



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0577KY-1 for Central Kentucky Educational Cooperative

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>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant describes a clear vision strongly supported by state legislation on college readiness. Vision is to accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning through a four part approach that sets the foundation for participating students to enroll and succeed in college and careers. 2. Applicant provides a strong list of performance measures associated with the vision. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is somewhat unclear how the vision builds on previous work of the school districts (LEAs) and educational cooperative regarding the four core educational assurance areas. <p>The evidence merits a score at the low level of the high point range because insufficient information is provided to know the vision builds strongly on experiences of the LEAs and ed cooperative in the four core assurance areas.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant provides complete data for the two selection criteria used in the selection process. 2. Applicant provides list of participating schools. 3. Applicant clearly substantiates high-need schools with data. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant description of school selection is somewhat unclear regarding why certain schools were selected within a school district. 2. Applicant sets selection criteria at or above 60% F/RP nutrition program eligibility for district, yet data reveals Harrison County district is 59%. 3. Applicant does not provide total number of participating educators in each school district. <p>The evidence merits a score at the high level of the medium point range because Harrison County district appears to not meet one of the selection criteria and total number of participating educators in each school district is not provided.</p>		

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant provides a logic model to substantiate theory of change for the project. 2. Applicant presents a chart of milestones and persons responsible for scale up. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant's logic model is somewhat confusing as inputs are inaccurately presented and explanation of external factors indicates five districts are in the project instead of three. 2. Applicant does not present sufficiently all elements of a high quality scale-up plan, as timelines for when the major activities/milestones will occur over the project period, or whether all students in all schools in each LEA will be reached (deliverable). A rationale for the plan activities is not described. <p>The evidence merits a score at the upper level of the medium point range because of the confusion presented in the logic model and the insufficient description of key elements required in a high quality scale-up plan.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant sets ambitious yet achievable targets for percentage of students scoring above proficiency on state test (i.e., summative assessment). <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is somewhat unclear why the consortium project expects the 5th grade male and female students to achieve the same level of proficiency in math in two school districts but little change in closing the male/female gap in the third (Powell County). This scenario reverses for reading, where Powell Co. male/female 5th graders achieve equally, but a higher percentage of female students than male students in Harrison and Marion counties are above proficiency. 2. Applicant's data reveal a lower percentage of 8th grade male students are expected to be above proficiency level than female students in Marion and Powell counties at end of project; and targets for reading show a much higher percentage of female students are expected to achieve above proficiency than male students in all three school districts at the end of the project — and this expectation is replicated for 10th grade reading targets. 3. Applicant's data reveal targets favor 11th grade male students to perform considerably higher on math measure than female students in all three school districts. In Powell Co. the gap in male/female 11th grade math achievement is higher at the end of the project than at the beginning. 4. Applicant provides insufficient information to explain why the consortium sets lower graduate rate targets for Powell Co. than in the other two school districts. <p>The evidence merits a score at the middle level of the medium point range because targets for closing achievement gaps between male and female students should be more ambitious given the project is designed to create personalized learning environments for all students to receive individual supports to accelerate achievement.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<p>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</p>	15	8
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant (cooperative) presents charts and statistics that reveal impressive achievement in collaborating with school districts to produce positive impact on student learning, including in federally-funded competitive grant projects. 2. Applicant clearly explains improving reading and math achievement of special education students is a priority. 3. Applicant explains professional development offered has had a positive impact on student success in Advanced Placement opportunities and scores. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant provides insufficient information and data to substantiate how each school district participating in the project has implemented significant district or school improvement initiatives and achieved positive student learning results. 2. It is unclear how the applicant and/or school districts have achieved collaboratively together, or individually, ambitious and significant reform in low achieving schools. 3. It is somewhat unclear if the "student data" released is student performance data, and if it is being released by the cooperative or it is a practice of each school district. For example, it is unclear if the advisory council meetings are specific to the cooperative or to one or more of the school districts. <p>The evidence merits a score at the upper middle level of the medium point range because presents adequate examples of how previous projects and initiatives have achieved impressive results in collaborating with school districts to produce positive impact on student learning, yet it is unclear how such impact has occurred in low achieving schools or how each school district participating in the project has implemented significant district or school improvement initiatives and achieved positive student learning results.</p> <p>insufficient information reveals how the individual school districts in the consortium have a clear record of success in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching.</p>		
<p>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</p>	5	2
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant specifies state law makes salaries of school personnel a matter of public record, and certified and classified employee schedules, audits of expenditures by county and per pupil expenditures by county are available. 2. Applicant (cooperative) provides clear information in appendix of audit results for CKEC organizational expenditures. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant provides insufficient information to explain the extent to which school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration are available to the public. 2. Applicant information reveals public access to information available is upon request, thus not released in ways to adequately inform and educate the broad public of school-level salaries and expenditures. <p>The evidence merits a score at the low level of the medium point range because insufficient information explains the broad public has adequate transparency of school-level salaries and expenditures.</p>		

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant specifies that as a local control state school districts have maximum flexibility in the design and delivery of instruction, including instructional methods for students. 2. Applicant specifies each consortium member is an independent political subdivision and has the autonomy to establish or change policies and procedures that affect the learning environment or, as described in this proposal, to establish the conditions for transformation. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is somewhat confusing that the applicant specifies the “Consortium has sufficient autonomy under state legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement students <u>from participating</u> in blended personalized learning environments.” 2. Applicant provides insufficient examples to demonstrate the extent to which each school district has established conditions of policy or practice to support implementation of a personalized learning environment in its schools. <p>The evidence merits a score at the middle level of the medium point range because insufficient information details how each school district has used its autonomy to establish conditions that support implementation of a personalized learning environment in its schools.</p>		

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	1
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant specifies a Frequented Asked Questions (FAQ) datasheet was produced for districts to share with stakeholders. 2. Applicant made a paper copy of the proposal available for review at CKEC (cooperative) office. 3. Applicant specifies district leaders took the time to speak and listen to educators to build and get feedback on the proposed reforms, and then to obtain their signature if the educators supported the ideas. <p>Weaknesses:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is unclear how the applicant (CKEC) collaborated closely with teachers, leaders, parents, students, and external community members to devise a strategy that improves the quality of the blended learning model. 2. Applicant provides no information to explain if each school district, who had an opportunity to respond to the proposal, provided a response that lead to revisions of the proposal. 2. Applicant specifies district leaders took the time to speak and listen to educators to build and get feedback, yet no documentation is provided, such as schedule of meetings held, number of participants, records of the meeting discussion, or participants’ recommendations resulting from the meetings. 3. Applicant provides insufficient information to document how meaningful engagement and feedback of any stakeholder was used to develop or revise the proposal. For example, a Frequented Asked Questions (FAQ) datasheet was produced for districts to share with stakeholders, but it is unclear how it informed stakeholders and generated feedback used in proposal development. 4. Applicant provides no evidence that at least 70 percent of teachers from participating schools in the three school districts support the proposal. 5. Applicant provides no letters of support for the application from key stakeholders. 		

The evidence merits a score at the middle level of the low point range because documentations of stakeholder engagement, use of feedback to development or revise the proposal, teacher approval of the project, and formal letters of support are extraordinarily insufficient.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	4
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

1. Applicant provides exceptional summative table that specifies current services provided by district; nature and magnitude of specific identified gaps, weaknesses or deficiencies in services, infrastructure or opportunities in services; and how identified gaps, weaknesses in services, infrastructure or opportunities in services will be addressed in the proposed project.
2. Applicant specifies key elements of a high quality plan designed to guide project response to the identified needs during year one.

Weaknesses:

1. It is somewhat unclear why creating personalized learning environments for students and educators is only reflected in the one area of the services to be provided, that is, disaggregation of district data and focus on student personal learning plan in reading and math.
2. It is unclear if the gaps in services are the same for all three school districts in all schools sufficiently warrant the same services in creating a personalized learning environment in each school, or if services will differ based on need.

The evidence merits a score at the low level of the high point range because it is unclear if the services and timelines are the same for each district or somehow tailored to school needs.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	16

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

1. Applicant provides information that reveals the districts will have access to the state's CIITS online learning model and data collection tool to facilitate personalized student learning through extensive use of data and numerous resources housed on the state dept. of education website.
2. Applicant provides clear information that demonstrates student learning is aligned with state's college- and career-ready initiative.
3. Applicants proposed blended online learning model, differentiated instruction through personal learning plans, use of online real-time data, and development of teacher leaders support students acquiring deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest and mastering critical academic content.
4. Applicant describes use of project-based learning and other activities that provide opportunities for students to develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving .
5. Applicant substantiates student access to a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals and ensure he or she can graduate on time and college- and career-ready is greatly facilitated by an electronic College and Career Readiness portal for students in grades K-12 and access to digital content.
6. Applicant specifies state provision for students to the ACT free of charge has accelerated number of students taking and perceiving they can master college content, as have restructured and rigorous career and technical education courses that

reinforce student preparation for college and careers.

7. Applicant specifies longitudinal K-12 data are now accessible to track student's to College/Career Readiness Academic milestones throughout the 12 years of schooling.

8. Applicant specifies teachers will use the state's Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (CIITS), a searchable online database that includes the new Kentucky Core Academic Standards and Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System, can link standards and student learning targets with high-quality multi-media instructional resources.

9. Applicant specifies that the cooperative (CKEC) will host a website to enhance and expand the ability for students, teachers, and parents to easily produce and access information, training, specialty lessons, invitations to activities, and visual demonstrations beyond what is available on the state's CIITS.

Weaknesses:

1. Applicant describes in section (i) important information regarding what is known about students and leaves somewhat unclear whether the students participating in the project will understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals.

2. It is somewhat unclear how the applicant proposes to leverage the vast capacity of state resources and project programs to specifically address the needs of high-need students, or if high-need students are perceived primarily to be special education students.

3. It is somewhat unclear how the applicant will train students to be able to use the CIITS and CKEC online tools.

4. Applicant provides a table with project activities, timelines, and persons responsible for year one only, without sufficiently describing in the narrative section of proposal the specific contents of training (e.g., summer academy structure, family workshop agenda, topics of student training), or where such activities are to occur to ensure parents, teachers, and educators have adequate access (or if training is blended online). It is unclear what the specific goals are for the many activities, an essential element of a high quality plan.

5. Applicant specifies CKEC will provide continuous hands-on support, leadership, training and technical assistance, without adequate specifics or examples to substantiate capacity to deliver such assistance.

The evidence merits a score at the low level of the high point range because key specifics are unknown regarding years two and three of the plan, and inadequate details of training activities, or sufficient information to explain services planned for high-need students in each school district.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	19
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

1. Applicant clearly explains that the project will leverage the state CIITS system as a repository for providing educators the tools, resources, and learning opportunities for deeper engagement in their professional development.

2. Applicant convincingly explains a new state teacher evaluation tool will aid administrators in more accurately recommending professional development for teachers that aligns more specifically with student learning needs.

3. Applicant specifies teachers will have professional development in multiple ways, including face-to-face, office 360 online sessions, Moodle classrooms, online videos, and involvement in professional learning communities (PLCs), with coaches or mentors to provide just-in-time, onsite embedded professional PLCs.

3. Applicant clearly explains PLCs are the primary way teachers will adapt content and instruction to be most engaging and responsive to student's academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches.

4. Applicant specifies each school district will follow the state-wide transition to Common Core Standards and customize the individual professional development plan required of each teacher annually by state regulations by selecting from a menu of professional development services with a focus on Common Core Standards.

5. Applicant clearly explains peers/coach mentors located n each participating schools, as well as various face-to-face, collaborative teamwork, and online opportunities facilitated by CKEC, will ensure teachers have the assistance to use student data appropriately to learn and revise content and pedagogy that accelerates student progress and improves their individual

and collective practices consistent with the Common Core Standards.

6. Applicant clearly describes how new state law drives use of educator evaluation system and results as a value-added model to customize educator professional development consistent with student needs.
7. Applicant explains that the state CIITS system to be used in the districts greatly facilitates a personal learning environment for enhancing instructional practices, as well as selecting and accessing appropriate professional development opportunities.
8. Applicant thoroughly explains a school leadership team will be established at each school, comprised of an administrator, four teachers, a counselor, and a parent, to ensure the needs of the students and educators are considered when developing a professional development program at the school level.
9. Applicant clearly explains the teacher leader at each school will be trained in research-based practices and have a shared leadership role with administrators in making decisions and facilitating collaborative efforts toward the improvement of teaching and learning in the school— and the teacher leader also serves on the school leadership team.
10. Applicant clearly explains how time bonus and special recognition incentives will be used to encourage highly effective teachers to select to work in lowest-performing and hard-to-staff schools.

Weaknesses:

1. Applicant provides inadequate information or rationale to explain if the incentive component of the plan offers a reasonable chance of addressing the number of hard-to-staff schools or number of high-need students in each school.

The evidence merits a score in the upper level of the high point range because the applicant provides a complete and convincing description of information, consistent with the project logic model, that appropriately addresses each criterion, with 1 point deducted because of the weakness cited.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	5

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

1. Applicant provides selected comprehensive district improvement plans and district technology plans that substantiate school districts have appropriate foundations in place to support implementation of the proposed RTT-D project. These plans show goals, activities, personnel responsible and timelines for supportive implementation.
2. Applicant provides job descriptions that define roles and responsibilities of personnel to be hired by CKEC to lead and provides services to the districts in the proposed RTT-D project.

Weaknesses:

1. Applicant provides a comprehensive school district improvement plan for Harrison and Marion and a district technology plan for Harrison and Powell. It is unclear why no comprehensive improvement plan is provided for Powell County and no technology plan is provided for Marion County.
2. It is unclear what document the applicant is referencing in the statement “This document describes the processes and procedures used to staff Project AIIRS.”
3. Applicant provides inadequate information to explain clearly how the school leadership team interacts with the existing school site-based council, or has sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school-level budgets.

- 4. Applicant specifies the students experience multiple ways to demonstrate mastery, but this is not explained clearly.
- 5. Applicant provides insufficient information to explain how students have opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic.
- 5. Applicant provides insufficient information to explain how the school districts or applicant has practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning by providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners. The following statement is extremely confusing: "The PLC will exceed the required inclusion and multiculturalism as all functions of the environment, such as e-mail, discussion and calendar will be actively selected by the individual."

The evidence merits a score at the low level of the medium point range because the important weaknesses cited substantially limit the potential foundation implied in the example comprehensive district improvement plans for implementing personalized learning environments, particularly the insufficient explanation regarding flexibility and autonomy of the PLC over school-level factors.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

- 1. Applicant provides school district technology plans that substantiate intent of districts to provide all stakeholders access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school.
- 2. CKEC (applicant) will ensure open source measurement solutions are embedded into the planned website to increase public access for all users.
- 3. Applicant clearly explains its website will provide configuration options that allow district administrators to enable or disable the views within the system, thus enabling students and parents to have secure open-data format access to a vast assortment of important student learning records.
- 4. Applicant specifies Infinite Campus, a role based student data management system, will be implemented to provide student and parent portals.
- 5. Applicant explains the project will implement the state's CIITS system to ensure school districts and schools use interoperable data systems.

Weaknesses:

- 1. It is unclear as to the extent school districts have been able to successfully implement their technology plans to give all stakeholders access to learning resources; for example, the computer to student ratio in each school, or the extent students have access to computers and Internet access in the home in the high poverty rural areas.
- 2. It is unclear how parents have appropriate technical support to participate fully in the project in support of a child's personalized learning opportunity.

The evidence merits a score at the low level of the high point range because the implementation of the state CIITS system and assistance of the cooperative (CKEC) substantially enable the school districts to have more than adequate school infrastructure supports for personalized learning, yet insufficient information is presented to explain if student to computer ratios in schools or student/parent home access to computers and/or the Internet will limit key support features.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	13

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

1. Applicant describes a strong formative and summative evaluation, with external evaluator using qualitative information and quantitative data collection techniques, and thoroughly explains how the evaluation results provided in a timely manner will be used to improve project implementation and outcomes.

Weaknesses:

1. Applicant does not describe how information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top – District grant will be shared publicly.

The evidence merits a score at the middle level of the high point range because of the strong continuous improvement strategy that incorporates external evaluation results. Two points are deducted because of the weakness cited.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths: Applicant describes numerous types of meetings that demonstrate ongoing communications occur for making timely project improvement decisions and for announcing successful accomplishments.

Weaknesses:

1. Applicant confusingly describes the Continuous Improvement Feedback Flow Chart as an organizational structure, as it shows an advisory committee that is unmentioned in the narrative. It is unclear who is doing the reflection, revision and analysis step, or how the rigorous experiential pd evaluation box fits in the flowchart, unless the process is specific to a professional development event.

2. Applicant specifies the Leadership Team will meet on a quarterly basis to facilitate communications between the partners, and manage the logistics of the institutes, yet no institutes are mentioned in the table of project timelines for year one that includes continuous improvement strategies.

3. Applicant specifies a leadership team exists, but it is not clear who makes up the team or its role in this consortium project, or who is on the council and its role, or who is on the advisory committee and its role (i.e., committee noted in the flow chat). Consequently, lines of internal communication are difficult to clearly interpret.

4. Applicant provides insufficient information to explain what topics the data will address that is to be placed in local papers, distributed through flyers within the community, and placed on the CKEC website.

The evidence merits a score at the low level of the low point range because it is exceptionally unclear how numerous internal and external stakeholders are engaged and for what purposes.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

1. Applicant sets ambitious yet achievable performance measures for which data are available.

2. Applicant provides a rationale for selecting each performance measure.

Weaknesses:

1. It is unclear when the school districts will be able to provide integrative student and educator data for effective use in the project.

2. Applicant does not provide information on how it will review and improve a performance measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

The evidence merits a score at the upper level of the medium point range because insufficient information is provided to know when integrative student and educator data will be available for effective use in the project, and how a performance measure will be reviewed and improved over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

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

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths:

1. Applicant describes a strong strategy for assessing the effectiveness of planned project investments and expenditures made with RTT-D funds.
2. Applicant includes elements of a high quality plan in description, including the purpose (goal), self-evaluative activities, timelines (i.e., part of quarterly formative assessment), rationale (i.e., to continually ensure that project processes provide the most productive use of time, staff, money, or other resources to build capacity at the classroom, school, and district levels); deliverable (i.e., report in annual summative project report); and persons responsible (i.e., project manager and Director of Research, Evaluation, and Accountability at University of Kentucky).

Weaknesses: None

The evidence merits a score of all possible points because applicant describes a highly credible plan consistent with the project's logic model.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant clearly identifies all funds that will support the project, including matching funds provided by CKEC and project partners. 2. Applicant provides detailed budget narrative that clearly explains all costs and how each is calculated, and a thoughtful rationale to justify expenditures as necessary to implement key project activities and priorities. 3. Applicant provides information in budget narrative that substantiates expenditures are sufficient to successfully implement project as designed and consistent with project logic model. <p>Weaknesses: None</p> <p>The evidence merits all points possible because the applicant identifies all funds, provides exceptional detail in the budget narrative to show cost calculations and explains they are reasonable and sufficient, and clearly provides a thoughtful rationale for funds invested consistent with priorities and project logic model.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Applicant specifies a training-of-trainers framework will ensure capacity exists among sufficiently skilled and partner staff to provide continued instruction of new staff to carry out the program effectively and efficiently after federal funding ends. 2. Applicant describes how development and structure of the Professional Learning Community (PLC) at each school builds sustainability with strong linkage to local curriculum experts and expertise in universities. 		

3. Applicant invests in materials from private vendors such as STEM ACADEMY and Web Lesson Resources (both who also signed MOU that they would provides their services and educational support to participating teachers perpetually for as long as they remain in their current educational setting.
4. Applicant explains its commitment to seeking funds to continue the project, based upon evidence of success, from sources such as State of Kentucky, local governments, community leaders, and foundations.
5. Applicant explains how increased skills of the teachers, increased rigor of the academic course offerings, and the support offered to the students will benefit teachers, students, parents and the school community as a whole and consequently garner their support in sustaining essential project components after federal RTT-D funding ends.
6. Applicants provides information that includes key elements of a sustainability plan, including goal to sustain project, through project embedded capacity building, collaboration, and commitments (rationale) and selective fund seeking activities, facilitated by CKEC (responsible party) that will sufficiently sustain essential project components (deliverables).

Weaknesses:

1. Applicant sustainability plan relies heavily on anticipated capacity building efforts will work to sustain core components of project.
2. Applicant does make clear if school districts must purchase the necessary support services available from the cooperative after the project ends.

The evidence merits a score at the low level of the high point range because it is unclear if the capacity built can be sustained in the schools or if each school district and its schools must purchase the services from the cooperative after the project ends.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The evidence merits a score of 0 because the applicant did not submit information for a competitive preference priority.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant meets Absolute Priority 1 because the project logic model clearly shows a short-term outcome is students will participate in the development and implementation of individualized learning plans, which lead to improved student attendance and achievement that results in the student being more college and career ready, able to graduate and go on to postsecondary education. The applicant substantiates the individualized learning plan outcome with numerous activities in the project narrative and estimated expenditures in the budget narrative.

Total	210	138
-------	-----	-----

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:

Applicant submitted no optional budget supplement project.



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0577KY-2 for Central Kentucky Educational Cooperative

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - applicant provides a coherent reform vision that is a four part approach to furthering efforts in blended learning, improving the data systems required to effectively personalize learning, developing teachers and leaders, and implementing a community partnership strategy to support students' socio-emotional needs. This approach establishes the foundation for participating students to enroll and succeed in college and careers. - the vision intends to build on its work through seven strategies for improvement that began during the 2011-2012 school year. - the applicant demonstrates a commitment to ensuring children are ready for college and careers in today's rapidly changing, global society and economy by raising academic benchmarks in both reading and mathematics. - a logic model provides a clear description how the applicant will utilize inputs and outputs to achieve desired outcomes. - the applicant provides a scale-up plan to achieve the vision which identifies major milestones over the 4 years as well as the parties responsible. - increasing equity is contained within the vision but does not address closing gaps between sub-groups. - overall, this section is evaluated at the high range. 		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the application lists all schools across the consortium that will participate, and provides numbers of students as well as high needs students and students from low-income families (all schools exceed the minimum requirement of 40%). - numbers of teachers in each school are also included. - grade bands for each school are identified, however, subject areas are not provided. - the applicant does not provide evidence regarding the selection process employed in selecting schools. Therefore it is not evident whether all schools that meet the criteria were selected or whether other factors in the decision-making process were at play. - the overall evaluation for this section is in the medium range. 		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

- the applicant's logic model is provided in an earlier section and concisely demonstrates how the vision might be achieved.
- the application also provides several milestones that reflect the manner in which the plan will be developed over the four-year period of the grant to reach the outcome goals to improve student learning and enhance teacher development across the district, particularly in low performing schools. Persons responsible for achieving milestones are provided, however, timelines for these activities are not provided. Therefore, most of the elements of a high-quality plan are addressed.
- while the applicant states an intention to scale-up the reform efforts to other schools in the consortium, information is too sparse to determine the efficacy of this intent.
- overall the evaluation for this section is in the medium range.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- assessments of student academic achievement are consistent with the state program and provide proficiency status and growth information. Targets for improvement are incremental, sufficiently ambitious and achievable. A one-year baseline is provided and targets are provided for the 4 years of the grant as well as one year thereafter. Data for baseline and targets are provided for sub-populations.
- requirements for decreasing achievement gaps and increasing graduation rates and college enrollment follow the same concise and comprehensive model as described for the summative assessments.
- therefore, all requirements for this section are addressed and, given how the goals are ambitious yet achievable, have the potential to improve student learning and performance and increased equity.
- the overall evaluation for this section is high.

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:

- evidence demonstrating significant academic gains with high needs students was documented. Indeed, proficiency rates in math and reading over a two year period were actually improved dramatically. Documentation only covers a two year instead of 4 year period.
- substantial gains were achieved in behavioral issues with special needs students.
- there is a commitment to transparency by having student performance data made available yearly to staff and, through the local newspaper to parent and community members. Advisory councils, where participants include all stakeholders, meet quarterly to review progress and adjust program goals/activities based upon disaggregated student and participant data.
- the narrative does not address high school graduation and college enrollment rates.
- much of the co-op's work is geared toward professional growth among superintendents, other administrators, and teachers in member districts, and the evidence demonstrates a focus on improving teaching and learning.
- the gains identified above are demonstrated in the description which includes graphics.
- overall this section is evaluated in the medium range and at the high end.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- the consortium practices transparency by publishing 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; actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only; and actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level.
- a commitment to transparency is also measured by how difficult it is to acquire information. In this situation access to the

necessary information is readily available at the Kentucky Department of Education website.

- overall evaluation of this section is at the high range.

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

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- as a successful condition, LEAs are supported in their efforts toward personalized learning by the state's vision - "every child will be proficient and prepared for success". Therefore, the consortium has laid appropriate groundwork with their focus on mastery learning being adopted at the classroom level and formative assessment strategies are designed to monitor each student's learning and progress.
- districts have maximum flexibility in the design and delivery of instruction due to Kentucky being a "local control" state.
- the state provides educators with the necessary autonomy to determine the instructional methods necessary for students.
- each member of the Consortium is recognized as an independent political subdivision and has the autonomy to establish or change policies and procedures that affect the learning environment or, as described in this proposal, establish the conditions for transformation.
- the overall evaluation of this section is at the high range.

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

10

2

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- close collaboration occurred with teachers, leaders, parents, students, and external community members to devise the initial strategy which is incorporated within this proposal.
- as another level of consultation, each member within the consortium discussed the Race to the Top grant opportunity with stakeholders including their Boards of Education, principals, teachers and labor unions, as well as other stakeholders such as parents, parent organizations and community organizations.
- superintendents of schools within the consortium signed the proposal indicating their support.
- there is no indication that students were involved in consultations.
- the section provides no indication how the proposal was altered as a result of the feedback thereby making it two-way.
- the applicant does not meet the criterion of providing evidence that 70% of teachers support the proposal.
- the applicant indicates 3 letters of support which all come from staff within the consortium. Missing are letters of support from the various groups identified in the selection criterion.
- the overall evaluation of this section is at the low range.

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

5

4

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

- the applicant provides a detailed listing of gaps in services currently evident within the consortium. The listing also includes how specifics in gap reduction will be addressed.
- evidence in high-quality planning for year-one activities include timelines, activities and responsible parties. Not provided are the goals for these activities. The applicant indicates that subsequent year's plans will be based on results from year one which is a reasonable approach.
- the overall evaluation for this section is in the high range.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - students have access to rigorous programs which engage them in course work that is relevant to their daily lives and future career goals which, ultimately, is key to their success. - students will be supported in achieving their goals and measuring their progress in personalized learning through universal stakeholder access to instructional tools and resources for students and parents, as well as all educators. Individual student data will be updated frequently which can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career- ready standards. - students benefit from involvement in deep learning experiences by having their schools utilize rigorous programs of study organized around state and local industry standards that blend college preparatory instruction with high-quality CTE instruction, work-based learning, leadership opportunities, and effective support services that enable them to connect what they are learning to real-life career choices. - the application is silent on how students will have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning. - evidence is not provided regarding student skill development in goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication and problem solving. - information regarding mechanisms to provide training and support to students to ensure how to use tools in order to track and manage their learning is too sparse and non-specific. - a strategy is identified to ensure students have personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development. - access to digital learning content is available. - several appropriate tools to assist teachers in differentiating instruction for all students, particularly those who are struggling, are available. - a website is available to enhance and expand the ability for students, teachers, and parents to easily produce and access information, training, specialty lessons, invitations to activities, and visual demonstrations. - overall this section is evaluated in the medium range. 		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	18
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - improvement to instruction will be achieved by teachers actively selecting areas for self-improvement. Additionally, data for specific professional development needs will be derived through observation. Using the <u>GoKnowiObservation tools</u>, administrators will be able to determine and recommend avenues for specific professional development aligned to evidence of research-based strategies in the classroom. Further, coaches or mentors will provide just-in-time, onsite embedded professional development to teachers in professional learning communities. - the narrative provides sufficient evidence of strategies for helping teachers adapt their instruction to engage students by meeting their instructional needs. - teacher training will be provided to assist their efficient and effective use of timely, accurate student information and data to assist in personalizing learning for students and to accelerate their progress toward mastery. - at least 50% of an educator's performance evaluation must be based upon data and indicators of student learning-growth assessed annually and measured by statewide assessments or, for subjects and grade levels not measured by statewide assessments, by district assessments as provided in state law. Further, each teacher employed by the district receives walkthroughs as well as informal and formal observations that may be utilized toward his/her evaluation. Therefore, there is timely feedback to teachers on issues relevant to student success. - as part of the principal evaluation, individual school disaggregated evaluation data will be provided to evaluate/ analyze 		

student learning growth within the school. Additionally, school data will be evaluated to analyze progress toward current school improvement plans and improvement goals.

- each individual educator will be able to utilize data information, to seek professional development that will enhance their instructional practices, and assist in meeting all learners' needs.

- technology is available to provide teachers with an opportunity to easily access data to make professional development and instructional decisions.

- school leadership teams operate in each school to ensure that the needs of students and educators are considered when developing a professional development program at the school level. The proposal identifies a series of resources these teams can employ to facilitate improvement efforts.

- a number of strategies are documented toward increasing the placement of effective teachers and principals in hard-to-staff schools and subjects. Elements missing from qualifying this plan as being of high quality are goals, deliverables and identification of responsible parties.

- overall this section is evaluated in the high range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	11
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the consortium is designed to support schools in their efforts. Extensive planning documents indicate objectives, activities, expected impacts, responsible persons, timelines, evaluation strategies as well as costs. - policy exists for school-level leadership teams to provide constructive recommendations for school culture factors. Information is sparse as to the extent that these teams have sufficient flexibility over factors such as schedules, personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities as well as budgets. - policies support student progress based on mastery in learning. - the narrative is silent relative to the criterion on students having occasion to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways. - programming will address the required inclusion and multiculturalism needs. Student users will create personal student plans via easy-to-use web interface. The process of ensuring that students have access to appropriate intervention necessary for personalized learning has been institutionalized within student assistance problem solving teams. - the overall evaluation for this section is in the medium range but at the high end of the range. 		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - documentation indicates the applicant's commitment for equitable access to technology for all students, parents and educators, and comparable levels of educational technology for all schools. Every school has full access and connectivity to the internet, and every computer has standardized imaging, internet connection, and access to learning tools software. All computers in schools and offices can access standardized management software, including CIITS for data collection, Core K12 for assessment purposes and instruction. - computer lab staff will serve in a technical support capacity to provide assistance in using equipment and navigating materials and related resources. The support data will identify students' strengths and weaknesses that will correlate to the Common Core Curriculum and curricular resources. - a portal will be used to ensure that students and parents have secure access to assignments, tests, scores, grades, and attendance information. Additional information available includes student mastery of standards; learning progression; grades, behavior; assignment details, assessment history, events and communication from teachers; and on-track status toward high school graduation and college readiness. 		

- The primary goal is personalizing learning and instruction in every classroom for every student. An interoperable system will link the following components and functions in one integrated system: educator evaluation, assessment, curriculum and instruction, professional development, parent/student portals, special education, academic progress, and graduation planning. All of these aspects contribute to the primary goal.
- the overall evaluation of this section is in the high range.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an external evaluator with expertise in research based grant evaluation and implementation will work with director and Leadership Team to ensure that the project is implemented with fidelity. The evaluator will meet with the Leadership Team quarterly during the school year to review data and activities to date, discuss ways to improve activities that did not meet expectations, and revise upcoming activities according to feedback. This will ensure timely attention to meeting objectives and budgetary matters. - a complete listing of quantitative and qualitative evaluation data will be collected and reported to the Leadership Team quarterly: - formative evaluation will take place while the proposed activities are being implemented and will allow for adjustments of the project tasks, schedules, allocation of resources, and other management decisions. - a variety of statistical analyses will be applied to determine significance of improvement efforts. - the narrative does not provide evidence how the information will be shared publicly or the improvement process to be used for going forward at the conclusion of the grant. - the overall evaluation for this section is at the high range. 		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the applicant provides extensive detail regarding how communication will occur between the leadership team and the evaluator regarding information acquired from the evaluation process. In this aspect of communication and engagement, the plan meets high-quality standards. - engagement from internal stakeholders is accommodated because they are represented on the leadership team. At the same time it is not clear who makes up the team or its role in the consortium project, or who is on the council and its role, or who is on the advisory committee and its role. - lacking in the commitment for ongoing communication is how external stakeholders will benefit from communication and engagement. - the overall evaluation of this section is in the medium range. 		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the applicant has proposed the full complement of measures consistent with the chart identified in the selection criterion. Rationale has been provided in all cases, and the applicant has provided targets for the first year with the clarification that targets will then be identified for subsequent years. How the measure will provide formative information is also provided. - ambitious and achievable targets are identified for each measure and its subset of measures. 		

- missing from the narrative is the process it will employ to review and improve the measure over time if it is deemed problematic in measuring progress.

- the overall evaluation of this section is in the high range.

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

5

4

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- in order to determine efficacy in the plan's suitability, an interim review will assess the decision-making and approval process for investing in RTTT-D funded activities, such as professional development and activities that employ technology, and to continually ensure that these processes will provide for the most productive use of time, staff, money, or other resources to build capacity at the classroom, school, and district level. The project's manager will work with an external expert from U of K.

- the foci of the plan leave out references to engagement of community partners as well as efforts at compensation reform which are important aspects of the RTTT-D grant.

- the overall evaluation of this section is at the high range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- funding sources in addition to the grant are clearly articulated.

- funds required for one-time expenditures are identified.

- the budget details all of the positions associated with the project as well as what their longitudinal costs will be. Inflationary costs have not been identified, however.

- funding is focused on resourcing strategies directly associated with supporting and sustaining personalized learning.

- costs appear to be reasonable for the activities and programs necessary to meet the selection criteria of the project. The detail provided in these descriptions is extensive and provide a ready road-map to conduct evaluations in implementation as well as outcomes.

- there is no indication for the potential of costs to sustain the program after the grant period.

- the overall evaluation of this segment is in the high range.

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

10

5

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- the applicant indicates that a training-of-trainers framework will be used to warrant there are sufficiently skilled and partner staff to provide continued instruction of new staff to carry out the program effectively and efficiently.

- it is projected that the Professional Learning Community (PLC), with strong linkage to local curriculum experts and universities, will continue long after the project has concluded.

- these two arguments have some justification, however, sustainability will be hampered because the various supports in time, substitutes and leadership will be reduced.

- key programs of STEM ACADEMY and Web Lesson resources will be utilized for many years into the future because MOUs from both stipulate their services and educational support to participating teachers perpetually for as long as they remain in their current educational setting.

- the applicant does not indicate funding commitments beyond the grant period. Rather, the argument is put forward that the programs and processes initiated during the grant will be seen as sufficiently productive that funding from the cooperative and other sources will be forthcoming.

- the overall evaluation for this section is at the medium level.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: None of the elements required for this section have been addressed. Therefore this section is evaluated at the low range.		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: The applicant demonstrates a commitment for personalizing learning with a focus on ensuring equity. The proposal demonstrates a strong commitment to professional development of staff so that educators have the knowledge and skills at higher levels of effectiveness to adapt the instructional program to meet learning needs where mastery rather than time is the determinant of success. Ultimately, student achievement improves, and students qualify with college- career ready- standards as they graduate and pursue higher levels of involvement in post-secondary learning programs. The efforts described incorporate technological supports to a degree that they support student learning and also ensure that parents, students and teachers are able to track student performance.		

Total	210	151
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0577KY-3 for Central Kentucky Educational Cooperative

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: The vision (Academic Instruction Reform for Rural Schools) for the cooperative is one that is ambitious. The proposal has goals to accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning through approaches which include an online learning model; differentiated instruction through personalized learning plans; real-time data to personalize learning; and highly effective evaluation plan to improve teacher leaders. Legislation in Kentucky is helping with the reform that the cooperative is trying to make. The standards take into account international benchmarks for success on the global economy. .		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	4
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:		

The schools were chosen by the cooperative in the proposal based on their free/reduced lunch (60% or more) status and locality (being a rural district). The proposal listed all of the schools participating, number of students and teachers; however the charts were lacking clarity. The reason for choosing the particular high needs students were their non-proficient scores on state-wide testing. The proposal was a little unclear as it listed 5 counties in the narrative that were chosen to participate, but gave data about only three.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:
All school are served.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	3
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:
The proposal's charts showing performance on state assessments and intended growth is inconsistent in closing the achievement gap on the various student groups which is a part of the vision set forth by the cooperative. For instance, Harrison County's Elementary 5th grade reading scores are determined to have growth based on change in achievement level. Their subgroups are Title I, Male, Female, ESS, Free/Reduced, Disability (no race or ethnic groups). The growth of the lowest and the highest subgroup are envisioned to make the same progress, thus making no progress in the achievement. In Marion County there is a 2% difference in the two groups over five years of a new test. In Powell County there is a one percent drop in the achievement level in growth of the achievement gap predicted between the group with disabilities and the highest scoring group. The Graduation Rates are entered into the chart without an explanation. Ordinarily, this is justified if a percentage mark or something to indicate if indeed it is a percentage is being used. The chart is unclear. At this time the districts have not been keeping specific data on their graduates. The final chart of College Enrollment also only indicated numbers. It is unclear if the number are for students or percentages.

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	10

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:
The cooperative showed a clear record of success by increasing the math and reading proficiency of special needs students in the past three years which will ultimately lead to closing the achievement gap. The proposal has examples of engaging teachers in professional development to increase Advanced Placement scores which improved over each of the last four years. This fact could lead to higher college enrollment and certainly college credit. One project goal targeting behavior intervention increased academic performance. 100% of one high school's at risk students graduated. Student data is made available to various groups. It is unclear how each of the various groups would be able to improve instruction or services from the description provides. The description is actually naming of the groups and parts of the puzzle the groups will see and be able to change. A more complete description is needed to understand how data would be used to improve participation, services, and particularly instruction.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:
In the section again the cooperative names five counties participating. The evidence thus far consists of only three counties participating. The cooperative describes making available all of the information in the application, but is inconsistent when providing the evidence in the appendix. The appendix does not provide actual personnel salaries at the school level, but shows the salary scale for the district. More detail in chart form would satisfy the requirement.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:
The consortium describes condition in which each county has "local control," as granted by the state of Kentucky. Thus, enabling each county in the consortium to implement the applicant's proposal for students to reach proficiency and graduate

from high school prepared for college and careers. The Senate of Kentucky passed a bill for the Common Core standards to be implemented by 2011-2012 school year. The Senate's vision is to have all students proficient and prepared for success which falls in with the consortium's goal. The consortium has establish leadership training networks to spread district-wide that will focus on course and assessment alignment, teaching and learning, and monitoring student progress. All to identify potential barriers to personalized student learning.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	2
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The assurances signed by the superintendents of the districts were not completely filled out by the districts. For example, the one completed by Michael Tate does not fill in the top part of the assurance. There is no identifying information as to the district name, no point of contact, employer identification number, nor applicant name, etc. The local board president did not sign for the district either, nor did he/she sign the MOU. The Kentucky State Department of Education noted that they did not receive 10 business days to comment on their proposal; therefore, no comments were made. The proposal notes that the majority of the staff supports the project, but that the education association preferred not to comment. No supporting documentation was attached.

There was a description of the involvement of the stakeholder groups and their involvement in the process to provide feedback on the proposal that strongly suggests involvement throughout the process.

Three letters from stakeholders are named in the proposal, but were not attached in the documentation.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The collaborative has made strides in identifying the gaps in personalized learning environments of the teaching staff of the districts involved, thus impeding the learning environments of the students. The proposal identifies Kentucky's Department of Education and the Council for Postsecondary's Education's plan unified strategic plan for promoting college and career readiness and intend on modeling after the plan. The gaps the collaborative have found are based on disaggregated data and through analysis of staff within the districts. The plan is based on for key strategies which are accelerated learning options, intervention programs, college and career readiness advising, and college persistence programs.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Student learning is key to their success in accomplishing student's goals. The example given by the cooperative is for student is to have access to PLAN, EXPLORE, COMPASS, and Kentucky Virtual High School. This can be extremely valuable to 8th grade students through high school, but there is no mention of their elementary population in the entire discussion.

As all of the components of the CIITS system are in place, personalized learning environments for the students will also. The CIITS connects the standards with curriculum and formative assessments to enhance the personalized learning for the students which can be shared with the parents in the districts. Staff can incorporate their units of study and have access to highly effective teacher materials to develop differentiated instruction for all students in personalized learning plans. Through the each plan the following can be obtained: college aspiration; academic planning; enrichment or extracurricular engagement; college and career exploration; college and career assessments; college affordability planning; and college and career admissions process. Using this information and data teachers and administrators will be able to see the learning gaps of students and differentiate the instruction to meet the needs of students.

The proposal also will develop additional resources for appropriate academic and behaviors intervention to personalized learning through CIITS. Using the CIITS each district will increase rigor in content, using teacher leaders, peer mentors for their expertise in content knowledge.

By incorporating college readiness activities into the high school day, the culture is changing to reflect a more postsecondary aspiring high school atmosphere. Scaffolding techniques have been used to adequately prepare the younger students to be AP prepared. The increased postsecondary atmosphere has encouraged youth to take the ACT.

Student have had an increase in opportunities for academic interest by adding more CTE classes involving real work experiences and rigorous programs of study that include a blend of college preparatory instruction, work based learning and leadership opportunities many involving STEM programs. Online instruction by Web Lesson is an opportunity for differentiated content based curriculum delivery for elementary and secondary students. The STEM Academy with emphasis on gender, racial and socio-economic concern, empowers a school with STEM pedagogy and a Learning Management System for continuous improvement planning for students, teachers and administration.

With the indicators already in place, the cooperative will add Response to Intervention strategies for teacher to see, as well as students and parents.

The cooperative provided a clear method of Our Teacher Leaders of providing training to teacher to promote student learning and becoming more effective leaders, but little evidence was given for providing training and support for students to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal will use the CIITS system as a repository for the tools, resources, and professional development offerings. The teachers and principals (after thorough observation) will select or determine the professional development needed to improve classroom instruction. The districts have a wide variety of available venues. The teachers also participate in Professional Learning Communities and coaching and mentoring (again, sound practices).

The cooperative is using professional learning communities which are a thoroughly researched method to enhance teaching and learning of both students and teachers. The plan is to use this method to adapt content and instruction to decide upon delivery methods and as a support system for new teachers.

Professional development for teachers is to be provided to teachers in data analysis. Teachers will test students using benchmarks and use instructional focus calendars to inform instruction based on the benchmark testing.

Kentucky's new professional evaluation system is an appropriate fit for the proposal. The system includes a component for principals to provide feedback on teacher's effectiveness on analyzing student data and choosing effective strategies to improve student learning. Administrators will be able to make recommendations to teacher for professional development in a variety of settings for improved student achievement. Principals also need to disaggregate student data and school data on their evaluation to provide individual goals. The goals determine school improvement goals which need to be met or revisited at the end of the school year which determines leadership effectiveness.

The cooperative describes a school leadership team that is missing critical components at each school, missing a community member and a student. The culture and the climate can often be misread without critical members of a team therefore stymying continuous school improvement. The school leadership team and other members of staff will have leadership roles at the school (peer/coach mentors and teacher leaders) that will remain current with professional practices, student data, and model professionalism to help colleagues with improving student learning. These practices demonstrate methods of increasing student performance.

The plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers was limited. The bonus of time is the only strategy given for retention. There was not a reference to hard to staff subject areas or specialty areas.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	6

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The cooperative has provided documentation that two of the district' strategic plans can be written to facilitate personalized learning by allowing the consortium to provide support and services to all participating school, but that only one plan is written entirely in that vein (Marion). One district plan was not included except for an out dated technology plan. The included district's plans enable the schools to have a school leadership team. According to the proposal the teams will meet monthly according to the proposal.

The proposal indicates that staff will develop Student Progression Plans to assist and guide officials in decision making about placement, promotion, retention and special programs. This is to include performance standards and promotional and graduation requirement. Again, there is a lack of evidence of sufficient autonomy to do so.

The students will also have an opportunity for demonstrating mastery multiple times in academic intervention and advancement programs piloted during the summer or before or after school.

The personalized learning environment is needed by all students. A Tiered System of Support is in the proposal. It is designed to ensure that all students have the intervention to succeed. The support teams have been trained to assist students that have personal, social or learning barriers to succeed. The idea presents a good concept.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The cooperative states that every school in each district meets the technology standards instituted by the state of Kentucky. All computers in schools and offices can access internet; management software, including CIITS and CORE 12 for assessment and instruction; Web Lessons instruction and curriculum tied to college- and career-ready standards; and Infinite Campus for management of student information.

The technology plans provided were out of date. Technology plans for students and parents out of school was not addressed except for parents who either had access to the internet at home or who could go to the school for training or access to the computers. In a rural district, parents do not always have this luxury. Plans for disabled and the rural parents were not addressed.

A wide variety of support is in the proposal. Technical support will be provided by technology teacher and lab facilitator at each school site on a scheduled basis providing on-on-one tutoring and guidance to educators, students, parents, and others, as well as accommodating other modalities (on-line, peer support, videos, quick reference guides).

Infinite Campus is a comprehensive technology system that will enable parents and students to view vital student information such as everyday tasks and assignment; test scores; behavior; assessment history; communication from teachers; schedules; and progression toward high school graduation and college readiness.

The Kentucky DOE CIITS system is a comprehensive interoperable system. When all the components are completely functioning, the following will be linked in to the system: Educator Evaluation, Assessment, Curriculum and Instruction, Professional Development, Parent/Student Portals, Special Education, RtI-Academic, and Graduation Planning.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The consortium has a sound process of evaluation of the project. Having a qualified external evaluator to work with a leadership team is a convincing way to show fidelity to investors. Qualitative and quantitative performance measures and evaluations are to be used and to provide feedback to Leadership Team to help keep them on track quarterly. The leadership team will receive this data to help improve activities that do not meet expectations. MAP testing will be given to students as pre-and post-tests to determine student's yearly content knowledge. Professional development surveys will be summed up in a database. Project evaluators will use variance and multivariate statistical analysis to evaluate progress toward key goals.</p> <p>There are many appropriate methods of gathering and collecting data, but little evidence of sharing the information with staff in order to make corrections and improvements during the time of the grant or after the grant has ended,</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Ongoing communication and engagement of the internal and external stakeholders will be held quarterly according to the cooperative. Meetings will be held with the Leadership Team and evaluation team quarterly. Interview and survey data will be placed in local papers, distributed through flyers within the community at all local sessions and will be placed on the website and archived.

This engagement for the stakeholder externally is reasonable, but not internally.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
--	---	---

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The cooperative provided a sound explanation of ambitious yet achievable goals for the four approached of the Project AIRRS proposal. Each of the four provided the rational; rigorous, timely, and formative leading information; method of measurement; and performance measure goals. However, as the proposal is “drilled down” to the actual performance measure goals, there are some valuable pieces of information missing from some of the goals. For instance, the participating students are not listed by subgroups as defined by the notice by effect or highly effective teacher and principal, only by all participating students, students by %with highly effective teachers and principals.

In all cases of subgroup listings, only male, female and free/reduced lunch is named. All subgroup categories as listed in the notice are used. There are many instances where the subgroups are not listed.

The cooperative do not have goals for grades 4-8 of the percentage of students who are on track to college- and career-readiness.

There are instances of not reducing the achievement gap in the performance measure goals. In grades 9-12, in English Females, the highest will increase from 28%-48% or 20%; free/reduced lunch will increase 20% the lowest; and the males will increase 28%. The lowest will not improve the achievement gap. The males, who were slightly below the females, are not predicted to surpass the scores of the females. This too occurs in Powel County's 8th grade reading.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The cooperative intends to use an outside source to work with the project director to assess the effectiveness of the project. The plan has assurances that it will include oversight of expenditures and investments made with RTT-D funds so that the project can realign activities if needed. The process is to ensure that the project is providing the most productive use of its resources to have the biggest impact on participating students, educators, and schools.

The strategies to improve results were also named by the cooperative that were reasonable, but were not discussed in detail.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The cooperative names most funds that will support the project except funds from the LEAs which have pledged support with technology and facility usage but the figures are not available according to the proposal. In-kind contributions are included.

A breakdown was given of personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, stipends, indirect costs, and contractual. Each of these items were described and the percent of total funds of the grant were given and why. A description for all software purchases is provided and a clear sound reason for the use of the software was given by the proposal.

The project –level budget narratives provided thorough descriptions and rationales for the investments and priorities of the funds used in the implementation of the proposal.

No clear evidence between one time investments versus ongoing operational costs was evident.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	6
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The sustainability of the project may depend on a few things. The state did not have the ten days require to comment on the plan, therefore the state could not support the project completely. The development and continuation of the Professional Learning Communities with the strong linkages to the curriculum experts at the universities provides a convincing reason to have some sustainability for continued curriculum growth to further student achievement at all levels. Materials bought for STEM Academies and Web Lesson resources will continue to be useful. The cooperative itself is a sustaining resource to the schools and districts in the project. The cooperative is seeking funding through theState of Kentucky, local governments, community leaders, and foundations.

The overall project's is relying that its success in building capacity at the schools and evidence of success at the school level will build sustainability throughout the community. In the future the cooperative has not defined the source of their own income.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

As noted in the goals and performance measures, decreasing the achievement gap across student groups was one thread that was missing throughout.

The Absolute Priority One was met but not to the highest degree.

Total	210	133
-------	-----	-----