



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0302OH-1 for Cincinnati City School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Ohio River Valley Consortium articulated a comprehensive and clear vision that can serve as the foundation for accelerating student learning, deepening student learning, and increasing equity. The consortium’s reform plan, “A Class of One” describes how students will have Playbooks that will be generated by the Information Integration System and the Personalized Learner Portfolio. The reform plan is grounded in the Common Core State Standards (CCSS).</p> <p>A strength (and a unique feature) of this application is that the consortium is made up of member districts in two states: Cincinnati Public Schools (OH) and Covington Independent School District (KY). The applicant recognizes the challenges of working across state lines, but also recognize the potential benefits of getting two urban districts in an urban area on the same page as they work together on school reform.</p> <p>Overall this places the Ohio River Valley Consortium at the top of the high range.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Ohio River Valley Consortium lists the schools that will participate in grant activities and includes data for the number of participating student from all groups as required in the notice.</p> <p>The proposed reform efforts will target Grade 7-12 students (Grades 6-12 in Kentucky); however, details about how the participating schools were selected was not adequately described in the application.</p> <p>Overall this places the Ohio River Valley Consortium at the bottom of the high range.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Ohio River Valley Consortium describes appropriate scale-up strategies where the proposed turnaround strategies will first be implemented in the Cincinnati schools—and then the best turnaround practices will be put into place in the Covington schools. Insufficient information is provided about how the reforms proposed will be scaled up for use in schools beyond the participating schools in the two districts.</p> <p>The application did not adequately describe how the Applicant would reach its outcome goals. It would have been helpful if a logic model or theory of change had been included.</p> <p>Overall this places the Ohio River Valley Consortium near the middle of the mid-range.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The Ohio River Valley Consortium provides baseline data for SY2010-11 and SY2011 and sets goals for the subgroups across the years of the proposed project for both school districts in the consortium. The baseline data does not show consistent increases for all subgroups/grades across years so it is unclear whether the projected goals for performance on summative assessments, decreasing achievement gaps, graduation rates, and college enrollment are achievable. The baseline data for college enrollment shows strong upward trends across the baseline years; however, it was not disaggregated by subgroup, so it is impossible to tell whether the college enrollment goals are ambitious yet attainable.

Overall this places the Ohio River Valley Consortium in the middle of the mid-range.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	6
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Ohio River Valley Consortium does not provide enough data to determine whether there is a clear record of success for the past four years. Very limited empirical evidence were presented for four years. Much of the historic data were presented in the Charts and Tables in the Appendices which included data for only SY2010-11 and SY2011-12.</p> <p>The Applicant provides evidence for some subgroups of achievement gains across the two years for which data were provided. However, there are also many instances of decreasing achievement across the two years (for example, for Cincinnati Public Schools on the Grade 7 reading assessment for the African American subgroup performance decreased from -13.8 to -17.3 and on the Grade 8 Reading assessment for LEP students it decreased from -16.0 to -24.00). Some of the data is also alarming for graduation rates. Overall for the Cincinnati Public Schools the graduation rate decreased from 81.9% in SY2010-11 to 63.9% in SY2011-12. For some subgroups the graduation fell even more dramatically across the two years. For example, for LEP students it fell from 80.0% in 2010-11 to 42.1% in 2011-12. Since the data does not provide strong evidence of historic success, it is unclear whether the Consortium will be able to achieve ambitious and significant results in its persistently lowest-performing schools.</p> <p>Overall, this places the Ohio River Valley Consortium towards the low end of the mid-range.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There are differences between the two member districts in the Ohio River Valley Consortium in regards to how transparent the processes, practices, and investments are.</p> <p>Both districts provide some financial information on district websites. Cincinnati provides financial data, including the budget and expenditures, to the public on the Building Futures Dashboard. According to the application, Covington provides budget details on its website, including information about revenue (general fund dollars, grant funds), capital outlays, and miscellaneous other funds. It is not clear whether expenditure data are available on the Covington website.</p> <p>Cincinnati makes personnel salaries available in the Board minutes which are posted on a public website. Based upon the vague information in the application, it appears that Covington does not make personnel salaries available.</p> <p>Overall, this places the Ohio River Valley Consortium in the mid-range.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	9
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Ohio River Valley Consortium indicates that Ohio is a Race to the Top state which suggests that Cincinnati would have sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements, but insufficient detail were provided. A letter of support was included from the Ohio Department of Education. The Applicant provides an extensive and wide-ranging description of many policies and programs for Kentucky. Some initiatives that will be useful in implementing</p>		

personalized learning environments were described, such the use of Individual Learning Plans (ILP) to guide the middle and high school experiences of students in Kentucky.

Overall, this places the Ohio River Valley Consortium in the high range.

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

10

5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The Ohio River Valley Consortium provided limited evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement. There appeared to be a little more teacher engagement in Cincinnati than in Covington. The president of the Cincinnati Federal of Teachers signed a letter of support—though little evidence was provided that there is support from the teachers in the participating schools. Covington does not have collective bargaining representation and evidence was not provided that at least 70% of the teachers in the participating schools support the proposal.

A strength of this application is the very strong support from the business community. For example, Proctor and Gamble, PNC Bank, US Bank, and Kroger all supplied letters of support. However, little evidence was provided that parent and parent organizations, and students organizations provided support for this application or that their was meaningful engagement with these groups in regards to the development of this application.

Overall, this places the Ohio River Valley Consortium in middle of the the mid-range.

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

5

3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The Ohio River Valley Consortium provided limited information about the identified needs for the Cincinnati Public Schools and the logic behind the proposed reform. A more thorough needs assessment would have provided additional direction in regards to how personalized learning environments might be appropriately implemented. Almost no information was provided about the needs assessment for Covington.

Overall this places the Ohio River Valley Consortium at the high end of the mid-level.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Ohio River Valley Consortium presents a comprehensive plan to use an innovative Information Integration System (IIS) and Personalized Learner Portfolios (PLP) to create personalized learning environments and improve teaching and learning.

The personalized learning environment is designed to be grounded in College and Career Reading Standards, and includes goal setting, student choice, and content based on real-world living experiences. Data will be used for ongoing analysis and to guide feedback. A strength is that students will be able to be involved in participate in Capstone projects that have the potential to provide deep learning experiences in areas of interest. The Capstone projects also have the potential to allow students to utilize and refine critical thinking and problem solving skills.

The application is ambiguous in regards to how much students will be able to personalize the sequence of instruction content. Students will participate in a discovery process to get a better understanding of careers that they are likely to find fulfilling and productions, and to a certain extent these finding will drive instruction. However, the application also indicates that students with complete certain tasks as each grade level. The application also describes a credit recovery option to assist students who need an additional course to graduate which suggests that, in general, there may be limited flexibility in how time is used.

The Applicant indicates that ELLs and students with disabilities will have access to tool and strategies that will help them access the content, however the details are vague in regards to how the Ohio River Valley Consortium will ensure that these subgroups will be able to access high-quality content and instruction that will help ensure that they are on track to be college and career ready.

Overall, this places the Ohio River Valley Consortium at the low end of the high range.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	15
--	-----------	-----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Ohio River Valley Consortium has a plan that is designed to improve instruction and increase the capacity of teachers. Teachers will receive training on how to analyze student data to make informed decisions. A strength of the proposal is that teachers will be required to develop professional development plans tailored to each individual’s unique teaching context. Both face-to-face workshops and online offerings will be available. It is unclear whether a professional team or community that supports the development of individual and collective capacity is an integral part of the plan.

Vague information is provided regarding how student progress toward meeting college and career ready standards will be frequently measured—though it is clear that teachers will use the data which are available to monitor and customize student learning experiences.

Information is sparse in the application in regards to whether the policies are in place—as well as the tools and resources—that will enable school leaders to structure effective learning environments. Administrators will have access to the administrative Playbook that will integrate building performance data with state, district and building goals. A strength is that the Playbook will also recommend action steps aligned to college and career ready standards that school leaders can share with teachers and other educators to build school improvement plans.

Overall this places the Ohio River Valley Consortium at the low end of the high range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	8

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The implementation of high quality multi-district governance structures can be challenging. For success, it is vital the Ohio River Valley Consortium has an appropriate governance structure. It is a concern that the application does not describe the consortium governance structure for the Consortium.

Schools in Cincinnati are site-based and have Local School Decision Making Committees. They have autonomy in classroom scheduling, but little information is provided about how much flexibility and autonomy they have in school personnel decisions and staffing models, and roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators. (Little information about school leadership teams was provided for Covington.)

The applicant does not adequately describe how students will be provided with the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable way. Details are also sparse in regards to how learning resources and instructional practices will be made fully accessible for all students, including students with disabilities and ELLs.

Overall, this places the Ohio River Valley Consortium in middle of the mid-range.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Ohio River Valley Consortium does not adequately describe how all participating students and their parents, regardless of income will have access to the necessary tools (especially outside of school) to support the implementation

of the proposal. The application fails to describe how it plans to ensure that parents, students, and other stakeholders will have access to appropriate levels of technical support. The application does not indicate whether the information technology systems will allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format; and it does not indicate whether the two LEAs and the schools use (or plan to use) interoperable data systems.

Overall, this places the Ohio River Valley Consortium at the high end of the low range.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	5
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Ohio River Valley Consortium application provides general information about Cincinnati Public Schools school improvement efforts (i.e., use of the Ohio Differentiated Accountability Model; use of the Ohio Improvement Process, including the use of district leadership, building leadership, and teacher teams). Similar information is not provided for the Covington Independent School District. The application does not provide details about the strategy that it proposes to use to implement a rigorous continuous improvement process that will help ensure progress toward project goals and opportunities during and after the term of the grant. For example, specific details are not provided regarding how timely and regular feedback on project goals and opportunities will be provided. Likewise, specific details are not provided regarding how the applicant will measure and publicly share information on the quality of the investment. Overall this places the Ohio River Valley Consortium toward the lower end of middle range.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Ohio River Valley Consortium adequately describes strategies that it plans to use to maintain communication with internal and external stakeholders in the Cincinnati Public Schools. For example, information will be placed on the Office on Innovation website. However, information was not provided about strategies that will be used for ongoing communication with internal and external stakeholders in the Covington Independent School District. Overall, this lack of information about Covington places the Ohio River Valley Consortium at the high end of the middle range.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Ohio River Valley Consortium described the performance measures that will be used. The measures that will be used in Cincinnati were described in the text and a rationale was provided for those measures. The measures were also listed in tables.</p> <p>Approximately 12-14 measures will be used in each district. Some of the measures differ across districts. For example, both district will use ACT (number participating, percent on track for college and career readiness). Other measures will differ across districts—Covington will use the NWEA MAP, but Cincinnati will not. Rationales were not provided for the measures which were unique to Covington.</p> <p>Overall, the Ohio River Valley Consortium scored at the low end of the high range.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Ohio River Valley Consortium provided limited details about how it plans to evaluate the effectiveness of the Race to the Top-District activities. The professional development division will use Guskey's model, but the Applicant did not</p>		

adequately describe how other activities (such as improved use of technology) would be evaluated. Overall, the Ohio River Valley Consortium scored in the middle level.

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>The Ohio River Valley Consortium application included an appropriate budget and narrative. The narrative included a description of how the funds will support implementation of the proposal. The budget included sufficient detail. For example, detailed budget information were provided for Personnel and Equipment. Budget information was included for both Cincinnati and Covington. Overall, the Ohio River Valley Consortium scored at top of the high end.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Ohio River Valley Consortium included a plan for non-financial sustainability. The applicant also identified several possible sources of funding after the project (Title 1 School Funds, Carl Perkins Federal Funds, State Vocational Funds-KY, etc.) The application did not include such items as a budget for the three years after the term of the grant or other detailed information Overall, the Applicant scored at the low end of the high range.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	9
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Ohio River Valley Consortium described the re-design of many of the school buildings in the Cincinnati Public Schools as Community Learning Centers (CLC). During the 2011-12 school year, CLC schools worked with more than 400 community partners. The Applicant proposes to scale up this CLC model from elementary schools to high schools.</p> <p>A strength of the proposed program is that there will be a targeted campaign to recruit additional resources for older students with disabilities and ELLs that will build capacity to meet specific needs.</p> <p>The Applicant identified three performance measures (125 targeted students at each school will be connected to a community resource that addresses specific needs, 75% of targeted students will demonstrate improved outcomes, 75% of targeted students will determine a college and/or career path on the Student Success Plan).</p> <p>It was unclear whether similar programs would take place in Covington.</p> <p>The Applicant described a continuous improvement process and indicated that they will work with their program evaluators to access progress in meeting goals.</p> <p>Overall, this places the Ohio River Valley Consortium in the middle of the high range.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score

Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
----------------------------	--------------------	------------

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The Ohio River Valley Consortium adequately described how it planned to create the “A Class on One” program to significantly improve teaching and learning. It proposes to create personalized learning environments via the use of “The Playbook” and an Information Integration System that includes Personalized Learner Portfolios. The proposed personalized learning environments have the potential to accelerate student achievement and close gaps across student subgroups. The Applicant met this priority.

Total	210	137
--------------	------------	------------

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	7

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The Ohio River Valley Consortium included an optional budget supplement for transitioning from the elementary school to the middle school with a bridge program in the Cincinnati Public Schools. Little information was provided about this program in the application, and the rationale and plan were insufficient. The applicant provided a reasonable budget for the proposed program. Overall, the Ohio River Valley Consortium scored towards the middle of the mid-range.



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0302OH-3 for Cincinnati City School District

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 Ohio River Valley Consortium (ORVC) has presented a coherent and comprehensive vision to further extend existing models of reform and implement a system of personalized learning environments that:

- customize strategies, resources and learning experiences
- align strategies, resources, and learning experiences with college and career ready standards
- use innovative practices

The consortium proposes to significantly improve teaching and learning environments through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and teachers with the intent to build a model to leverage across the region and in other school nationwide.

Student learning will be deepened and accelerated by meeting the needs of each student, increasing the effectiveness of educators, expanding student access to the most effective educators, decreasing achievement gaps across student groups, and increasing the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

Three major components of the proposal are;

- developing a Personalized Learner Portfolio (PLP) bridging all digital tools with a single used sign-on
- assimilating student data from all the various tools of the PLP in an Information Integration System (IIS)
- designing a student "Playbook" attuned to student data, learning styles, assets, and interests that engages students in their own learning and promotes student direct pathways for academic coursework project based learning and exploration

The proposal includes the developing of "Playbooks" for teachers and principals generated by student data, linked to a portfolio of tools, which provides recommendations for professional development and opportunities for meaningful reflection and mentoring.

The vision of the consortium of the Cincinnati Public School District and the Covington Independent School District is comprehensive and coherent.

Score high

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

10

10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Cincinnati schools were selected based on changes in the structure of the school district. In 2013-14 a reconfiguration of the district will take place from a PreK-8 model to a 7-12 high school model. The grade bands selected for Cincinnati schools for the project are grades 7-12.

The Board of Education members from the Covington Independent School District selected the schools for participation. The schools are inclusive of grades 6-12.

Schools selected meet the criteria of competition's eligibility requirements.

A list of the schools that will participate from each of the two districts is provided. Charts include the total number of students participating from each school, number and percent of students participating from low income families, number and percent of high-needs students participating, and number participating educators from each school.

For the Cincinnati schools the total of students is approximately 13,903 and 520 educators. For the Covington schools the total number of students is approximately 1,701 and 127 educators.

The applicant meets the requirements for a high-level LEA and school-level implementation.

Score high

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The Strive Partnership, a subsidiary of Knowledge Works Foundation, leads regional education partnerships of community leaders and philanthropic organizations focused on building positive futures for children in both of the school districts that make up the consortium. Through Strive the consortium's influence will be extended beyond the schools in the proposal.

Following the successful efforts in Cincinnati to turn around its lowest performing schools, the consortium will extend the best practices to low performing schools in neighboring Kentucky. Transformative new reform practices will also be expanded to many average to above average performing schools. The rationale for this strategy is that as schools leave behind continuous improvement rankings they often lose key funding and support that were critical to their success. Average performing schools tend to receive little support to move them to high performing schools. Also noted is that elementary schools have received many resources under turnaround efforts while high schools have been largely underserved. Students in the middle are generally underserved. The consortium proposal addresses a high quality plan for students in the "middle", while continuing to support the lowest achieving schools and strengthening the highest performing schools.

The plan for scaling up the reform efforts lacks detail and is inadequate. Need to include specific strategies for scale-up. Reform across the school involved is described but not in enough depth to provide evidence for scale-up.

Score low.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal lists the following overall strategies:

- implementation of Common Core standards that will allow for effective teaching practices by higher student formative assessments by 5% end of year 4
- Increase student achievement and student growth by decreasing the number of dropouts by 5% by the end of year four for all subgroups
- increase on time graduation rates of all students with focus on high needs and subgroup populations by 5% by end of year 4

Providing personalized learning experiences through an integrated data system using actionable data plans to inform instruction will result in the following:

- grade level achievement goals\decrease in drop-out rates
- decrease in achievement gaps across student groups
- programming to support transitioning from middle to high school
- authentically prepare students for college and career by graduation
- engage community leaders in efforts to raise college going success for region

Detailed charts provide summative assessments indicating proficiency status and growth for all students and by sub-group across four years of grant with baseline and post-grant data.. The assessment is identified by name if available. Provided for grade 7 and 8 reading, grade 7 math, grade 10 reading for Cincinnati; composite score on 8th grade EXPLORE, 8th grade EXPLORE English, 8th grade EXPLORE math, reading, science, composite for Covington; 10th grade PLAN English, 10th grade PLAN math, 10th grade PLAN reading, 10th grade PLAN science composite for Covington, 11th grade ACT English, 11th grade ACT math, 11th grade ACT reading, and 11th grade composite for Covington.

Data table for decreasing achievement gaps is presented for overall and subgroups for Cincinnati for grade 7 math, grade 7 reading, grade 8 math, grade 8 reading, grade 10 reading, and grade 10 math; for Covington decreasing achievement gaps is presented overall and for subgroups for 8th grade composite score EXPLORE, 8th grade EXPLORE English, 8th grade EXPLORE math, 8th grade EXPLORE reading, 8th grade EXPLORE science, 10th grade PLAN composite, 10th grade PLAN English, 10th grade PLAN math, 10th grade PLAN reading, 10th grade PLAN science, 11th grade ACT composite, 11th grade ACT English, 11th grade ACT math, 11th grade ACT reading, and 11th grade ACT science.

Graduation rates are presented for Cincinnati overall and by subgroups and for Covington overall and by subgroups for baseline and for four years of grant plus post grant. Notation that for Cincinnati graduation rate formula changed between 2010-11 and 2011-12. In future Cincinnati will use same 4 year cohort. Until the US Department of Education's approved cohort formula is available for Kentucky, USED requires Kentucky to use the Averaged Graduation Rate. This will be used for Kentucky's graduation rate until cohort graduation rate can be calculated beginning with 2013 graduates.

College enrollment for all students in Cincinnati and Covington school is provided as a percent for baseline, four years of grant and one year post grant.

The information provided by the applicant in the data tables and charts partially reflect the selection criteria. It is not clear if the annual goals are equal to or exceed State ESEA targets for the LEAs overall and by student subgroup.

Score medium

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	6

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Cincinnati Public Schools (CPS) have demonstrated a record of success in the past four years receiving a rating of Effective in the 2011-12 school year which is the highest rating for an urban district in Ohio.

The proposal details the efforts made by CPS in initiatives of providing instructional tools, educator training, and application of student data to customize learning environments to each student's particular academic and social emotional needs.

The CPS teachers' union in collaboration with district administration began a project to develop a new teacher evaluation system using the question What is good teaching and what does it look like? A new evaluation system emerged based on Danielson's Framework. The new system consists of four domains of teaching composed of standards accompanied by rubrics that describe the levels of performance for each standard. The Teacher Evaluation System (TES) has been recognized nationally as a leading model for enhancing teacher professionalism and supporting high student performance. Cincinnati piloted the first Teacher Evaluation System in Ohio. Data is being gathered currently on the results of the pilot in which teachers defined targets for student growth and the means to reach those targets as part of the evaluation system.

CPS uses several customized Dashboard systems and customization of PowerSchool student information system to make student performance data accessible to students, parents, teachers and administrators. Examples of data on Dashboard are state assessment scores, benchmark assessments, attendance, discipline, course grades, college entrance exams, nationally normed tests and early childhood assessments. Embedded in Dashboard are instructional decision making tools such as curriculum and pacing guides, model lessons aligned with standards, and state standards and indicators. This is a highly developed system for data to drive instructional decisions.

Learning is further personalized through Class Profile that flags students who may be struggling with attendance, behavioral, or academic issues. Teachers can use Class Profile and Dashboards to have discussions with students so that students can understand and track their own progress. Aggregate data from Dashboard is available on the district's website so community members can view the performance and productivity of the district. The system will be made available to Covington to coordinate a collection system throughout the Consortium.

This work has also been extended beyond the District to a Learning Partner Dashboard allowing for a multidirectional data flow among all stakeholders. Learning partners have the ability to upload student-level program/service data provided and, with parent consent, community partners can view student performance information provided by the school district.

PowerSchool is the main student information system for Cincinnati Public Schools which includes enrollment, attendance, fees, discipline, course grades, and teacher grade books. Parents and students can see individual assignments and

teacher comments from teacher grade books. A link to Student Dashboard provides student information and high school students can see a summary page "Are you Ready for College and Career?" to track their grades, credits, graduation tests, etc. to view their current performance and how it will affect college and career planning.

The Elementary Initiative (EI) created in 2008 in response to a CPS Board directive to accelerate student achievement in the lowest performing schools led to an ambitious program in 16 buildings focused on data-analysis to guide evidenced-based decisions; individualized learning plans aligned to state and district assessments; developing customized student-centered classrooms; job-embedded professional development and collaboration for educators; new principal evaluation tied to student performance scores; and support teams for high-priority schools. Result was achievement of APY status for schools previously in lowest state ratings for over a decade and an overall rating for the district as "Effective" making CPS the highest rated urban district in Ohio.

In less than two years after EI was launched 13 of 16 targeted schools showed measurable achievement. Seven of 16 jumped one to two categories on the 2009-10 Ohio Report Card. Six of the schools met all federal accountability targets for APY in 2009-10. Five schools jumped two categories on the 2009-10 Ohio Report card achieving the Continuous Improvement Rating.

A high quality STEM education program is offered to students beginning Pre-K-6th grade at Taft Elementary STEM School and continues at Hughes STEM High School for grades 7-12. STEM education is purposefully tied to math and science literacy skills at the elementary level with authentic applications in engineering and technology for the 21st Century. This framework includes professional development for educators. Students leave the elementary STEM school ready to transition to Hughes where science, technology, engineering, and math are grounded in a strong liberal arts foundation. Project-based learning, critical thinking, application of technology across disciplines, collaboration with business and community and higher education partners are some of the many components of the STEM experience.

Community learning centers involved a re-design of all school buildings in the district. Schools were physically transformed to be centers of learning with space for co-located community partners, This initiative brought targeted resources into schools in the form of adults as tutors which reached 500 tutors giving an hour a week tutoring students in math and/or reading. The goal is to reach 2,000 tutors. An independent evaluation indicated that students receiving targeted services were improving in attendance, behavior, core subject grades and test scores at greater rates than those not receiving services.

Capstone is a project funded through a grant from GE Foundation which provides equipment to facilitate mobile learning and digitally presented projects. Using principles of project-based learning students are guided by teachers in collaborative groups to study units of content aligned to standards in social studies, science, English language arts, informational writing portfolio pieces and mathematical skills. Students apply problem-based learning approaches to the projects to create innovative solutions to human problems. Students presented their projects at the GE Aviation Learning Center. Exemplary projects were selected based on review of volunteer GE aviation employees using a district project rubric.

Covington schools have increased graduation rates. The number of graduating seniors compared to the number of freshman four years earlier ranged from 42% to 56% and has slowly climbed to 63% for the 2010-11 academic year. During the late 1990's and early 2000's Covington schools were consistently ranked among the state's lowest 5% in academic performance.

CPS has demonstrated success in many of the initiatives described in the proposal. The presentation would benefit from charts to show closing of achievement gaps, raising of college enrollment rates, and appropriate charts or graphs to illustrate improved student learning. While the narratives are highly descriptive of achievements and impressive, the presentation is not clearly focused on advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in teaching and learning. Information for Covington is sparse.

Score low medium

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

5

3

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

CPS has a publicly available Building Futures Dashboard which gives the community detailed up to date financial data for the district and each school. Community members can view district's general fund budget and rate of spending. Public can also view how much each school spends per pupil per year. Staff salaries are made public in the Board meeting minutes on the CPS website. Teacher and administrator classification and salary ranges are publicly available in the collective bargaining agreement. Additional financial reports are on CPS website.

Covington Independent School District is striving to be transparent in its processes and practices and investments. Financial Transparency is taken directly from the district's website. Information available is:

- General Fund dollars--local and state revenue distributed to all local school districts in an equalized way to support education (approximately 64% of total budget)
- Grant Funds-Federal and State categorical funds to local districts based on individual student populations or awarded through a competitive process (approximately 18% of total budget)
- Capital Outlay, Building and Construction Funds- restricted money designated for construction and renovation. The district repays these restricted funds back as bond payments. (approximately 13 % of total budget)
- Miscellaneous other funds-programs that operate in the school that are ideally self-sufficient such as Food Services, and Chapman Daycare (approximately 5% of total budget)

Additionally, parents can find detailed information on policies, testing, results and performance on district or state website.

Presentation is inadequate and does not include sufficient information on policies and practices or specific salary or expenditure information.

Score medium.

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

10

9

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

CPS follows the Ohio Race to the Top state grant and the districts dashboard meets the requirements of an Instructional Improvement System. The CPS Dashboard includes items such as:

- Pre/Post and Short Cycle Assessments
- State Achievement, Graduation, and Diagnostic Tests
- Model Lessons, Intervention Strategies, Precious OAT/OGT Test Items
- Attendance
- Discipline
- Needs Assessments
- One Plans
- Classroom Walkthroughs
- Customer Service Surveys
- Financial Dashboard
- Pyramid Interventions and Positive School Culture
- Accountability Calculator (Full Academic Year Calculator)

System is refreshed on a nightly basis and student data is available in a rapid-time reporting system. State assessment data is generally available on dashboard within 72 hours of district receiving files. The district is able to link student and teacher level data and has done value added for almost 10 years.

All teachers will participate in district developed training on value-added. Training will assist teachers in identifying student sub-groups that are not progressing.

Covington Independent Schools participate in the state's Race to the Top activities and plan. It is required to use certain tools, formats and process to document and measure individualized learning and student achievement. The structure dictates the measures but not the methods to achievement. Students in middle and high school levels are developing possible career interest and exploring careers while developing strong academic foundation through a variety of learning opportunities.

The Kentucky Board of Education has established the following expectations for secondary education:

- Every student will graduate and hold a diploma that credentials proficiency and college and work place readiness.
- Every student's educational experience will be guided by an Individual Learning Plan (ILP) for lifelong learning.
- Every student will be engaged in ongoing, meaningful conversations with educators, parents and other caring adults who place high priority on helping that student reach his or her learning goals.

The state of Kentucky's Department of Education has designed a set of strategies to ensure that all students reach proficiency and graduate from high school ready for college and careers. The proposal presents in great detail the items within Kentucky's strategies that support the implementation of personalized learning in the Covington schools. The major topics described are: use of an Individual Learning Plan; Persistence to Graduation Toolkit; Standardized Core Content in Middle School Education; Standardized Core Content in High School Education; and Accommodation of Children and Youth with Disabilities.

In addition Kentucky is implementing standardized assessments and testing across the academic year, educator training to build capacity of district leadership team, and a Teacher Professional Growth and Effectiveness model.

Both Cincinnati district and Covington have sufficient autonomy to implement personalized learning. In the both cases the state policies and regulatory requirements support the applicant's proposal.

Score high

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5
--	-----------	----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

CPS's proposal was spearheaded by the Office of Innovation which includes a former high school principal, a teacher from Cincinnati Federation of Teachers, and Hamilton County Educational Service coach in leadership roles. The Curriculum Office developed the concept in concert with the Offices of Research and Evaluation, Information Technology Management, and College and Career Technology. Key building principals and administrators have shown support for the proposal as well as the Cincinnati Federation of Teachers. STRIVE has served a key role in bringing together the Consortium Districts as well as community partners named in proposal.

Covington has no collective bargaining representation. The local CEA representative, who represents the KEA members meets regularly with superintendent and attends all the Board of Education meetings where she can raise concerns.

Letters of support in appendix are strong.

Evidence that parents, students and teachers were engaged in development of the proposal is sparse. Collective bargaining representation for Kentucky is vague. Lacking detail in proposal development.

Score low.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

CPS's high school graduation rate has increased from 2003-04 (72.1%) to 2009-10 (81.9%). However student record for college attendance and completion remain low. Enrollment rate from 2006-07 show a 63% enrollment increasing to 68%

the following year. While this is a positive trend it is below the goal of CPS and is not supported by graduation from college rates. Data from graduates in 2005 indicate that only 23% of CPS students graduated from a four year college or university within 6 years of completing high school.

Using ACT scores as indicators of college readiness, district average over 2008-10 of a composite score of 19 indicate that many of the CPS graduates will require remediation work in their freshman year. CPS 9th graders present another challenge in that a district retention rate of 31.4% shows the transition from grade 9 to 10 occurs without the necessary supports to retain and ensure student success.

CPS has taken the steps of relocating 7th and 8th grade students from the elementary context to high schools. These students will not experience the same program as students in grades 9-12. The 7th and 8th grade students will have the best elements of elementary education blended with a personalized academic learning plan.

The scale up effort of the Community Learning Center Model will result in targeted resource allocation to positively impact high school attendance, behavior, core subject grades and test scores. Currently only five of the 15 high schools have Resource Coordinators. These coordinators struggle to recruit enough tutors, mentors, after school providers, health services, music and art programs and other resources to meet the needs of older students. Resources for students with disabilities and English language learners have been particularly scarce for older students. Scaling up will require intensive work from Cross Boundary Leadership Team, The STRIVE Partnership, United Way, other funders, local corporations, and city leaders to expand partnerships and meet the needs of high school students.

In addition to the state specific tools of Persistence to Graduation, Individual Learning Plan and other data, Covington will join CPS in implementing Community Learning Partner Dashboard. Covington will also implement the Personalized Learning Plan and student Playbook. As Kentucky has moved forward in implementing the Common Core fully, Covington data on assessment and implementation will be key to informing ongoing Consortium plan.

Needs and gaps are included for CPS but not for Covington. A plan is described for implementing personalized learning with some data.

Score low medium

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	18

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium proposes a high-quality plan for improving teaching and learning through the personalization of each child's learning environment in grades 7-12 in Cincinnati and grades 6-8 and 9-12 school in Covington. The rigorous courses of study will be co-constructed by teachers and students and facilitated through the use of an innovative Information Integration System. Students will interface with the Integrated systems through "Playbook" a highly organized set of flexible learning experiences displayed visually as applications similar to the way interactive icons are displayed on smartphones or tablets. The system will put students squarely at the center of their instructional schema, directing their own steps from learning experience to standards based learning, moving toward mastery.

The plan focuses on college and career readiness Standards and incorporates three features from the student perspective:

- goal setting and assessment for ongoing feedback
- student choice and management of their own learning
- high quality content through real world learning experiences

Students will be involved in deep learning. They will have increased access to a wide variety of courses including Advanced Placement and Baccalaureate programs. They will have the opportunity to master content and develop skills of working in teams, setting goals, perseverance, creativity, and problem-solving.

Working collaboratively with family and school staff and using their Personalized Learning Plan and Playbook, the student will annually lead the process of setting three goals for meeting college and career readiness: one academic, one career, and one social emotional. Teacher mentors will support the student through regular meetings, dialogue, and reflective activities. The system proposed is a high-quality digital environment to help the student master key learning standards and expectations. Rubrics will guide the performance-based tasks. There will be frequent assessments, both formative and summative, as the student engages in learning. A key to the implementation will be routinely held student-teacher conferences to balance the digital curriculum, student performance and planning.

Students will have educational choices across buildings to provide expanded opportunities in such areas as STEM, New Tech, Paideia, Career and Technical Education, Dual Enrollment with Gateway Community College.

Instruction will be differentiated to challenge all students. English language learners will have access to tools that will allow them to monitor their progress through their language learning journey. Gifted students will have immediate access to increasingly advanced and rigorous content. Students with disabilities will have the ability to use additional adaptive strategies and tools as they learn.

The infrastructure offers a platform to support students and educators as they build and implement individualized plans for learning. Learning becomes learning about, learning to do and learning to be" rather than a transfer of information.

Plan is high quality. More could be included in this section to directly address student interaction with diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives. It is implied indirectly in the narrative.

Score high

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal presents a high-quality plan for improving teaching and leading by building the capacity of teachers and administrators to support student mastery of college- and career- ready standards through a personalized learning environment. Educators will be provided training and practice to learn to: provide adaptive, responsive learning experiences for all students; accurately and frequently measure student progress toward standards, mastery, personal goals, and graduation; and engage in individual and collective reflection to improve teaching and leading. Professional development is provided also for administrators to support teachers as they implement personalized learning environments.

Three principles guide the transformative role of teachers:

- informed analysis of student data
- targeted professional development and dialogue
- customization of standards-based student learning experiences

Teachers will be trained to use the digital environment to support students in their journey and become master at using formative and summative data and analysis to be able to conduct on-going interactions with students. The access that school staff will have to data at various aggregate levels will include academic, personal interest and social/emotional data as well as data from community partners. The data will be aligned to relevant college- and career-readiness standards.

Teachers will participate in professional and personal surveys to develop an educator profile. The system will recommend professional development opportunities based on the profile similar to that for students. On-line courses and web-based community forums will be provided for teachers. Teachers will engage in regular dialogue with other teachers and partners.

Connected education provides opportunities for students, parents and educators to build on-line learning communities. Professional development for teachers will include areas such as: content and pedagogy; building staff capacity for project based/inquiry learning; career development and guidance; use of technology and software; data analysis; Universal Design of Learning; Teaching English to Speakers of other Languages credential; Response to Intervention; cooperative learning and developing strong student learning objectives.

Professional development will be available through face-to-face workshops, on-line offerings, during the day, in summer, during district wide scheduled staff development days, and through scheduled learning team meetings. Blended learning coaches will provide embedded coaching in content and instructional practices that integrate communication technologies into the learning environment.

Administrators will support teachers as they implement personalized learning. Three principles guide the transformative role of principal:

- informed analysis of student and teacher data
- targeted professional development and teacher mentoring
- resource management, monitoring, and customization of stands based student learning experiences

Principals will maintain a focus on standards relevant to college and career readiness. Principals will have access to an administrative Playbook to guide best instructional leadership practices. Principals will interact with leaders and partners from across the consortium to discuss student and teacher progress and take advantage of peer mentoring. A key role for the building administrators is to equitably manage resources for all teachers and students to support the personalized learning model.

The plan provides detailed descriptions of supporting teachers in implementing personalized learning and professional development opportunities for teachers and staff. School leaders also are provided with targeted professional development. The plan is weak in developing a plan for providing all students with effective teachers and effective school leaders or dealing with sufficient effective teachers for hard to staff areas and school.

Score medium

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	9

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Cincinnati Public School District is governed by the Cincinnati Board of Education. The Board formulates and adopts written policies regarding personnel, administration of pupil personnel, educational programs, instructional materials, facilities and equipment, finances, and public relations for the quality education of students. The Board is comprised of seven people elected at large for four-year terms. The Board's vision, mission and strategic goals for 2012-13 support personalized learning;

- equip the district to encounter and engage each child in a manner that ensures his/her individual success
- improve and sustain a child-centered safe school district focused on schools as the center of a safe community
- encourage and create a culture of shared leadership, accountability and transparency in which everyone is achieving his/her highest level of development
- create opportunities fro students to become contributing members of local and global societies

The Central Office is designed to support administrative effectiveness to support schools. The Superintendent's Office includes teams in content area managers under a Deputy Superintendent. The team has developed a five-year Common

Core implementation plan aligned to Ohio's New Learning Standards that includes college and career readiness standards. The plan includes professional development goals and strategies to support the Consortium's professional development plan in the proposal. CPS has developed a plan to transform education as a personalized environment that fosters creativity, leverages resources and reinforces learning to prepare students for college and career readiness.

Each school is governed by a Local Decision Making Committee comprised of teachers, administrators, parents, community partners and students. This committee gives insight and input into decisions that impact students' lives and shape their educational experience. The schools are site-based managed. The shared governance and leadership allow for autonomy in classroom scheduling, building level decision-making, flexibility in schools programming, a portfolio of school choice, innovative practices in and out of the classroom, and a strong emphasis on shared leadership.

The plan does not address Covington governance structure and assumes that as lead LEA the governance structure of Cincinnati schools is sufficient to describe. Student opportunity to progress based on mastery and not seat time, opportunity to demonstrate mastery in multiple ways and at multiple times, and learning resources that are adaptable and accessible to all students including students with disabilities and English Language Learners are not addressed here.

Score medium

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

10

5

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The plan includes areas in which Board of Education and their respective district superintendents will collaborate to deliver regional supports:

- building capacity of teachers and school leaders in the balanced assessment of the common core standards
- enhancing educator's capacity to maximize robust value added information at their disposal
- ensuring quality, transparency, and utility in shared data systems
- supporting participating schools and all students selected to participate in RttT-D application process
- supporting the long-term capacity of the Ohio Valley region to deliver innovative sustained and replicable outcome
- adopted Teacher/Principal Evaluation Policy which incorporated The Ohio Teacher Evaluation System Frameworks consisting of 50% Teacher Performance and 50% Multiple Measures of Student Growth

Various activities have been carried out that support project implementation:

- development of formative assessments for tracking student progress and providing feedback to students
- turn-around teams to support teachers and principals through trained coaches
- learning teams that provide embedded professional development on new College and Career Ready Standards
- developing capacity of teachers as teacher leaders to support sustainability

The list of individuals and their role in key leadership positions is provided.

A detailed table of milestones, task activities, responsible parties and timing is provided for the project implementation. Within this table are specifics which address the technology infrastructure, professional development for administrators and teachers, support for teachers to integrate technology into the classroom, student service providers and tracking of students, strategies for personalizing student learning, transition activities for students, developing a sustainability and replication plan.

This section includes the infrastructure for the Covington Independent Schools.

The district level structure includes the Board of Education, Superintendent, Central Office Planning and compliance staff, and the principals and administrators at the schools. The structure is designed to get input across the schools and broader community:

- an overall district I-Team which is an instructional teacher with team leaders from each building who met to assure alignment with the required core content
- each school has an annual School Improvement Plan available on the district's website and updated annually

- School-Based Decision Making Councils responsible for curriculum, budgets at each building and which includes parents, teachers and student representatives
- Standards and Assessment teams at each building and across the district review the MAP testing results three times a year to assess math and reading achievement and growth and develop instructional strategies to propel students forward

Covington has an organization Covington Partners to reduce barriers to student achievement. The collaborative is comprised of 80 individuals and community organizations representing a broad range of community sectors and meets regularly to plan activities to support Covington youth. The goal is to strengthen the relationships in the community to help students succeed at the highest level possible.

The plan does not address in sufficient detail that all participating students have access to the content, tools and other learning resources that they need both in and out of school, information technology systems that allow students and parents to export information in an open data format and to use in other electronic learning systems, or ensuring that LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems.

Plan needs the above additions to make it high quality.

Score medium

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The CPS District's strategy in the RttT-D proposal is focused on student success so that they are college and career ready through embracing standards, better measuring student learning and comprehensive accountability for the districts and all the schools that focus on growth and progress and on closing the achievement gap. The district will continue to foster innovation and excellence by having in place conditions for innovation and reform that expands and sustain promising and proven innovations, expand range and quality of educational choice available for students and empower families to make informed choices for their children. The goals that will be monitored are:

- increases in student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics
- decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics
- increasing high school graduation rates
- decreasing high school graduation rate gaps
- increasing college enrollment and increasing numbers of students who complete at least a year's worth of college credit that is applicable to a degree within two years of enrollment in an institution of higher education

The district participates in a continuous improvement using Ohio Improvement Process. This practice uses teams to supervise the plan in progress to ensure tasks, actions and strategies are on course and on schedule in meeting goals as measured by progress indicators. Each is responsible for monitoring the actions and strategies needed to make the plan work.

Specifically the district will:

- adopt and embrace the new Ohio Standards
- make active and extensive use of student performance data, including Value-Added data, in instruction and assessment utilizing an instructional improvement system ensure that principals and teachers are the best they can possibly be through the use of data to inform professional development and performance evaluation and retention
- participate in the development of statewide tools and pilot projects, as appropriate
- establish partnerships with fellow school districts, universities, and other stakeholders as appropriate

Frequent monitoring and adjustment to the plan is necessary to ensure desired results. At least twice annually, at mid-year and the closing of the year, the evaluation of the plan's effectiveness is conducted to determine the degree to which goals are met.

The plan provides an overall sketch of how the project will be monitored and measured. It needs information on how project activities such as professional development, investments in technology, assessments and data collection will be evaluated. The cycle of continuous improvement from implementation of an activity or part of the plan, system for collecting data, who looks at the data, decision about implications of the data, and recommendations, if necessary, for change needs to be described. How the information will publicly be shared needs further description.

Score medium

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

5

5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A Transformation Team will develop a comprehensive strategy to ensure effective internal and external communication.

Plan includes:

- monthly Office of Innovation Newsletter (sent to parents, community and district personnel)
- biweekly Cincinnati Federation of Teachers Newsletter (sent to all district teachers)
- Cincinnati Federation of Teachers website
- monthly Executive Committee meetings of the Cincinnati Federation of Teachers
- Contract Implementation webpage
- Office of Innovation website
- monthly reports to the Educational Initiatives Panel, Board of Education, Principal meetings, Cincinnati Federation of Teachers Executive Committee, Public School Board meetings
- district-wide Local School Decision Making Committee quarterly meeting
- weekly RttT Office meetings
- will develop and forward to parents literature (Common Core Parent Guides) that provides parents a strong understanding of the new Common Core State Standards

Implement following strategies for two-way communication with parents, students, and community members:

- Quarterly District-Wide LSDMC meetings
- participate in local radio and cable television call-in opportunities
- Twitter, Facebook
- Quarterly Community Conversations held at district schools
- "Question of the Week" surveys for district personnel student surveys

Numerous well developed communication strategies.

Score high

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

5

5

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

CPS has developed a system for evaluating teachers and principals on the level of effectiveness as determined by student growth measures. A portion of the teacher effectiveness comes from Value Added data. In 2010-11, the only group of teachers to receive Teacher Level Value Added Reports with an effectiveness rating was teachers of reading and math in both grades 7 and 8 and teachers of science in grade 8 using the state assessment in all buildings. In a select group of buildings additional effectiveness ratings for teachers were obtained in grade 7 science and grade 7 and 8 social studies using the Terra Nova assessment. A graph is included showing the district level distribution of teachers and their effectiveness level compared to state of Ohio distribution. A new Teacher Evaluation System will be implemented in 2012-13.

Principal Effectiveness using student growth data is available for those buildings that receive student growth data. Buildings that are K-8, K-6, K-12, and 7-12 receive the growth measure in the form of Value Added. Currently 9-12 schools do not receive effectiveness ratings. As high school models transition to grades 7-12, all schools will receive effectiveness ratings for principals. Student Learning Objectives are being developed as a method to determine student growth for those teachers and principals where there is currently no student growth data. The state of Ohio is introducing a new series of assessments that will provide growth measures for the secondary level that will result in principal effectiveness ratings for all principals.

Cincinnati is moving to a predominately 7-12 high school model. Three schools that are Pre K-12, two that are community based and the third, an arts school, will maintain their configuration as well as four elementary schools that are Pre-K-8 serving a high concentration of English as a second language population. Retention in high school is the measure that will be collected. This measure will allow the examination of data in terms of retention for years in school, and the courses that are the greatest impediment to students progressing. Strategies to provide support to students to help them be successful will be developed.

The Class profile report includes data on attendance, discipline, and formative assessment scores. Different data sets for subgroups across grade bands are collected. For high school students (grade 9-12), the data includes the same demographic data, attendance, discipline and performance on the five areas of the Ohio Graduation Test (if they have taken the test) credits earned, GPA both weighted and unweighted, failing courses, and PLAN/ACT Results, PSAT/SAT Results. Data in the Class Profile allow teachers to see the data immediately, creating an opportunity for student-teacher discussion.

For grades 7/8 a tool called Naviance is being used to support students in developing their own college and career plan. Teachers will be able to monitor students as they develop their goals. The process will begin with grades 9-12 this year. The district belief is that as students begin to develop their individual purpose for learning with a college and/or career goal in mind, student readiness for college and career will increase.

The district has selected the number of grade 8 students enrolled in Algebra 1 with the ability to receive high school credit as the main indicator. Goal is to grow the enrollment and increase student achievement in math.

Grades 7-8 the social emotional health indicator will be used. How students are connected in extra curricular activities, co-curricular activities, school clubs, and other things that show involvement with some aspect of school will be collected. Data will be tracked through PowerSchool.

To create a seamless system of college and career assessment in the newly structured 7-12 high school model, the district will use the EXPLORE assessment for all 8th grade students. Using this assessment along with PLAN and ACT will allow changes in individual career interests to be observed and provide academic growth data in four core academic areas.

Grades 9-12 the FAFSA completion will be monitored for high school seniors. This is currently done but not by subgroup. To get a better handle on subgroup achievement gaps that exist in the district, the district will collect data by subgroup in the 2012-13 school year.

Act and PLAN will be used to inform instructional practices. They have been used in the district for several years. With the adoption of the CCSS and the College and Career Readiness Standards, these assessments have taken on more value. The results of these assessment will be monitored both in grade 10 and 11 to provide feedback to the instructional staff.

For the academic on track indicator by subgroup, average GPA has been selected for students in grades 9-12. This allows the district to examine the overall health of academic performance during the high school years.

The district will collect data on the social emotional health for students in grades 9-12 .The overall connectedness of the students will be tracked through PowerSchool. Along with the "Class Profile" the district will get a more detailed picture of each student. The student will access the profile through the Student Dashboard.

Inclusive charts for these measures are included for both Cincinnati and Covington schools for all students, by subgroup and with baseline data as available. Some measures will be collected for the first time in 2012-13 such as EXPLORE, the number of 8th grade students enrolled in Algebra I, and the FAFSA completion by subgroup. Data are across four years of grant and one year post-grant.

Score high

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

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The evaluation plan will provide formative and summative data for on-going decision-making and to inform the district and community on project implementation. Data will be collected at four levels on specified indicators:

Student level

- Proficiency results (Ohio Achievement Assessments/Ohio Graduation Test/ACT)
- The development of 21st Century Skill
- Student subgroup achievement
- Student engagement

Adult level

- The development of 21st Century Skill and Strategies
- The development of adult technological skills
- Employee retention rate
- Principal turnover

School level

- Implementation of College and Career Ready Skills
- Classroom computer ratio
- Classroom technology
- Collaboration
- Community partner volunteer engagement

District

- College and Career Ready Standards media blitz
- PowerSchool usage by teachers, parents and students
- Instructional System (Dashboard w/ Playbook) use by students, teachers, and partners
- Collaboration

The internal evaluation plan will identify SMART goals (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Results-Oriented and Timely) with specific indicators, data collection methods, regular check points and status reports.

Instructional Rounds data will be collected. The goal is to gauge the degree that the Teacher Professional Development is positively being implemented and incorporated into instruction in the classroom.

The professional development activities will be evaluated using five levels of evaluation as adapted from a model designed by Thomas Guskey (2000).

The levels are:

- Participants' reactions
- Participants' learning
- Organizational support and change
- Participants' use of new knowledge and skills
- Student learning outcomes

The plan is high quality.

Score high

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 budget narrative and budget present the rationale for funds requested. Many of the components are already in place in Cincinnati Public Schools (PowerSchool), Dashboard, Naviance, Blackboard, and Apex, etc.). Funds are requested for an integration portal to bring the disparate systems together in a seamless learning environment for students. A safe collaboration tool is needed for secure communication between teachers and students and among students. Digital curriculum resources are needed to support the delivery of common core content to students in a personalized learning environment.</p> <p>The budget does not include an adequate description of funds from other sources that will be used to support the project.</p> <p>Score medium</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	9
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Sustainability of the project will encompass multiple methods. Both Ohio and Kentucky are grantees of the state Race to the Tops program. Each is working on expanding funding for the educational systems and all districts expect to benefit from the states' efforts. Kentucky has expanded its funding to high needs/high poverty districts including Covington and Newport. Ohio's funding is in transition as debate centers upon expanding the existing system that relies on property taxes.</p> <p>Current access to funding for specific opportunities for funding may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title 1 School Funds • Social Innovation Funds (Competitive Grant) • Carl Perkins Federal Funds • State Vocational Funds (Kentucky) • 21st Century After School Programming Funds • School Based Decision Making Allocation of General Fund Dollars 		

Non-Financial Sustainability

The outcomes of the project will inform proposals for continuing and spin-off program/project funding by the Consortia and its individual district members.

It is likely that the project is sustainable

Score high.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has formed coherent and sustainable partnerships. These partnerships have already provided a variety of resources to the district schools in the form of mentoring, tutoring after school health services, college access and other support services. Community Learning Centers are operating in 32 of the 56 schools in CPS.

Both academic and behavioral tracking indicators have been identified and will be used to articulate community resources with student needs. Resource Coordinators can monitor whether students are receiving appropriate services and if there is a positive impact on the student. Students are identified as having high priority status in the dashboard when they have one or more factors impacting their development and academic achievement.

The REFORM process has garnered national attention. The connecting of services to students based on needs in areas of attendance, behavior, core subject grades and test scores allows a better allocation of community resources. Students participating in community program services had a higher number of risk factors yet continued to make gains on state assessments in math and reading.

The successes achieved at the elementary level with the Community Learning Centers pilot is going to be scaled up to include additional high school students. Scaling up this work will require intensive efforts since many resources are already taken up by the elementary schools. Resources for English Language Learners and students with disabilities have been particularly scarce for older students.

The digital resources described that will be implemented to connect students and parents to engage them in meaningful experiences to support student success will build a strong base for the personalization of student learning.

CPS has created an innovative approach to transforming schools into community hubs and centers of excellence with extensive support services for students, families and community members. Expanding the model to address the needs of older students will improve their developmental and academic outcomes. The ambitious and achievable performance measures identified are:

- 125 targeted students in each school are connected to a community resource that addresses specific need identified by ABCT data
- 75% of Targeted students with community resources demonstrate improved ABCT outcomes
- 75% of targeted students determine a college and/or career pathway on the Student Success Plan

The applicant has addressed the competitive preference priority.

Score high

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Throughout the application the applicant has addressed the educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to improve learning through a set of strategies and tools, and supports for students to help the students be college and/or career ready. Methods to deepen student learning with a focus on rigorous content to meet high academic standards are described. Students become managers of their own learning using data system that are integrated to provide them with checkpoints on their progress. Teachers and school leaders are provided with professional development to help them become effective educators who support students in a more personalized learning environment. Community resources are brought to bear on the learning environment and also support the emotional/behavioral development of the students. Parents are active participants in the education of their children and open communication is maintained so that all parties understand the goals and measures being used.

Strong efforts are made to close achievement gaps across student groups and to increase the number of students who graduate from high school prepared for college or career.

Total	210	156
--------------	------------	------------

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	10

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

An optional budget is included for Transitioning from Elementary School-Middle School Bridge Program.

Five days of the Bridge Program each year and 1 day of professional development each year for 4 years of proposal. The 5 days of Bridge Program is for 7 hours per day for 5 days and the 1 day of professional development is for 7 hours per day. The budget includes the expenditures for personnel each year, including fringe benefits, and materials and supplies for students each year.

The purpose of the bridge program is to support students in the transition from middle school to high school. The optional budget needs a more adequate description and rationale for the proposed program.

Score medium



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0302OH-4 for Cincinnati City School District

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 (a consortium of CPS in Ohio and CISD in Kentucky) has articulated a strong proposal, albeit sometimes lacking details, for reform that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- An emphasis on accelerating student achievement and decreasing drop-out rates. This will be accomplished by extending previously successful reform efforts in the CPS to neighboring Kentucky, and providing more innovative personalized learning options to average and higher performing schools. -- A focus on deepening student learning through personalized learning through the use of a personalized learning portfolio, which aggregates assessment data, career choice data, goals, student services, and learning resources together. In addition the consortium will use an integrated information system for providing recommendation for personalized learning (although the details of how this will work is not well explained), and individual student playbooks, which will provide the personalized learning activities. However, this is also not well explained in specific enough detail to fully understand what the learning and teaching will look like at the individual student level, and how the teaching will change from traditional methods to the coaching method described. -- personalized professional development for teachers and educators based on assessment of their performance and personalization of resources for their development through the same system as that used for the students. 		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant lists the schools, and describes the relationship between the districts in the consortiums and which students from each will be participating, which will be those in grades 6-12. The consortium will begin servicing over 15,000 students via this proposal before growing to 37,000 students, but it is not clear how these participating students were selected for initial service and then for scale up.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant is clear on many activities for achieving learning outcomes, as it will be scaling up ideas that have been done before in CPS. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- elementary initiative, which implements data-based individual learning plans -- teacher and supervisor evaluation -- converting schools into community learning centers that support and build communities as well as teach children -- multimedia capstone projects for children in grades 4-8, 		

- the development of dashboard to inform educators and students about student data
- a learning partner dashboard that makes some achievement data available to community partners for greater integration of services

Many of these previous reforms are well described and show efforts to integrate data and instruction at a good level of granularity (specific outcomes) for improving learning, which is what the results show CPS has achieved.

Less clear is what exactly the LEA plans to do next with the RTT money. Ideas are described for implementing personalized learner portfolios, information integration systems, and individual learning playbooks that will provide learning activities based on the learner portfolios and integration systems, but details about how specifically this will all be done is missing and not clearly described. It is also not clear how the reforms will spread throughout the whole district beyond the schools participating.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has set achievable goals for a wide array of performance measures, which, if attained, would indicate a significant improvement in the learning of the students. However, the goals are not always as ambitious as they could be, and it is not always clear why the LEA selected these goals. For example:

- For many of the measures, the goal is for students to become "average" according to state and national norms, no matter where they began. Thus, the goals for some sub-groups are not as ambitious because the gap for them to become average is not as high. The applicant could have had more ambitious goals that signaled average is only the first step, and that they can continue attempting to improve scores above average, and indicating these goals with more than just < (average)%, but rather indicating a specific number for how much above average (or in other words, how proficient) they would like their students to be.
- Many of the columns were unreadable, so it was difficult to interpret the goals they had set.
- For graduation rates, the goal for IEP students was only to improve by 10% over the course of the grant, whereas the goals for other subgroups were higher, and there was no explanation for this.
- The "percent of HS graduates enrolled in college" is not a measure of "post-secondary degree attainment"
-

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	13

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A strength of this application is the applicant's prior record of success in instituting the reforms proposed. The CPS especially has been successful by:

- Already establishing a strong collaboration with community stakeholders through the STRIVE partnership
- Implementing reforms in the lowest-achieving schools, and going from a district continually labeled as needing improvement to one deemed "effective" by the state, a recommendation that names the CPS as the highest-performing urban school district in the state. This has been done despite challenging demographics.
- Improving 13 of 16 schools targeted with significant improvements in only two years, with seven of these jumping 1-2 categories in the Ohio report card. Five jumped from Academic Emergency to Continuous Improvement, a jump of 2 levels.

-- Instituting measures for using data to personalize learning through the Dashboard for parents, educators, and students, and the Learning Partner Dashboard, which provides data to community partners.

-- Developing technologies that allow teachers to drill down to evidence on learning for specific indicators and outcomes, and then link to lesson plans and resources targeted at overcoming learning deficiencies

Covington schools also showed improvement despite dealing with a challenging demographic that includes nearly 20% of its students being homeless, and the schools consistently ranked in the bottom 5% of the state. They have recently been making improvements by jumping graduation rates from 42% to 63%.

A critique of the application, however, is the lack of data in the forms of charts and tables to accompany the narrative, in addition to a lack of additional data for Covington schools.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has a record of making salary and financial information publicly available via board meeting minutes and a building futures dashboard, but the CPS is not clear on what kinds of financial data is made available other than salaries, and Covington is not clear how salary data is made available.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The application is not always clear what autonomy the LEA has under state law, which is especially important considering the LEA spans two states. Covington explains they are held to uniform standards, but given autonomy over methods to meet those standards (but without specifics), and CPS has shown great autonomy in the past by extending school through the "Fifth Quarter" and implementing personalized learning approaches. They also indicate later in the proposal that they have autonomy in "classroom scheduling, building level decision-making and flexibility in school programing," as well as offering a portfolio of schools of choice for parents. Still the kind of autonomy provided to the LEA is not always clear.

Also, there is evidence that the states are supportive of their efforts to implement reforms, and the states support issues such as teacher/principal evaluation, merit pay and promotion, etc.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	6
--	-----------	----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

A strength of this application, for the most part, is the community stakeholder engagement through the STRIVE partnership, which includes major corporate partners as well as social and academic institutions. This partnership has existed for several years and is a key reason for the LEA's past success in educational reform, and thus there is a good foundation for implementing future reforms. There is a letter of support for CPS teachers, but without specifics about how involved they have been in developing the proposal, which leaves doubts about how supportive they really are of the proposal. In addition, Covington's teachers are not unionized, and no data was provided to show they had 70% support as requested in the criteria, nor is there other evidence provided that show clearly the teachers' support.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a strong understanding for CPS of their current strengths, but also current needs and gaps that will be addressed in the current proposal, including gaps in college attendance despite a rising graduation rate, the lack of community engagement with some specific schools, and the need for Covington to partner with CPS in order to benefit from CPS's already instituted reforms. However, there is not much discussion on how Covington has analyzed their needs and gaps and participated in the development of the proposed ideas.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	18
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has a strong plan for improving the learning of students as they progress towards colleges and careers. The plan emphasizes personalized, student-led learning as students meet with parents and educators to develop personalized learning plans that will in part be based on career interest assessments managed by the Naviance management system. The Naviance data will be coupled with student assessment data to give a clear picture of what a student wants to be, where their current performance is, and then charting through the student's Playbook the resources and courses that can help the student to achieve his/her goals. This plan is strong because of how it will engage students in identifying their own college and career goals and understanding how their learning activities map directly onto these goals. In addition, the applicant's plan will emphasize deep learning and critical skills such as collaboration, teamwork, critical thinking, and communication skills through the use of capstone projects where students demonstrate through multimedia their learning on an open-ended, collaborative, and STEM-related project. Other projects will be incorporated throughout their curriculum as the LEA takes on more of a project-based learning approach where teachers serve as mentors and coaches to students engaging in projects. For some of these projects, students can engage with community partners and mentors.</p> <p>Each student will be able to see how their performance data guides and directs learning opportunities through frequent "data talks" where the teacher, student, and parents look at the data and make adjustments to the student's learning plan. Based on this data, the student's Playbook will make recommendations for courses, tutoring, and resources. Some of these will be online, and some could be from outside of the district. Thus, a student could, for example, enroll in an AP course they would like that is offered in a different district. Students and parents also have choices in which schools within the district to attend, including schools with innovative focuses on areas such as STEM.</p> <p>Accessibility for students of all abilities will be improved through implementing a bring your own device model, and by using grant money to purchase devices so there is a higher ratio of technologies to students. The LEA mentioned a 4:1 ratio, but this may not be enough for the reforms they propose.</p> <p>A criticism of the application is that it is not clear what mechanisms will ensure students and parents know how to use these technologies and resources other than the references to teacher mentoring of students.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	18
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant plans to improve teaching and leading by implementing similar strategies as those used for personalizing the instruction for students. This will allow not only for greater personalized professional development for the educators, but also training in how personalized learning can work for their students. Similar to the students, the teachers will have individual Playbooks that bring together data on their students' learning as well as assessments of the teachers' professional development needs to make recommendations for what kinds of professional development the teachers should engage in. The system will then link to resources and courses within the LEA and outside of it for helping the teacher to gain this personalized professional development. Through this process, the principal serves as the teachers' coach, mentoring them through their own learning. The system will also enable communication between teachers, particularly those teachers of the same child, so they can collaborate on more effective strategies for enhancing the students' learning. These methods have been well described, and should bring about high quality training for the educators in how they can personalize and deepen learning for their students, and should improve their abilities to adapt content and instruction and measure student progress and thus improve their instructional effectiveness.</p> <p>For the principals, the system will bring together building-level data as well as resources for improving professional leading. This will include connection to professional leaders and administrators of both educational and business/governmental entities in the community. This will be a useful method for empowering leaders with data on their schools' performances.</p>		

What is not clear is what process the system will use for ensuring that recommended resources are of high quality, nor how the LEA plans to increase the number of students receiving instruction from effective teachers and leaders, other than by using these personalized resources for improving all teachers' performances.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	10
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes an LEA central office for CPS that is committed to the reforms described in the proposal, and organized to support them. One effort in the CPS to better support the focus on college readiness is transitioning away from middle schools to high schools serving grades 7-12. The district claims this has proven more effective in the past, but does not provide data, and argues that this will allow students to progress as they show mastery of subjects because they will have greater options for advanced classes.</p> <p>Local schools in the CPS have a strong leadership model that is based on local decision making committees that have equal representation from parents, community, teachers, and non-teaching staff. This shared leadership should lead to greater buy-in and integrated services. Covington also indicates having school-based decision making councils, but is less descriptive about who participates in these and how they are made up.</p> <p>The applicant mentions the importance of offering students the opportunity to progress based on mastery, and says this will be made possible through the Playbook technologies, but specific details are not give of how students would demonstrate mastery and move forward based on these assessments.</p> <p>There is no mention of Covington in this section, lending doubt to how well that district is organized to benefit from reform.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The LEA indicates that technology will be made available to students and assumedly parents after hours. In addition, the CPS is converting schools into community learning centers. However, the consortium is not very descriptive about how they will improve access for all parents and ensure that they have sufficient technical support and other support structures to implement the reforms, which is essential for personalized learning to work. The consortium has described using information technology systems, but has not discussed what format this will be in and whether it will be portable. The systems used by the district will be inter-operable and work together to create one picture available to students and parents through the Student's Playbook.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	6
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not discuss a plan for continuous improvement outside of the existing Ohio Improvement Process, and brief references to district, building, and teacher teams that will "supervise the plan in progress" but without giving details about how they will do this. The applicant also mentions twice annually an evaluation of the plan's effectiveness being conducted, but it does not discuss who will be in charge of this evaluation, what standards they will use to make judgments about the success of the implementation (outside of the student achievement goals), nor how they will make these evaluations and spending strategies publicly available for regular feedback and collaboration. In short, it appears the continuous plan is to continue with already enacted school improvement plans, with the additional use of personalized</p>		

professional development for the educators, but without specific oversight to improving the implementation of the specific proposal described in this application.

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

5

3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant discusses holding meetings and using technologies like Twitter and Facebook, but without specific details not just on ongoing sharing of information, but for ongoing communication and engagement with stakeholders. However, the current STRIVE partnership is a strong one, lending some assurance of future engagement with stakeholders, even though it is not described well in this proposal.

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

5

2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes to use the state's teacher and principal evaluation systems, which will use value-added data for multiple assessments, aggregated into one score for overall effectiveness. This sounds good, but there are no details about how this overall score is calculated. There are also no proposed social-emotional assessments, as the LEA proposes to use records of high school student attendance and discipline issues as an emotional assessment, but this is not a very good indicator. For middle school students, they propose tracking participation in clubs and extracurricular activities. These are at best indirect measures, and the LEA would be better served using a more direct measure. Also, it is not clear how these measures would be assessed, what level of involvement would be considered good, for instance. Because it is such an indirect measure, and an example of how it would be analyzed is not given, it is difficult to have confidence that this will provide very much useful information for the LEA.

The district also proposes to use the number of middle school students enrolled in Algebra 1 as an indicator of college readiness, but enrollment (in contrast with proficiency or achievement) is not a good indicator of college readiness. Later in the proposal, the LEA indicates it will assess "development of 21st Century Skills" and "student engagement" but it isn't clear how they will do so. A "media blitz" is also listed as a district-level "indicator," which is confusing.

Some proposed measures will be effective, such as the ACT, PLAN and EXPLORE assessments, as well as the state assessments for specific subjects and grades.

Overall, there is not a strong justification for many of the measures used, and it is confusing to understand exactly what the district plans to do.

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

5

1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA mentions that it has an evaluation division that will use Guskey's 5 levels to guide its evaluation, but no detail is given about who will oversee this project, how they will report their findings, and exactly what methods they will use to answer the evaluation questions (which were not solid questions, but just temporarily proposed ones). It does not appear that the district has a strong plan in place to evaluate implementation of this proposal beyond regular school and LEA evaluation through the value-added scores.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	3
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
The LEA does not provide a very compelling narrative, when there is one at all, for many of the budget items. For example, they request money to purchase smartboards, and many other pieces of technology, without explaining why those are		

essential to the program being used? They also request funds for some pedagogical (assumedly) resources that were not discussed in the proposal at all (Aleks, LinguaFolio, etc.). This gives the appearance of the LEA requesting grant money to continue funding their regular budgetary needs, especially since they acknowledge that most of the reforms are already in place. In addition there is no discussion of which budget items are one-time costs, nor how they will sustain them overtime, indicating they have always "routinely identified funding" and will be able to do so again.

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

10

3

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not discuss sustainability of the goals other than to indicate that they have a history of securing funding and they will disseminate the knowledge gained by doing this project with the other LEAs and thus grow the ideas. The applicant indicates that "all districts have an effective plan for communicating with key community and state leaders," but do not give any details about this plan and even though in the very next section the applicant contradicts itself by saying "Every school district struggles with effective outreach to the community". There is no budget provided for after the grant. Some points were given for the connections with stakeholders and funders already in place that could be useful in sustaining the project in the future.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has a strong community partnership model, with the STRIVE partnership and the conversion of schools into community learning centers where community partners can engage with students and provide for their socioemotional, as well as academic needs. This partnership in the past has already had excellent success by recruiting hundreds of mentors; integrating services for students, providing a portal for community partners that identifies students that are most in need for assistance, based on performance and behavioral data; and showing remarkable academic improvement to the point that troubled youth who are served by these resources outperform other students. The program appears to be very successful, and the proposal is to scale up the program to the high school level.

However, there are many missing pieces of information in the applicant's plan, including how they will measure success, what kinds of resources they will integrate for the high schoolers, and what their goals are. The applicant proposed goals of 75% of students determining a college path, but it is not clear what this means. Also, they indicate a goal of 75% of students demonstrating improved ABCT outcomes, but we do not know what their baseline is, what "improved" outcomes would be (ie. how much improvement is sufficient), and what kinds of academic data is making up this ABCT outcome. These are good goals, if they were described more specifically, but they are insufficient and other outcomes should also be identified, including more specific academic ones. It is also not clear what performance measures the LEA will use.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's plan revolves around personalized learning, with the goal of creating deeper, more significant learning experiences for students. These experiences are targeted to specific career goals that the student identifies, and involves also personalized professional development for educators and goals for improving performance of all students and decreasing gaps in achievement.

Total	210	139
--------------	------------	------------

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	3

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

A budget is included, and it appears to be reasonable, but no narrative for justification for this optional budget explaining the rationale for this additional part of the program, and the high quality plan for how they would carry out these additional activities.