not explain how students who master a topic will progress and earn credit.

The 8-step process was sufficient to address (D)(1)(d). Tutorial and remediation activities could provide students with multiple opportunities to demonstrate mastery.

The office of Special Services and the Language Assistance Program (LAP) were described to explain how the district provides learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students. Description of the Special Services (evaluation, eligibility determination, IEP development) does not provide information about instructional practices that are adaptable and accessible. The description of the LAP contained some information about adaptable and accessible instructional approaches (e.g., small group, translation, etc.).

For the lack of a high-quality plan and inadequate responses to the sub-categories, a low medium range score is given to this section.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	3
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Although the applicant's plans to support all participating students and parents by providing transportation, free information sessions are valuable, that support doesn't ensure that families will have out of school support to access the necessary learning resources. The district expressed their commitment to working with families and students to enhance their technology systems to allow open data format and interoperable data. However, necessary details, such as activities to achieve this goal, timelines and responsible parties were not found in the narrative. For these reasons, the applicant's responses to this section was inadequate and a low-medium range score is given to this section.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	4

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

While the applicant clearly expressed the district's commitment to continuous improvement, the process described in the narrative was too generic. The described " Core Steps" of the continuous improvement involved: Form a team, define a clear aim, understand the needs, identify measures of success, brainstorm change strategies, plan and collect data for effective decision making, and apply scientific methods to test and refine changes. These are important steps to any improvement process. However, it was vague how those steps would apply in the implementation of the proposed project. Some types of data/measures were mentioned in the narrative, including state summative assessments and benchmark assessments. However, necessary information, including who would form the team and what methods will be used for decision making were all missing.

A "Dashboard model" was mentioned to address public sharing of the project information. The applicant did not describe what a dashboard model is.

For these reasons, a low-medium range score is given to this section.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The described stakeholder group key expectations for students, parents/families, employers, community, etc... do not provide information on the district strategies for ongoing communications and engagements with key stakeholders. The criterion is not asking about what expectations will be communicated with the stakeholders, but how the communications will occur. Therefore, the applicant's response to this criterion is not appropriate, and a low range score is given to this section.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposed a total of 16 performance measures for all participating students in grades PreK- 12.

1. The total number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup whose teachers and principals are highly effective or effective were presented. The applicant set an ambitious goal of 100% for the next four years for all students. However, the baseline data was missing in the table and student subgroups were defined only by the free/reduced priced lunch eligibility. Other high-needs students, including culturally/linguistically minority, English learners, and students with disabilities were not included.
 2. For the PreK students, the ISTAR KR assessment outcomes were proposed as the performance measure. Since the early childhood center will be established once the grant fund is received, it was reasonable that the applicant did not provide the baseline data. However, again, student subgroups were defined only by the free/reduced priced lunch eligibility.
 3. For grades K-3, both academic (NWEA) and non-academic measures (social emotional intervention needs, and attendance) were proposed. However, the student subgroup included only students from poor homes.
 4. For grades 4-8, the number and percentage of students, by subgroup, who are on track to college-and career readiness were included as requested in the notice. Also, the applicant included both academic (ISTEP) and social/emotional indicators (suspension rate, attendance) in their performance measures. However, the student subgroups were defined only by the poverty level.
 5. For grades 9-12, the applicant addressed students who participate in the FAFSA, college-career readiness, applicant proposed college-and career ready measure (Preparing for College and Careers course), academic indicator (English end of course assessment), and social-emotional leading indicators (suspension rate, attendance) as required in the notice. However, the student subgroups were defined only by the poverty level.
- Overall, the applicant provided a comprehensive list of performance measures. However, student subgroups were defined only by the poverty level, and a narrative that details (E)(3)(a), (b), and (c) is missing. For these reasons, a medium range score is given to this section.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposed that they will use a specific measure to evaluate the effectiveness of the grant activities. The measure, the Early Childhood Environment Rating Scale (ECERS), seems comprehensive enough to address relevant and important components of the proposed program, including staff development, schedules, interaction with students, interaction with parents, and learning resources. However, these measures by themselves cannot make the evaluation plan successful. An evaluation plan should include information regarding who will lead the evaluations, who will be involved in the evaluation, and what process will be used (e.g., frequency of the evaluation, pre-post actions. etc.). Therefore, the proposed evaluation plan could not be determined as complete. For this reason, a low-medium range score is given to this section.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant described how the RTTD fund will be used for the project and how the funded project will be sustained after the grant term. Since the applicant is proposing to construct a early childhood and family center, it is a reasonable explanation that the center will be self sustained after the grant period. Other funding sources that will support the proposed project were identified (TIF funding).

The applicant also clearly described one-time investment (construction) and operational costs (personnel) that are included in the budget. The budget table provided itemized costs with the number of persons to be hired, roles and responsibilities of the jobs, and contractual costs. It was easy to understand and the description of each cost was reasonable.

However, 74% of the budget was allocated for the construction of an early childhood center. Although the early childhood center is one of the focused project activities, it is not considered as sufficient to improve their goal areas, such as the school data system or student achievement. No considerations were found in the budget for other important factors that have high impact on student outcomes, such as curriculum, and teacher training. For this reason, a medium range score is given to this section.

Therefore, a high range score is given to this section.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provided a reasonable explanation on how the proposed project will be sustained after the grant term. Financial support from the Partner organizations, such as YMCA, United Way, and community hospitals will support the Family health center after the grant period. These community organizations are believed to have the expertise and resources to provide support for the family health center. The early childhood center can be self-sustained since it collects tuition fees. So, the proposed project is believed to be sustainable after the grant term. Although the applicant described who will be involved in the effort to sustain the project (e.g., superintendent of the schools, partner organizations) with their expected roles, a high - quality plan that contains goals, activities, timeline, deliverables, in addition to responsible parties was lacking. For this reason, a medium range score is given to this section.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	2
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>It was evidenced in the previous sections of the application that the district already has built a strong partnership with community organizations (YMCA, United Way, and Community Hospitals) to provide social and health services to high-needs children and families. However, the partnership was not articulated in this section. The section was visibly missing in the application. Therefore, a low range score is given to this section.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposed to develop and implement a universal early childhood and family health center to support personalized learning environments for low income children. In the beginning of the application, the applicant articulated how the project will build on the district's current effort in the four educational assurance areas.</p> <p>Quality early childhood education has a strong impact on children's academic achievement in later years, and skills that are important to be college and career ready. Therefore, the goal of the project directly supports accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support.</p> <p>Throughout the application, the applicant described how the district is addressing college and career ready standards and requirements. The courses and assessments high school students have to take to be college and career ready were described. The assessment was also used as a performance measure of the project.</p> <p>The district's new teacher evaluation system (TAP model) was described in length in the narrative to ensure that the district will increase the effectiveness of their educators. The descriptions provided sufficient details (e.g., areas where data will be collected, use of summative and formative evaluations, etc.). The applicant explicitly stated that the new evaluation system will affect high-need schools and hard to staff subjects.</p> <p>The applicant's own performance measures and district-wide goals for the next 4 years included decreasing achievement gaps, increasing graduation rates, college enrollment rates, and increasing the number of the most effective educators. However, student subgroup goals were sometimes missing, or subgroups were defined only by the poverty level.</p> <p>Overall, the project goal supports the absolute priority 1 and the district clearly expressed their commitment to improve the core educational assurance areas. However, the district sets incomplete goals in some areas (e.g., achievement gaps between subgroups). Also, 74% of the budget was allocated for the construction of an early childhood center. Although the early childhood center is one of the focused project activities, it is not considered as sufficient to improve other core areas, including the school data system or student achievement.</p>		

--

Total	210	86
-------	-----	----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0459IN-3 for Beech Grove City Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: While the program described in the application does describe a comprehensive and coherent vision of early childhood intervention however the vision that is described is not consistent with the allocation of resources in the identified budget. There is doubt that the applicant can implement the vision when \$7,400,000 of the \$10,000,000 being requested is allocated for the construction of a building.		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	2
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: There was no identified participant selection process. The applicant states all students in the district will be have access to the benefits of this grant proposal. This approach is not aligned with the stated goal and vision of early intervention when all students include intermediate and High School.		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	1
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: The applicant did identify the Theory of change that would be the basis for this proposal as "Theory of change: A practical tool for Action, Results and Learning. There was no description of how this program was to be scaled up. The applicant provides a outline of the proposed program but fails to identify the specifics of plan implementation or expansion of the program.		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
(A)(4) Reviewer Comments: There was not sufficient information provided by the applicant to complete evaluation this section. The applicant provided series of charts with minimal targets and no explanation of the data.		

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	1

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant provided a series of charts demonstrating their student results to those of students across the State in similar grade groups. There was little if any explanation of these results. There was no discernable information provided that would serve as evidence of a clear track record of success.		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant did describe in detail the process of how their Board of trustee meetings are conducted in public inclusive of places and times of such meetings, and that all information related to budget expenditures, meeting minutes and contractual agreements are available on their Website and in public documents located in the District Offices. These procedure are standard for all public institutions but there is nothing beyond the required disclosure in place.		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	2
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: The applicant did not address the successful conditions and sufficient autonomy of this program other than to make general reference to the establishment and use of a teacher evaluation process..		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	3
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments: There was engagement of stakeholders however it is very difficult to categorize the engagement as anything beyond standard operating procedure. There is no evidence of sustained partnerships or community engagement. The outcome of these meetings was the Building of a facilitiy. The applicant held meetings with community groups such as the YMCA and Chamber of Commerce however the focus of theses meetings was the need to build a facility.		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1
(B)(5) Reviewer Comments: The applicant has an incoherent description of what they plan to implement "Pathway to Personalization". The description is broad with no specific detail. These plans were described as Individual learning plans with students using these plans to "envision their future". The focus of the application is early childhood intervention and the use of the "Pathway to Personalization" is inconsistent with this vision.		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	2
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant does not address specific educational strategies other than in broad terms again relying on the general development of the "Pathway to Personalization" planning process and the use of current systems to monitor student achievement and provide feedback. The "Pathway to Personalization" as described in this application focuses on students being able to envision their future interests. This strategy is inconsistent with the target population of early childhood intervention which is the focus of this application.		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	5
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant describes a strategy in which Cluster meetings are the means of supporting teachers. These are one hour meetings weekly which are not sufficient as a means of providing on-going teacher support. There needs to be a more comprehensive teacher support system inclusive of quality professional development related to student success and achievement. There is a standard teacher evaluation system in place which focus on teacher effectiveness and identifying		

quality instructional practice. This provides some credibility to the monitoring of effective teaching strategies.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	5
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided a general explanation of the development of the infrastructure for the management of their schools. The ability of "Principals to visit every classroom daily during the instructional focus periods to monitor programs".... While an ambitious goal it is not a practical one. As a practical matter during the daily operations of a school there are instances which will require significant time on the part of the building administrator (Emergencies, parental meetings, district commitments). To suggest that principals will be available to visit every classroom daily is unrealistic.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	2
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant did not sufficiently address this portion of the application. The applicant identified student transportation to and from the site using current transportation systems, technical support and use of data systems as building infrastructure. Specifically The applicant uses three different data system one for student information, one for budget and another for instructional improvement data. The goal as stated in this section is "to align these systems for increased efficiency".</p> <p>This does not address the criteria set forth in this section.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	5
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant generally identifies the Quality Continuous Improvement Process, Motto, Guiding Philosophy, Vision and Mission as the focus of the continuous improvement process. The lack of detail and specifics greatly impacts the ability to evaluate this plan.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant simply lists a group of characteristics next to each stakeholder group and then provides a broad description of strategies for interaction between these stakeholders. Each characteristic listed is simply a description of how each stakeholder group could contribute to the communication process. There is no defined plan for implementing a process to ensure the communication occurs or is of value.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant simply provides charts with no explanation of the data. The data is difficult to understand in that there is no reference points to use to evaluate the data. Additionally, there is no indication of the validity of the data. In many instances the numbers simply repeat (Performance Measure (a) 85,55,35,) these numbers are used throughout the chart without reference to origin.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Nothing was submitted for this section although the applicant does describe charging families for services once grant funding</p>		

is exhausted.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: This plan calls for \$7,400,00 to be spent on the construction of a facility to house the Early Childhood Center. The remainder of the monies would be used for program development and implementation.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: This is an incomplete submission for this section and there is no description of how the applicant would sustain the program and operational costs once construction of the facility was complete		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: N/A		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: This application is incomplete: Many sections of the grant were not submitted Those section that were complete lacked specificity The general purpose of this grant was to cover over 7 million dollars in construction cost related to the building of an early childhood Learning Center		

Total	210	45
-------	-----	----

