



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0629MO-1 for Camdenon R-III Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant sets forth a very clear, goal-driven vision. They plan to develop personalized environments and monitor students with an in-depth data program that will be an aligned and streamlined version of the several they currently have. The applicant also plans to increase parental involvement and provide families access to the data system.</p> <p>The applicant is also looking to enhance extended learning opportunities to overcome issues of space, time and resources that consistently plague rural schools. This will also aid in their goal of working with higher education agencies to provide students a "real world" education.</p> <p>Finally, the applicant intends to increase teacher effectiveness by using PLCs and effective use of data. The applicant does not, however, address the four assurance areas directly so this section is scored in the medium range.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant lays out an extremely informative implementation plan outlining specific activities and what actions and steps will be taken during each year of the grant. All schools in the consortium are expected to participate and are listed in the narrative, as well as their individual student populations. This section scores highly, as it meets all the necessary criteria.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The consortium plans to use strategies from Danielson's Framework for School Improvement to support district-wide change. They will align curriculum to college and career standards, personalize classroom environments, and develop training activities to support educators. The consortium will use the Danielson Framework to engage stakeholders in school and district policies and develop strategic plans for the consortium members district wide. There is no logic model or theory of change, but the applicant does describe the numerous ways it will involve stakeholders and focus on district and school activities to personalize learning for students. This section scores in the medium range as it still lacks clarity and a theory of change or logic model that would better delineate the plan for the proposal.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant discusses each of the four areas described in the application for showing increased student learning. They will use the Missouri Assessment Program tests to measure student proficiency as well as identifying achievement gaps that will be focused on. Graduation rates will be determined using the state measure.</p> <p>The applicant has set numerous ambitious and achievable goals, and has clearly expanded upon how they determined the numerical increases that are expected in student achievement. However, this section receives a low-medium range score as there is no discussion of how the consortium's vision will help schools to reach these goals.</p>		

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

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

(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	7
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Both districts have shown evidence of success. Camdenton has met the Distinction in Performance Rate on all standards for the past six years. Knob Noster has been accredited with distinction for the past eight. Achievement data has shown increases in Communication Arts, though math has gone up and down in the previous years. Districts have begun implementing technology in their classrooms as a way to ingrain formative and summative assessment for use in data teaming and decision making. There is evidence that teachers are using data, but not that it has been made readily available for students and parents. There is no evidence provided of any ambitious reform efforts in low-achieving districts, so this section can only be scored in the medium range.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section lists expenditures at each school, but is scored low as the applicant has not addressed any district policies or procedures regarding transparency or how readily available the requested data is. Or even if it is made public at all.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>State law allows school boards to adopt their own rules and regulations, and districts have full autonomy to implement programs as they see fit.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	8
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal stemmed from conversations between district and postsecondary administrators and staff. Ideas from these discussions were taken back to individual school districts to determine if there was support for the proposal. Stakeholders from schools and community groups were brought in to voice their ideas and concerns regarding the project.</p> <p>Student data was used to determine what was already working in the schools, and that would be built upon and expanded in the proposal.</p> <p>The proposal was then made available online for any stakeholder to review and leave feedback. Feedback was taken into consideration for the final draft. However, there is no mention of what kind of teacher support exists for the proposal, which places this section in the low end of the high range.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The consortium plans to use Danielson's framework for School Improvement to support districtwide change. Districts will engage stakeholders in order to assess policies, programs and learning. Strategic plans will be developed from these conversations.</p> <p>Both districts view high poverty rates as a barrier to their ability to ensure equal access to all programs. Knob Noster recognizes a gap between students scoring basic and advanced, and plans to work on raising the achievement level of all students.</p> <p>This section scores in the high range, as the applicant recognizes its needs and deficiencies and understands how personalization can close their gaps.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	17

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant recognizes the effects parents and schools have on student attitudes. They realize that the school must work to change negative parental attitudes and work with parents to raise the level of expectations for their students. This in turn will effect the student views of their own learning and behavior.

The applicant plans to foster a digital learning environment where students can modify and update their studies based on their own personal interests. Faculty and staff can monitor these digital plans to help students get the attention and instruction needed to achieve their goals. The goals students will set for themselves will be connected to Common Core State Standard, helping them to be college and career ready. Digital plans also allow students to monitor their grades and progress.

This personalized approach allows for the creation of extended learning opportunities for students, which will provide students the chance to learn in a variety of contexts and environments outside the traditional classroom. This is especially important in rural schools, as they often lack the resources necessary to provide students such diverse contexts.

Teachers will be provided professional development on personalization which will focus on varieties of instructional approaches. Current curriculum will also be modified to align with Common Core state Standards.

This is a very strong section, and is scored highly as it addresses all the criteria laid out in the application, but also provides an understanding of the rationale for the criteria and a detailed plan for how each of the goals of the proposal will be met.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant plans to increase teacher knowledge and ability by providing trainings, using evaluation systems, aligning curriculum to Common Core Standards, enhancing data systems and fostering personalization. Trainings will be provided through numerous outlets, including Missouri's Regional Professional Development Center, the American Alliance for innovative Schools, State and National conferences, PLCs and formative assessment. All educators will receive PLC training and the technical assistance required to implement digital personal learning environments.

Training will also be provided on using data from formative assessments, and Differentiated Instruction in order to personalize and focus instruction on students form high-need populations, such as ELLs. Student progress towards college and career readiness will be frequently monitored with the PLCs.

Each teacher will also participate in comprehensive performance based evaluation in an effort to improve instruction and enhance student learning. The evaluation system will determine teacher strengths and weaknesses and pinpoint the skills teachers need to improve their instruction. The system also determines whether or not teachers meet competency requirements. All staff have a professional development plan.

This section scores very high, as it covers the criteria in depth. Not only does it address each of the points outlined in the application, it provides a plan for meeting these points and what specific steps will be taken in order to improve teacher practice.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	14

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has organized a board composed of superintendents, project managers from each district, board of Education members, and representatives from partner institutions. Monthly budgets will be reported to project managers to ensure expenses are being allocated properly. All reports will be available to the board. Camdenton is audited annually by an independent accounting firm.

Applicants maintain leadership teams at the district and school levels that meet regularly to discuss issues such as scheduling, personnel, budgets and responsibilities. Any issue may be added to the agenda upon request. Goals are set at building as well as district level. Teachers meet regularly in PLCs in order to review data and discuss strategies. Each school is granted autonomy to address their individual needs and set goals and strategies accordingly.

Camdenton has Power Standards for each subject in which students are pretested, taught, and then post tested. Students then recieve enrichment or remediation depending on how they performed. Knob Noster has created several mastery-based programs which provide students various learning environments to recieve enrichment or remediation.

Camdenton reassesses student mastery throughout the quarter, semester or year. The students best score is the one that counts for their grade. Assessments can take numerous forms. Knob Noster provides a variety of ways for students to achieve mastery including RTI programs. The goal is to meet the learner at every level. Knob Noster also includes volunteers from families and the community.

Camdenton uses the PLC framework as well as Marzano's High Yield Strategies. Power standards allows for personalization of learning by providing enrichment or remediation based on the students' needs. The district has hired staff to work with SWDs and ELLs. Knob Noster integrates technology into instructional practice to enhance student learning. A High School Readiness class was introduced to teach basic skills. The New Teacher Evaluation Program encourages teachers to use research based, proven instructional strategies. There is little detailed evidence provided for Knob Noster adapting resources to meet students at all levels. For this reason the section receives a very high, but not perfect score.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Camdenton has a substantial technology budget and will focus on providing students the ability to access it at home. Focus on ELOs at both schools will also provide students the chance to learn outside of school. However, the applicant does not address how resources will be made available outside of school.

PD will be held for staff as well as parents and students to ensure they know how to use the technology. Access to information will be available from any location. The applicant does not provide much detail as to how this will be ensured.

District systems are currently interoperable and cover most major indicators. This section scores in the medium range as it has a decent vision in place, but is lacking in details as to how it will be achieved.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant plans to collect detailed, accurate data to identify both baseline information as well as progress towards goals. Program managers will work with educators to assess student growth towards college and career readiness. Information that is gathered will be used to focus on closing the gap between the vision of the LEAs and the current reality. This will help educators to strategize as how to best close that gap. The project director will be responsible for monitoring goals. The consortium committee will share information with the public. Each year there will be a project resource audit which will focus on financial aspects of work towards the project goals. The applicant does not present a formal, systemized process for improvement, and relies mostly on individuals undertaking the data team process without any true oversight. The lack of a systematic plan brings the score into the medium, instead of high range.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Stakeholders will be kept in the loop through electronic newsletters. The project will also convene an advisory board to work with staff and provide guidance. Stakeholders will also be informed of progress through existing channels (ie School Board meetings) and will be allowed to provide input into the future of the progress. There will be numerous communication vehicles for internal stakeholders, such as blogs, PLCs and webcasts. This section scores highly as it provides numerous avenues for stakeholders and the school to communicate.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

This section scores low, as it does not meet all the necessary requirements. It lays out numerous performance measures that will be closely monitored to follow progress. Data will be analyzed to monitor trends and determine the appropriate actions moving forward. The applicant does not explain its rationale for choosing the measures, nor how these measures will provide timely results for project improvement.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant plans to evaluate progress at regular intervals. Formative evaluation will involve analysis of stakeholder feedback through surveys, and summative will be tied to performance measures. Stakeholders, collaborative teams and the advisory board will evaluate and determine the best course of action. The evaluation does not fully describe a high-quality plan, as even though there are numerous measures as well as numerous stakeholders who will be involved, the plan lacks clarity. There is no explanation of who will oversee the evaluation, streamline the data and create an action plan for the best way to move forward.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has broken down their budget into several individual projects. Personalized learning environments will include developing career plans, assessments, curriculum alignment and personnel needed to implement these pieces. Costs will also include necessary technology and training. Other projects include parental partnerships, ELO, PD and administrative costs which will cover the grant period only. The funds that are described cover the necessary components of the application and will support each aspect of the project goals, as well as identifying pieces as either one time or on-going costs.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal is designed to enhance systems which are already in place and discussions of sustainability will occur throughout the process. The applicant intends to use most grant funds for start up and initial implementation, where the programs would be able to continue as normal after the four years. Partnerships established during the grant would be expected to continue, as would support from external stakeholders. The section does not fully address future financial support, but does explain that most grant funding would be used for inputs, in which programs should be self-sustaining.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Not submitted

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

While not plainly outlined in the proposal, the programs and aspects of this applicant's program clearly build on the RTTD assurance areas. The main focus is on personalizing learning, which will be covered through teacher PLCs, data teaming and Extended Learning Opportunities. The Common Core has been adopted which will put in place the college and career ready standards that the personalized environments will be pushing students toward. This will also help to accelerate student learning by providing more individualized instruction. Finally, PD will help teachers to become better educators, who can focus on closing gaps across student groups.

Total	210	149
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0629MO-2 for Camdenon R-III Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant thoroughly describes some components of the reform vision based on the work in four education assurance areas. For example, the applicant includes a comprehensive timeline that delineates key activities that will be implemented each year. This breakdown by year shows evidence of planning and long-range thinking as the applicant developed the vision for reform.</p> <p>A clear approach to accelerating student achievement is apparent in several project components. For example, the applicant describes specific ways in which parent informational components will be enhanced to support students in their current course of study as well as in preparing for college and career. This approach is critical as parental involvement is vital in helping student excel and deepen their learning experiences.</p> <p>The applicant also shows evidence of connecting the project to existing state reforms through the integration of two data systems. Linking data systems that provide important information about student achievement with specific standards and career exploration represents an attempt to streamline processes and examine specific student information which can help increase equity to personalized student support.</p> <p>A few components listed within the timeline are not thoroughly developed and explained. For example, the applicant does not describe the roles and responsibilities of the technical assistants. The applicant also makes a vague reference to formative assessments, but does not specify how they will be developed, how teachers will utilize the information gleaned from the assessments, and how that information will be used to make instructional decisions about students in personalized learning environments.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant includes all schools in the rural consortium of districts. This shows an effort on the part of the applicant to initiate change across multiple sites to improve student achievement. The applicant does not clearly explain why each of the districts will be included. For example, the applicant does not discuss specific needs that each participating school had and that were used to drive decision making about the proposed project. The application is lacking a clear connection between specific site needs and the rationale for targeting every school throughout the project.</p> <p>The applicant provides a comprehensive list of the schools that will participate in the grant activities. This provides clarity in understanding who the target audience will be for the proposed activities.</p> <p>The applicant provides sufficient evidence of the actual numbers of students who will be served. For example, the applicant clearly displays the number of low-income students, high-need students, and participating educators from each site. This breakdown provides a foundation on which to begin data analysis by site and student groups as the project progresses.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The applicant includes some components of a high-quality plan for describing how the proposal will translate into meaningful reform. For example, the Danielson Framework for School Improvement to support large-scale change represents one element of a high-quality plan. The applicant describes some important components of this model which represents a research-based model that will drive the reform process.

Evidence of a high-quality plan is apparent in the outline of project activities that will occur in each year of the project. Within the timeline, the applicant does not explicitly define the deliverables that will result from each of the activities. The activities within the timeline are not all directly linked to measurable outcomes and objectives. The applicant makes some generalized statements about several of the project activities. For example, the applicant notes that educators will address student needs by working with English Language Learners. There are no details accompanying this statement, so it is unclear how specifically educators will be trained to and will implement best practices in working with this specific population of students. Within the timeline provided, the applicant does not specify who will be responsible for each activity listed. This leaves some ambiguity in the overall plan for project implementation. There is no discussion about scaling this project beyond the districts served in the initial project.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Overall performance goals are provided for each year, which represents potential for improved student learning and performance. The stated goals are ambitious, but possibly not achievable in some cases. For example, in one case, the applicant proposed nearly a ten percent growth in student achievement each year. Given the low baseline percentage of just over forty percent, it is not clear how the applicant proposes to increase performance by ten percent the first year and each year after. The applicant indicates a desired goal of 82 percent, but the table of goals includes a column for the last year of the grant showing a gain of 80 percent rather than 82. This difference is not discussed.

The applicant references achievement gaps between the state and the districts serviced.

The applicant does not clearly describe the extent to which the project is likely to impact all student subgroups. The applicant provides data for different groups of students, but there is little narrative describing intentional efforts aimed at reducing these gaps among diverse student groups. The applicant provides a thorough explanation of the graduation rates and includes ambitions and achievable rates of growth in this area each year.

Ambitious growth is projected in the college enrollment rates. Achievability is questionable in that the applicant illustrates a jump of almost 30 percent from 2011 to 2012 for one district. The projected growth is based off of the 78 percent that was the result of this large increase. It is not clear whether or not this rate will remain consistent over time or it was an deviation from past trends and probable percentages in the future. Without an additional explanation of the projected growth, it is unclear whether the proposed rate is attainable.

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	11

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a table showing clearly that one of the districts has met all standards each year since 2009-2010. This shows a clear record of success in the past four years. The applicant does not thoroughly describe what each of these standards represents. For example, the data provided appears to be calculated for students overall. There are no specific performance measures for each site in each subject area for all student subgroups. As a result, it is not clear how achievement gaps have been addressed and how the applicant has worked intentionally to increase equity in teaching and learning. The applicant does not provide the same detailed student information for the second district who will be served through the proposed project. The applicant notes that they have not had accountable subgroups in two of the buildings, but there is no discussion of classroom level analysis of student performance across subgroups that could provide insight into equity and accessibility for all students.

The applicant indicates sufficient evidence of achieving ambitious and significant reforms. For example, one of the districts has implemented several significant technology initiatives, including a 1-1 High School initiative, a High School readiness class, and a pilot program with specific technological devices. This shows evidence of innovation and potential for large-scale reforms across the district.

The applicant does not explain how each of the initiatives implemented have resulted in specific student success in that

district. A more comprehensive description of the student achievement that is linked with increased technology usage could provide additional clarity in this area.

The applicant explains ways in which data has been used and presented to stakeholders. Intentional focus on specific standards at the middle school in one district show the impact of examining student data and engaging in collegial discussions about how that data can be used to address instructional needs.

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

5

1

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides tables showing total salaries at the school level for all certified and classified staff. This information provides an overall summary of expenditures in this area. The applicant also includes a table showing a total summary of personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only. This allows for transparency in the percentage of total salaries that are composed of instructional staff.

Total salaries for classroom teachers also show a more in-depth look at the percentage of salaries overall that are allocated for teachers. This level of description can provide insight when planning for project activities and designing budgets.

The applicant does not specify a description of the extent to which the applicant already makes available salary information to the public. There are no details regarding transparency in terms of providing public access to the school-level expenditures.

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

10

7

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant cites a policy of the local Board that allows for the creation of personalized learning environments. This provides some evidence that the applicant has autonomy in implementing reform initiatives. The applicant does not thoroughly describe how the proposed project was presented to the local Board and to stakeholders for input. The applicant states that personalized learning environments fall within the Board statute, but little information is provided about how the proposed learning environments align with state policy or local policy about issues such as earning credits and preparing for graduation.

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

10

7

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant includes some evidence to show that different stakeholders were involved in the process of developing the ideas in the proposal. For example, previous data from students and parents on what works for them was considered by the developers. The applicant does not specify what data was included from various discussions with teachers, parents, and community members. The applicant indicates that initiate participants talked with various stakeholders, but it was not clear what process was used to hold these discussions and how specific input was incorporated at the beginning of the development phase. After the drafting of the proposal, it is evident that a formal review and feedback period was allowed, which increases the potential for learning about different stakeholder concerns. The applicant notes that for stakeholders without Internet, a printed version was provided and feedback was collected. There are few details explaining who received printed copies, how the applicant knew which stakeholders needed these copies, and how the feedback was actually obtained using the written method.

The applicant does not specifically mention collective bargaining representation, so it is unclear how this was considered in the development of the proposed project.

A variety of support letters show clear evidence of support for the proposed project from a variety of stakeholders. This support will be critical in moving the project forward.

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

5

3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides some evidence of a high quality plan for an analysis of the applicant's current status in implementing personalized learning environments. For example, the applicant indicates plans to base the project on the Danielson Framework for School Improvement. The applicant lists key strategies that will be implemented, and they all represent best practices in improving student achievement. The timeline shows a level of specificity in which activities will be the focus in each year of the project. The applicant does not clearly specify some of the proposed training components such as what process will be used to conduct curriculum alignment and what specific classroom strategies will be implemented to support

English language learners. The applicant also cites poverty as the main need and gap that needs to be addressed. There are not specific connections made between student achievement data in the content areas and how that data drove decision-making about the set of proposed strategies. For example, the applicant lists support for English language learners as a needed strategy. Specific data showing a gap in performance for this group of students or growing numbers of English language learners are not provided as a rationale for addressing this population.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides some evidence of a plan that engages students to understand what they are learning is key to success in accomplishing their goals. For example, through use of the online digital application, students gain awareness about their own personal plans and sequence of courses. Exposure to careers that align with student interests also provides some measure of engagement for students in secondary grades.

Students can gain awareness of their own learning and development goals through the use of formative assessment provided in an online tool. Students can see their own strengths and weaknesses which provides additional understanding about learning goals. The digital tool provides students with increased access to immediate feedback which is a critical component to improving learning and achievement. The applicant does not thoroughly describe how students in lower grades will gain understanding of what they are learning is key to their success. There are few details about how students in elementary grades will identify and pursue learning and development goals. The applicant notes that PK children will become a part of the Parents as Teachers Program, but there are few details outlining how the applicant will integrate this program in a meaningful way to help students understand their learning and development goals.

Several examples of opportunities for students to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest are included. The use of workplace learning quests, career exploration days, and emersion experiences on college campuses represent opportunities to observe how knowledge learned in the classroom can translate into success in college and career. The applicant provides little description of the same meaningful experiences for students in elementary grades.

The extent to which students have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning appears limited to career exploration days, college campus visits, and educational outings. The applicant does not clarify how these collective experiences results in exposure to diverse cultures for students in grades PK-12.

The applicant references generalized efforts to help students master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving. For example, a general statement shows plans to examine these skills in the context of career. The applicant does not clearly specify a plan for ensuring all students master critical content and develop problem-solving skills on a routine basis. There are few descriptions of how elementary students will be engaged in these processes. The applicant lists general strategies such as career exploration days, but there are no direct ties made to specific content in the Common Core State Standards in Math and Reading that will be targeted and cultivated over time. There is also little description of an intentional effort to increase teamwork, critical thinking, communication, and problem-solving.

The applicant plans to partner with a community college and Institution of Higher Education to help students connect learning with graduation and college-readiness. As students are able to take personalized sequences of rigorous courses, the opportunities for growth are greater for individual students.

The integration of Marzano's nine-research-based strategies represents work with a variety of best practices across the curriculum. Specific details about how teachers will be trained and expected to utilize the strategies with the personalized learning environments are not readily apparent.

The applicant does not clearly describe the curriculum alignment process that is continually referenced. A process for ensuring that the digital content aligns with standards and the formative assessment data is utilized by the teachers to design learning opportunities is not clearly articulated.

The practice of receiving immediate feedback through the digital tool can be helpful for students in identifying areas of growth. The applicant does not provide a comprehensive account of how the data will be utilized by the teachers to create instruction for students and monitor student progress against specified learning goals. While it is important to see areas of need, it is critical that the teachers use this data to inform their own practice and ensure that students are provided with differentiated

learning to help them progress toward their learning goals.

The potential for including personalized learning recommendations based on student's current knowledge and skills is inherent through use of the technological tools. It is not evident how the information gleaned from the digital tools will be utilized to make available needed content, instructional approaches, and supports.

The self-paced modules contribute to differentiated instruction efforts. The applicant does not clearly define what supports will be in place for accommodating students with high needs as they engage in the self-paced modules.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	14
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant indicates plans to provide all educators with training in the use of professional learning communities. With any major change, professional communication and collaboration is critical, and the implementation of professional learning communities can help facilitate the change process. The applicant also proposes a framework for school improvement, but provides few details explaining the different components of this framework and how it will be used to guide improvement efforts.

The incorporation of project-based learning, graphic organizers, and manipulatives represent efforts to adapt content and instruction to meet student needs. The applicant provides few details about training opportunities for teachers in each of these areas that will increase the likelihood of effective implementation.

The examination of formative assessment data with professional learning communities represents a process by which student progress can be monitored on a regular basis. The applicant does not thoroughly describe the process by which instructional adjustments will be made in response to data analysis.

The applicant indicates the teacher and leader evaluation system can generate a plan for individual professional growth based on stated goals. The identification of areas of strength and weakness for individual educators can encourage improvement in specific areas while acknowledging areas in which the educators are excelling. The walk-through evaluation instruments increase opportunities for immediate feedback, which is helpful for educators in improving their practice. Individual professional development plans also reflect possibilities to target areas of need for educators. The applicant does not clearly connect information from the individual professional development plans with the proposed professional development offered through the project.

The applicant provides some evidence of accessibility of student data for educators through the online/mobile application. Training opportunities offered by the higher education partners can provide teachers with information to help meet academic needs of students.

Training focused on digital tools can help educators implement strategies and use data to help accelerate student progress toward meeting college-and career-ready standards.

The use of student focus groups can provide information about how well the personalized learning environments are being utilized by students. Feedback through the websites can also provide feedback about the effectiveness of the resources. The applicant focuses much of the continuous improvement process on online submissions. There are little details about diverse mechanisms that will be incorporated to solicit feedback from multiple stakeholders.

Comprehensive performance-based teacher and leader evaluations can provide insight into areas of need for individuals as well as for the collective staff. This information can be used to guide improvement efforts. Professional development can be tailored to meet the needs identified through the evaluation systems.

The applicant focuses on the poverty barrier as the achievement gap, but there are few details provided about student performance and the gaps that exist between students in poverty and all students across a variety of criteria. A more detailed analysis of these gaps could provide information needed to generate strategies and providing educators with training that could work toward decreasing the achievement gaps.

Professional learning communities can be an effective forum for sharing ideas about instructional practice and analyzing student data. The applicant lists a variety of professional development options that can be based on individual or collective needs. A comprehensive discussion of how professional development will be determined for individual teachers, grade levels, content area teaches, and the schools as a whole is not readily apparent.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	13
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant evidence of an effective leadership team to oversee the project activities. A project manager from each district can be helpful in ensuring that all processed are understood and applied consistently across districts. Monthly meetings between the superintendents and project manager can facilitate ongoing conversation about the financial aspects of the project. Evidence of financial responsibility is referenced with the successful management of funds over time. A system of checks and balances, as well as voting requirements for all bills, represents an organized structure for supporting schools throughout the project.</p> <p>Various teams will meet on a regular basis to discuss any issues that arise with schedules, staff, and roles and responsibilities. The ongoing professional learning community meetings that have been a part of the culture of one of the districts also demonstrates evidence of autonomy and flexibility in making decisions about school-level factors. The applicant does not describe this autonomy for each building included in the project.</p> <p>Various assessments provided to students demonstrate multiple ways of determining student mastery. Student supports such as Response to Intervention and tutoring show a commitment to mastery for all students based on individual needs.</p> <p>The applicant notes that sufficient staff has been hired to work with students with disabilities and English language learners, but there are no details provided about the staff hired, including training, experience, and strategies that will be targeted specifically for the needs of these student groups. The use of technology and Marzano's research-based strategies reflect instructional tools and practices that will help all students.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposes a one-to-one initiative that addressed the accessibility of technology for all students. Extended day opportunities also increase access of learning resources for all students. The applicant does not clearly specify how all stakeholders have access to necessary content, resources, and tools.</p> <p>The applicant makes a general statement about technical support in that it will be available through the technology staff, peers, and online tutorials. There is little information about each of these methods of providing technical support. For example, it is not clear how the online tutorial will be developed or who will develop them. It is also not apparent how the peer support will be implemented.</p> <p>Students, parents, and teachers will have web-access to student achievement information through an innovative technological tool. This increases accessibility for those with Internet access. The applicant does not specify how this information will be provided to parents who are not proficient with the technology or do not have Internet access.</p> <p>The applicant describes the capabilities of the student management system which is interoperable with other systems. Separate staff portals provide a private area to house financial information and human resources information so that it can only be accessed by appropriate staff.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	7
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposes several general measures to encourage continuous improvement. For example, a project resource audit will be conducted each year to examine expenditures in relation to goals. This is an important aspect of project management and can inform work in future years. The applicant also notes that conversations and collaboration will continue. The applicant provides few details to accompany the broad strategies for continuous improvement. For example, the applicant does not specify exactly what data will be collected to assess project effectiveness in each aspect of the project. It is also not clear what the collaboration referenced will consist of in terms of assessing project effectiveness and encouraging ongoing improvement.</p> <p>The public sharing of information will occur using online websites. It is not apparent what other mechanisms will be employed to share information with stakeholders about the continuous improvement process.</p>		

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant indicates that the primary method for ongoing communication will be electronic newsletters and be updates. The advisory board can help facilitate information sharing among certain groups of stakeholders. It is not clear how all parents will be notified or whether or not the applicant has a strategic plan for notifying all internal stakeholders and diverse groups of external stakeholders.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has defined ambitious yet achievable performance measures for all students. The performance measures for all student subgroups are not thoroughly described. The applicant provides little information about the rationale for each selected target.</p> <p>The use of district data teaming and professional learning communities can encourage regular review of progress according to the stated performance targets.</p> <p>The identification of patterns in the data represents a way in which the measure can be reviewed and improved over time. Complete details about this process including participating staff members, training required to participate in the analysis, and effective reporting mechanisms are lacking.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant includes pilot testing and the use of surveys to glean information about the effectiveness of various project activities. Teacher evaluations of professional development can provide insight into how effective the trainings may be in influencing practice over time. The applicant does not specify methods for evaluating work with community partners throughout the project to assess their effectiveness. There are few details about gaining information from parents and other stakeholders about the progress of the project over time.</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>The applicant identifies all funds that will support the project. Effective use of tables and budget narrative clearly show all of the Race to the Top-District grant funds that will be used to support the project. Additional LEA funds are also clearly delineated. The applicant also identifies another grant that will support the proposed project. The funds appear reasonable given the scope of the project.</p> <p>The applicant does not provide a rationale for the investments for every priority established within the project. The application is lacking additional narrative describing the allocations and rationale for the overall budget design.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant cites careful data tracking and growth in professional learning communities as key aspects of sustainability. The applicant includes a table with thorough descriptions of different aspects of sustainability. The sustainability components were built into each phase of the project making it a seamless transition from the grant to the sustained growth and development. For example, developing work with stakeholders was considered at the onset, and there is a plan for developing these relationships over time to increase likelihood of financial support and community support.</p> <p>The applicant provides evidence of support from both local and state leaders. For example, letters of support from the mayors and state representatives indicate commitments to support the project over time. This support can increase the potential for sustainability in the future through additional recognition and possible financial support.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: This section was not addressed.		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: The applicant provides a coherent plan to create personalized learning environments to improve teaching and learning. The digital tools proposed by the applicant provide students the opportunity for self-paced instruction based on mastery of standards. Opportunities are included for tracking data based on built-in formative assessments. Training for teachers is referenced as a tool for effectively implementing the personalized learning environments. While the applicant states that they will benefit students from Pre-Kindergarten through high school, it is not readily apparent how they will address the needs of all students, particularly in the lower elementary grades.		

Total	210	131
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	0
Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments: This section was not included.		



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0629MO-3 for Camdenon R-III Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:		

The applicant articulates a clear, concise, comprehensive and coherent reform vision which involves focusing on the following five goals that would engage all students in deeper learning experiences.

1. Developing digital personalized learning environments for the academic achievement of each student;
2. Developing parent informational components, including increased access to student data;
3. Enhancing extended learning opportunities to provide deeper learning experiences for students within their communities;
4. Developing curriculum with an increased focus on real world applications of academic content; and
5. Creating educator learning opportunities to best meet student needs.

The achievement of these goals will have a positive impact on overall student achievement as well as strengthen teaching and learning skill sets. The parent informational component, inclusive of them having access to student will increase their buy-in, involvement and support of the goals of the proposal. Access to student data will strengthen parents' understanding of their student's learning needs.

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

10

10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presented a clear and detailed approach to implementing its reform proposal which involves a four year implementation process that focuses on personalizing the learning environment, career plans of study, curriculum alignment, formative assessments and self-paced modules, district assessment and training, extended learning opportunities. The process includes participation of all schools in the rural consortium districts that meet the grant eligibility requirements as well as the total number of students that will participate.

The implementation approach is concise because it identifies all persons such as the project manager, industry partners, post-secondary partners, parents and the role they will play in the implementation process. The applicant will gather feedback from assessments across each district. The feedback will identify training needs and action plans for improvement and inform overall project implementation and its impact on student learning experiences.

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

10

5

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not clearly articulate how its plan will be SCALE UP and transformed into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond its participating schools. The following activity is a high-quality plan that can be translated into meaningful reform. In Camdenton, the greatest limited resource is space, which inhibits a truly coordinated effort to provide extended learning opportunities built on course work and college and career ready standards. Developing a centralized location for staff, supplies, and resources for services such as Parents as Teachers, extended day programs, and career exploration excursions, will allow the Camdenton School District to provide a coordinated effort for academic support for students, parents, educators, and the community. In Knob Noster, the greatest restriction is the time for staff to develop truly meaningful extended learning experiences, specifically in the PK-4 age group. The above activity was not identified as the SCALE UP portion of the proposal. However, the applicant does not demonstrate how its plan would improve student learning outcomes for all students who would be served. In addition, there is no mention of how the plan would be transformed to support district-wide change beyond its participating schools. The applicant also did not document the impact of the SCALE UP plan on all student sub-groups.

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

10

9

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides documentation that its vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by its ambitious yet achievable goals.

The methodologies used to identify student academic needs are based on performance on summative assessments including the percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced and determining growth as the change in the percentage of students achieving proficient or advanced from year to year.

Relative to decreasing achievement gaps, the methodology used by both districts (Camdenton and Knob Noster) was determined by comparing district performance by grade level on the Missouri Assessment Program grades 3-8 in communication arts and mathematics and the Missouri End of Course Assessment in Algebra I, Algebra II, Biology, and English I and II to the overall state performance by grade level in the same year. In addition, performance on the Missouri

Assessment Program in science grades 5 and 8 were compared to the overall state performance on the same assessments.

The applicant will focus on digitizing personalized learning environments, increasing parent access to student data, developing curriculum with an increased focus on real world applications of academic content and creating educator learning opportunities to best meet student needs.

The methodologies use to identify student academic needs are also based on the high school graduation rate, and college enrollment.

However, the applicant does not provide an explanation of projected student growth.

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	12
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides data that demonstrates a clear record of success in the past four years relative to advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and achievement. It is clearly evident that two LEAs have been working successfully to improve student learning and achieve higher success for all students. For example, the Camdenton District met thirteen of fourteen performance standards of the state's assessment program consistently over a six year period. Based on MAP growth, between 2009 and 2012, Knob Noster's seventh grade cohort showed 12% gains in the number of students scoring proficient and advanced in communication arts. Knob Noster's seventh grade cohort showed a 26% increase in the number of students scoring proficient and advanced in math between 2009 and 2012. Based on the above assessment results from Knob, Noster, it is clearly evident that the skills enhancement sessions with students implemented at the Middle School level proved to be beneficial to student learning outcomes. However, there is no mention of data being made available to all stakeholders. In addition, data is not provided for all tested sub-groups.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant adequately demonstrates a high level of transparency in LEA (Camdenton R-III and Knob Noster R-VIII) processes, practices, and investments, including by making public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration in the following areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff; • Actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only; and • Actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers. <p>The applicant does not provide documentation relative to expenditures that include but not limited to actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level or district level such as professional development, instructional materials/supplies and expenditures for technology. In addition, the applicant does not provide documentation relative to how processes, practices and investments would be made available to the public.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal are clearly evidenced. Under the Missouri Revised Statutes, Chapter 171 School Operations, Section 171.011, a "school board may adopt rules and regulations." Under this statute, the "school board of each school district in the state may make all rules and regulations for the organization, grading and government in the school district." Personalized learning environments in the project described in this proposal fall within the conditions of this statute, permitting the districts latitude and autonomy to implement the proposed program.</p>		

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	8
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>B4 (a)</p> <p>Meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal and meaningful stakeholder support for the proposal was described. Students, families, teachers and principals, as well as community leaders have been engaged throughout the development of the proposal. Evidence of direct engagement and support for the proposals from teachers in participating schools is clearly evidenced by the letters of support from the Teacher's Association for both Camdenton and Knob Noster. The concept for the proposal was generated through/during discussions between district and postsecondary administrators and staff who are engaged in collaborative efforts to improve student achievement and closing the achievement gaps. Survey results evidenced buy-in and support for the proposal from parents, school administrators, and teachers. However, only two parents completed the survey. Parents were not given adequate opportunities for stakeholder input other than by being surveyed.</p> <p>B4 (b)</p> <p>Meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal and meaningful stakeholder support was clearly evident. The proposal received support from superintendents of the participating districts, local school boards, and teacher associations, state and US legislators, post-secondary institutions, as well as after-school and pre-school organizations.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Although the applicant communicates the logic behind the reform proposal contained, it does not clearly describe a high-quality plan for an analysis of its current status in implementing personalized learning environments. The plan communicates that educators will address unique student needs by obtaining training in technical skills, differentiating instruction, aligning curriculum, working with English Language Learners, recognizing student needs and gaps in using data, and other needs determined through the assessment process. The applicant did not define some of the unique student needs.</p> <p>The focus of one district is to move students into the proficient level of performance. Moving more students to the proficient level of performance will have a positive impact on closing the achievement gap for identified sub-groups.</p> <p>The applicant makes several references regarding using strategies based on the Charlotte Danielson's (2002) Framework for School Improvement to support district-wide change; however the applicant does not explain or provide detailed information about the Danielson Framework.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	16
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant adequately demonstrates a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready as evidenced by the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant proposes to expand on current parent resources, such as the Parents as Teachers program to a parents as partners approach by engaging and assisting parents of all students, starting with PK children in the Parents as Teachers program through high school seniors, to have meaningful information to be involved and engaged in their child's educational experiences. • Through a digital personalized learning environment students will be able to update their course of study based on changing interests, courses, and work experiences through a personalized electronic application (iPad, Nook, computer, etc.). As students update career interests, changes are saved to an educator database where administrators, advisors, 		

counselors, teachers, and parents can view student interests and goals. Career Center staff can access information to provide targeted information to students interested in career areas, including academic skills needed for particular careers.

- The personalized learning environment will be connected to a student's career goals and the Common Core State Standards.
- Teachers across content areas can access formative assessment results to determine where a student needs additional assistance.
- By utilizing the personalized learning environment, the consortia will be able to align curriculum with the Common Core State Standards to ensure that student goals are linked to college and career ready standards and post-secondary programs. The applicant also proposed to use a digital personalized learning environment that allows students to structure and measure their learning to achieve their goals.

Based on the above plan, it is evident that mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning. However, the applicant does not mention how the personalized learning environment would be made available to all students.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	16
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant adequately demonstrates a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready based on the following activities.

- The applicant's plans involves increasing teacher knowledge and utilization of instructional strategies to increase rigor and relevance of education for all students, providing educator training opportunities, utilizing effective evaluation systems, aligning curriculum to college and career ready standards, enhancing data systems, and employing a personalized learning environment to engage all students in career goals.
- The applicant proposes implementing a variety of sound approaches will be implemented for increasing educator capacities in teaching and leading that include training opportunities through Missouri's Regional Professional Development Centers and the American Alliance for Innovative Schools state and national conferences and professional learning communities; technical training and assistance; and formative assessment and self-paced module development meetings.
- The applicant proposes to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals by creating educator learning opportunities to best meet student needs is an excellent strategy.

Teachers engaged in professional development based on identified student needs will have a positive impact on the overall quality of the proposal. They are better equipped to engage students in the learning process. Principals engaged in professional learning opportunities will also positively impact the overall quality of the proposal. They too are better able to assist teacher by identifying professional development for teachers that enhances teaching and learning.

However, the applicant does not specify how it proposes to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals by creating educator learning opportunities to best meet student needs. In addition, there is no mention of how frequently it will measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready or college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides sound evidence of a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed as it relates to its practices, policies and rules that are clearly documented by the following:

The Camdenton Board of Education will provide oversight for grant services, will become the fiscal agent and manage expenditures including the reimbursement of funds. Knob Noster will provide oversight for grant services within their respective districts.

The consortia will be governed by a board including the district superintendents, a project manager from each district, a member of the Camdenon R-III Board of Education, a member of the Knob Noster R-VIII Board of Education, and representatives from the two partner institutions. The Camdenon R-III district bookkeeper will provide the Project Manager with monthly budget reports. The Camdenon's central office leadership team meets weekly. There are also monthly meetings of principals and assistant principals for the high, middle and elementary schools. The Camdenon district will reassess student mastery of standards quarterly, each semester and yearly.

Knob Noster will demonstrate student master of the standards via building wide programs dedicated to thirty minutes in which every available person works with students. The Knob Noster R-VIII RTI support system includes parent volunteers and retired teachers from the local community. Knob Noster is committed to Student Teacher Enhancement Program or STEP, which provides tutoring to students who need extra support, encouragement or remediation are able to join tutoring groups before and/or after school. Through the use of virtual server space and a web-based system, students and parents will have access to information from any location.

With the support and resources, such as the ones above, the personalized learning environment will provide an additional means for students to demonstrate mastery of the standards. The above mentioned supports and resources are clear indications of a high-quality plan to support the project's implementation.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides sound evidence of a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed as it relates to it's the LEA's and infrastructure as evidenced by the following:

The substantial technology budget and the use of personalized learning environments highlighting formative assessments based around an area of interest and the one-to-one initiative students will be allowed to have access to technology at school and at home. Technical support will be provided by the instructional staff, the technology department, and via on-line tutorials. Professional development sessions will be held for staff, parents and students to properly utilize the technology. Students and parents will have access to information from any location via a virtual server space and web-based system. Digital application will be available for students, parents and educators to access data, career exploration information, formative assessments and self-paced instructional modules. Currently 25 percent of Knob Noster's student population participates in some form of after school or extending learning program.

This high-quality plan implementation plan justifies opportunities for increased student participation in extended learning programs beyond the 25 percent student participation cited.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Relative to a continuous improvement process, the applicant presents an adequate quality continuous improvement plan that includes:

- The applicant will identify of and clarity in the core beliefs that define the school's culture.
- LEA's have created a shared vision with respective district educational stakeholders that explicitly define what the core beliefs will look like in practice PK-12.
- The applicant will collect accurate, detailed data and use analysis of the data to identify baseline and progress toward program goals.
- Guiding questions will be utilized by collaborative teams, educational stakeholders and the program manager to facilitate the implementation of program goals.
- Project goals and action steps to support the goals will be used to help close the gap between the vision of the LEAs and their current reality.
- Districts will implement action steps to support the professional learning of local educators.
- The local LEA will embrace the collective accountability and responsibility of all educational stakeholders to close the identified achievement gaps, ensure attainment of program goals and prepare students for college and career

readiness.

- A project resource audit will be conducted each year to highlight project expenditures and how these support project goals.

The applicant makes reference to its core beliefs; however, the core beliefs are not defined or communicated in the application. Data collection is referenced; however, specific times are not provided regarding when data will be collected and by whom. The applicant does not explain how its plan for embracing the collective accountability and responsibility of all educational stakeholders to close the identified achievement gaps, ensure attainment of program goals and prepare students for college and career readiness.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Relative to ongoing communication and engagement, the applicant documents an adequate quality plan based on the following:

- Internal and external stakeholders will be apprised of the current activities and milestones reached during the project through regular electronic newsletters.
- The advisory board will meet on a regularly scheduled basis, and also provide updates to the community via news releases and newsletters.
- External stakeholders will be informed of project progress and solicited for input through presentations and discussions at existing stakeholder group meetings, such as school board meetings, chamber of commerce meetings and PTO meetings.
- Internal stakeholders will also receive ongoing professional development around the implementation of project components.

Ongoing communication and engagement is adequate because the applicant uses obscure terms such as on-going and regular when referring to meeting times.

The applicant did not clearly define “regular: in terms of when the advisory board would meet, and when and how often existing stakeholders meetings would take place. The applicant did not provided specific documentation regarding what kind of professional development would take place around the implementation of the project components.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has a high-quality approach to continuously improve its plan. The plan demonstrates clear, ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures. The plan communicates performance measures in the following areas.

- Highly Effective Teacher/Principal
- Effective Teacher/Principal
- Grades 3-8 Communication Arts Proficiency
- Grades 3-8 Math Proficiency
- English I and II End-of-Course Proficiency
- Algebra I End-of-Course Proficiency
- Biology End-of-Course Proficiency
- Missouri Safe and Drug Free Schools Survey Questions
- The Percentage of Students Who Completed FAFSA Applications
- Percentage of Seniors Who Have Taken the ACT
- Percentage of 10 Graders Who Scored 18 or Higher on the PLAN assessment

For Knob Noster 40.3 % of the students completed the form (baseline). The goals for the schools are for 60.9% (Camdenton) and 51% (Knob Noster) of the students to complete the form the next year. The goals to increase the number of form completions are 10.4% (Camdenton) and 10.7 % (Knob Noster) respectively. These percentages are realistic, ambitious and achievable, given the overall plan to improve student achievement proposed by the applicant. However, the applicant does not provide achievement measures for all sub-groups.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents an adequate plan regarding how it will evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities, such as professional development and activities that employ technology, and to more productively use time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results, through such strategies as improved use of technology, working with community partners, compensation reform, and modification of school schedules and structures (e.g., service delivery, school leadership teams and decision-making structures) based on the following:

- Every aspect of the proposed project, whether it is a process or a product, will be evaluated and assessed at regular intervals throughout the lifetime of the grant.
- Formative evaluations will include activities such as collecting and qualitatively analyzing stakeholder feedback garnered from communication tools and efforts, pilot testing of the applications developed as a part of the proposed project, administering use and usability survey instruments following the delivery of professional development programs, providing online user feedback surveys linked to web applications, and conducting focus group style discussions with program staff, teachers, students, community members and key stakeholder groups.
- Collaboration education teams will be responsible for reevaluation and integration of action steps to focus efforts and address concerns illuminated in the formative evaluations to ensure that the respective LEA's make adequate and continued progress toward the learning goals.
- Summative data will be collected from the web application on usage and student improvement, as well as from longitudinal student achievement data from various assessment tools including state, and local assessments and health surveys.
- Implementation and effectiveness of professional development will be evaluated. Teacher evaluations, student achievement data and budget information regarding professional development funds will be monitored and reported to gauge the effectiveness of the Race to the Top District funded activities.
- Technology implementation and the impact on student achievement will be reported through the use of teacher evaluations, student surveys and district gathered samples demonstrating the effectiveness of supported technology software, hardware and other programs.

The plan does not mention evaluating its effectiveness of working with community partners. The applicant does not clearly communicate how it proposes evaluate the Implementation and effectiveness of professional development. Nor does the plan communicate how professional development funds will be monitored.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's budget, including the budget narrative and tables clearly identifies all funds that will support the project and are feasible. The budget and sub-part budgets are reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal inclusive of project services and activities as evidenced by the following:

- The personalized learning environments of the project includes the development of the multiple career plans of study, module and formative assessment development, curriculum alignment, and the personnel and contracts needed to create and train on these systems. Costs also include the technology needed for students and educators to access and personalized
- The development of parent resource materials training workshops will be videotaped for sustainability, inclusive of printing costs and shipping costs.
- The project will create educator learning opportunities to best meet student needs, focusing on utilizing a variety of instructional strategies, using data effectively, and technical assistance.
- Extended learning opportunities for the project enhances current before and after school, pre-school, and career related exploration programs, curricular achievements of students by integrating services and programs with a common mission and purpose.
- The project is also supported via LEA and state funding. Maintenance funds provided by the school districts will be maintained throughout the grant.

The applicant proposes to serve 2 school districts (Camdenton R-III and Knob Noster) and 5,934 students. Other costs

associated with the project will include personnel and fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contractals and other costs over a four year implementation period.

The proposal clearly provides a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities by utilizing personnel, supplies, and contracted services to meet the program goals. Technology staff will maintain equipment, software, servers. Technology contracts will be secured for student the information system. Administrative costs are for administrative personnel during the grant period only. The development of parent resource materials for training workshops will be videotaped for sustainability, inclusive of printing costs and shipping costs.

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

10

6

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates an adequate plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant based on the following:

- The applicant communicates that the management of resources will be essential to sustainability, as well as professional development and training all stakeholders so knowledge can be shared for the continuation of services beyond the life of this funding source.
- The applicant proposes to focus on data driven results of improved student achievement to ensure cooperation and support of local school boards and community partners for sustainability.
- The applicant will track increased learning, attendance, career preparation goals, and students entering higher education institutions to demonstrate success to assure decision makers that the needs of students, parents and community are being met.
- Discussions about sustaining the grant beyond the funded four-years will be incorporated in each step of development of this project. For example, the school districts involved in this grant application have already given careful consideration to ways of maintaining the same scope and quality that is established with funding after the funding runs out.
- The applicant will engage in collaborative partnerships
- The applicant proposes securing continued support from school administration and a variety of stakeholders
- The applicant proposes to ensure that the project continues to be mutually beneficial to all partners involved.

The applicant has identified potential sources as it proposes to secure diverse funding via collaborative partnerships and district buy-in of the project including but not limited to the school districts' budgets, funds from local foundations and agencies, business and industry, and school patrons. However, the plan does not include support from State and local government leaders and financial support. The plan does not include a budget for the three years after the term of the grant that includes budget assumptions, potential sources, and uses of funds.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not address the Competitive Preference Priority.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant articulates a clear, concise, comprehensive and coherent reform vision which involves focusing on five goals that would engage all students in deeper learning experiences.

The applicant presented a clear and detailed approach to implementing its reform proposal which involves a four year implementation process that focuses on personalizing the learning environment, career plans of study, curriculum alignment, formative assessments and self-paced modules, district assessment and training, extended learning opportunities. The process includes participation of all schools in the rural consortium districts that meet the grant eligibility requirements as well as the total number of students that will participate.

The applicant does not clearly articulate how its plan will be SCALE UP and transformed into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond its participating schools. The following activity is a high-quality plan that can be translated into meaningful reform. In Camdenton, the greatest limited resource is space, which inhibits a truly coordinated effort to provide extended learning opportunities built on course work and college and career ready standards. Developing a centralized location for staff, supplies, and resources for services such as Parents as Teachers, extended day programs, and career exploration excursions, will allow the Camdenton School District to provide a coordinated effort for academic support for students, parents, educators, and the community. In Knob Noster, the greatest restriction is the time for staff to develop truly meaningful extended learning experiences, specifically in the PK-4 age group. The above activity was not identified as the SCALE UP portion of the proposal. However, it is comprehensive relative to the applicant reaching its outcome goals as well of improving student learning outcomes.

The applicant provides comprehensive data that demonstrates a clear record of success in the past four years relative to advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and achievement.

The applicant adequately demonstrates a high level of transparency in LEA (Camdenton R-III and Knob Noster R-VIII) processes, practices, and investments, including by making public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration.

Successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal are clearly evidenced.

Meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal and meaningful stakeholder support for the proposal was described. Students, families, teachers and principals, as well as community leaders have been engaged throughout the development of the proposal. Evidence of direct engagement and support for the proposals from teachers in participating schools is clearly evidenced.

Meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal and meaningful stakeholder support was clearly evident. The proposal received support from superintendents of the participating districts, local school boards, and teacher associations, state and US legislators, post-secondary institutions, as well as after-school and pre-school organizations.

Although the applicant communicates the logic behind the reform proposal contained, it does not clearly describe a high-quality plan for an analysis of its current status in implementing personalized

learning environments. The applicant did not define some of the unique student needs. The applicant makes several references regarding using strategies based on the Charlotte Danielson's (2002) Framework for School Improvement to support district-wide change; however the applicant does not explain or provide detailed information about the Danielson Framework.

The applicant clearly demonstrates a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. Based on its plan, it is clearly evident that mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning.

The applicant clearly demonstrates a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready based on the following activities.

The applicant provides sound evidence of a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed as it relates to its practices, policies and rules that are clearly documented. This high-quality plan implementation plan would provide opportunities for increased student participation in extended learning programs beyond the 25 percent student participation cited.

Relative to a continuous improvement process, the applicant presents an adequate quality continuous improvement plan. The applicant makes reference to its core beliefs; however, the core beliefs are not defined or communicated in the application. Data collection is referenced; however, specific times are not provided regarding when data will be collected and by whom. The applicant does not explain how its plan for embracing the collective accountability and responsibility of all educational stakeholders to close the identified achievement gaps, ensure attainment of program goals and prepare students for college and career readiness.

Relative to ongoing communication and engagement, the applicant documents an adequate quality plan. Ongoing communication and engagement is adequate because the applicant uses obscure terms such as on-going and regular when referring to meeting times.

The applicant did not clearly define “regular: in terms of when the advisory board would meet, when and how often existing stakeholders would take place. The applicant did not provided specific documentation regarding what kind of professional development would take place around the implementation of the project components.

The applicant has a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve its plan. The plan demonstrates clear, ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures. The plan communicates performance measures.

The applicant presents an adequate plan regarding how it will evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities, such as professional development and activities that employ technology, and to more productively use time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results, through such strategies as improved use of technology, working with community partners, compensation reform, and modification of school schedules and structures (e.g., service delivery, school leadership teams and decision-making structures). The plan does not mention evaluating its effectiveness of working with community partners. The applicant does not clearly communicate how it proposes evaluate the Implementation and effectiveness of professional development. Nor does the plan communicate how professional development funds will be monitored.

The applicant’s budget, including the budget narrative and tables clearly identifies all funds that will support the project and are feasible. The budget and sub-part budgets are reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant’s proposal inclusive of project services and activities. The proposal clearly provides a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities by utilizing personnel, supplies, and contracted services to meet the program goals. The proposal clearly provides a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities by utilizing personnel, supplies, and contracted services to meet the program goals.

The applicant demonstrates an adequate plan for sustainability of the project’s goals after the term of the grant. The plan does not include support from State and local government leaders and financial support. The plan does not include a budget for the three years after the term of the grant that includes budget assumptions, potential sources, and uses of funds.

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

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	0

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

An optional budget was not included in the application.