



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0511WI-1 for Cooperative Education Service Agency 10

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium does a very credible job in setting forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that builds on its work in the four core educational assurance areas.

The Consortium shows that it has adopted standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy. Because the Consortium is located in Wisconsin, it already has a strong state support for this, as Wisconsin was the first state to adopt the multi-state initiative to implement the Common Core State Standards and is a governing member of the Smarter Balanced Assessment System in order to benchmark performance. The Consortium will continue this work and through the grant will strengthen its ability to develop common assessments based on the Standards for every child. The Consortium will be able to leverage its prior experience to build a strong continuum for the "rural experience."

The Consortium will be able to build data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction. Again, because of its location, the Consortium will be able to capitalize on Wisconsin's two interconnected statewide information systems -- a data warehouse/dashboard system (SLDS/WISE) and a student information system. The Consortium says that these systems will increase transparency, but does not directly stipulate how accessible the systems are, but since they have a dashboard component, the implication is that they are open for teachers and principals.

The Consortium shows some strength in recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most. Within this data system will be an annual evaluation system, professional development trainings and as stated in the application, the system will focus on both the "process and product of high quality instruction." There will also be a creation of Professional Learning Communities to improve the instruction of the school through the data systems ability to highlight strengths and weaknesses. The system will allow for a "consistent application for expectations" and provide a method for professional development. The application says that the data system will help guide personnel decisions such as placement, compensation, promotion, and retention, but does not talk in depth about how teachers are going to be recruited or rewarded.

The Consortium shows a desire to help support its lowest-achieving schools. Though it does not have schools that match the federal designation, the Consortium shows a willingness and ability to support the schools and students who are not succeeding at a high level evidenced by implementing a comprehensive Response to Intervention system and partnering with the State's Rtl Center.

Thus, with a comprehensive and coherent vision, only lacking in a clarity of recruiting and rewarding teachers and principals, this section is scored in the high range of the rubric. (9/10)

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium makes a strong case that its reform proposal will be implemented in a high-quality way both on the LEA and school level. Because this application is a Consortium of districts, the districts have already committed to the process of coming together to apply. Further showing the strength of the desire of the Consortium as a whole is that all rural districts served by the CESA 10 (a regional education unit) committed to the project. When different districts signed up, a needs assessment was done as well as an assessment of success and innovation across the Consortium. Not only were MOUs signed and the eligibility requirements were always checked, there seems to have been a real collective will to work together and improve the schools throughout the Consortium through this reform proposal. The specific reform proposal was created by acknowledging each of the component districts' needs and strengths and consensus was reached. Further, because of the

understanding of different needs and strengths of the Districts, a plan based on differentiated roles, with collective learning, and cooperative sharing was created. This answer reaches the high range because it not only followed the eligibility requirement and provided the list of schools, and total number of students, etc. but showed a true ability for the Consortium to work together to implement the reform proposal (10/10)

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

10

7

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium makes a compelling case that it will be able to scale up the meaningful reform beyond participating schools. The Consortium has created a leadership model where all the Consortium's LEA will be considered "Foundational Builders" and participate in the foundational reform components. These LEA's will then highlight Districts that have already demonstrated the capacity for leadership and increased student achievement by way of the reforms proposed. These "Structural Leaders" will work throughout the Consortium to help support the reforms. Then other Districts who have been early innovators will be considered "Innovational Engineers" who will be tasked with also helping out across the Consortium. This plan is well structured and seems to understand the complexity of a Consortium model. However, the plan lacks the specific ways in which Districts will turn-key their work or how the Districts will actually offer support and help. Because of the clear structural model, but lack of specifics of support, this answer is in the high of the middle range of the rubric. (7/10)

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

10

6

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium shows a strong ability to turn its vision into improved student learning and performance and increased equity. First, the Consortium's goal of meeting and exceeding both the ESEA and Wisconsin targets is ambitious yet achievable. The Consortium is not just attempting to meet the requirements. The suspect part of the vision is that the Consortium proposed that "all K-12" students demonstrate proficiency in ELA and Math. This is ambitious indeed, however, might not be achievable. The Consortium's plan of rigorous and ambitious goal setting and purposeful use of data are pathways toward the improved student learning. Additionally, the entire Blueprint espoused by the State and the Consortium seems directly to support the improved student learning and performance and increase equity in most of the subsections of this question. Performance on summative assessments and decreasing achievement gaps have a strong possibility of occurring because of the vision of the program's goal of personalizing the learning environment, using PLCs, CCSS, and Rtl, and implementing performance-based accountability. However, since almost all the participating students are currently in K-8 the Consortium did not create goals nor does it seem like the vision will lead toward improvement in college enrollment rates. Additionally, though it can be agreed that following the vision will probably lead toward increased student achievement and thus will lead toward an increased graduation rate, there is no clear or specific acknowledgement of how the Blueprint will lead toward an increase of graduation rates. Thus, even though the vision is strong and will seemingly lead toward improvement in student learning, because of the failure to focus on high school, college or postsecondary degree attainment this response is graded in the medium range (6/10)

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	11

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Though the Consortium makes a strong and compelling case that the State of Wisconsin has a long history of success, the Consortium's application fails to fully show four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching. The proposal lauds the achievement of the State results: "Wisconsin ranks third in the nation in graduation rates and in the ten years from 1999-2009 the graduation rate has continually risen a total of 7.4% to 83.8%." The Consortium then shows how it has done good work across the Districts, by highlighting a a video conferencing grant it received and how this has led to an increase in video field trips. The Consortium also speaks to other statewide discretionary grants it received that help "rural districts to close achievement gaps and improve graduation rates by addressing cultural differences, school climate issues, positive supports for behavior, and transitional planning for college and career choices."

Yet, the Consortium does not address the specific subsets of the question. There is little discussion of college enrollment or high school graduation rates for specific districts and very little conversation about four years of growth in any of the subsections. The application highlights a series of grants that districts in the Consortium have been awarded, but does not answer the question above. Many of the districts should be commended for their work in moving students, but the examples of this growth are different for each district and only read as a highlight reel of good work rather than actually answering the

specific questions in the subset in an organized manner. For example, the proposal highlights the work of individual consortium members: Bruce School District not only increased the number of students taking the ACT test but their students' composite scores have increased as well. The School District of Abbotsford is commended for having its staff fully embrace "PLCs and the implementation of Positive Behavior Interventions." And the proposal states that "indicators show student achievement on standardized testing trending upward." But the proposal does not give full and specific data points.

Even though the Consortium does not contain schools that meet the federal definition of "persistently lowest-achieving" the Consortium acknowledges that it has underperforming schools and students and has shown leadership in addressing these schools and students. Districts in the Consortium achieved very good results in achieving and exceeding state target data points for Special Education issues.

The Consortium shows how it does and will make student performance data available. Student performance data on locally-developed assessments have not been as available as the State data, (which is already available) but the Consortium will be following suit making it accessible to all stakeholders. The new State WI DPI computer system allows for data to be used by stakeholders to inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. The WI DPI, new public "State Report Cards" and additional annual measurable objective data will all strengthen this ability. However, the Consortium, through the State's data base already allows for students, parents, and educators to have access to student performance data on state assessments through individual assessment reports.

Though the Consortium does not show a clear record of success over four years it does present many success stories and seems ready to improve student outcomes, help its most struggling students and schools, and make data available to stakeholders. Thus, this section is graded in the top part of the medium section. (11/15)

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Because of the Consortium's location in the State of Wisconsin, much of the school-level expenditures are accessible and transparent. The State's Department of Public Instruction collects and posts the salaries of school administrators, teachers, and other employees. You can search for information by teacher name, position, school or district. This is in addition to the WI DPI public information which is searchable. Districts in the Consortium can link their website to the State's information, but either way an incredible amount of salary information is accessible and transparent. However, there are some issues in getting all of the Consortium school districts on the same page of a single model policy of transparency for non-salary school level expenditures. But on the strength of the State's openness with personnel salaries, subsections a-c, the failure to have cohesiveness in subsection d is unfortunate, but not totally damaging, especially with the Consortium's acknowledgment of attempting to deal with this issue. Thus, this section is graded in the high range, based in large part on the State's data systems. (4/5)

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Wisconsin affords each school district a large amount of autonomy in implementing any specific design and delivery of instruction. Because Wisconsin is a "local control" state, educators have the autonomy to "determine the instructional methods necessary for students." Thus, the Consortium seems to have the successful conditions and sufficient autonomy to implement the personalized learning environments described in the plan. Additionally, the State Superintendent has articulated strong support of the Consortium's plan and has embraced the application. Because of both the local control characteristic of Wisconsin and the stated strong support of the plan by the State Superintendent, this section is graded in the high range.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium has demonstrated some evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal. The Consortium should be commended for its ability to gather a wide swath of schools and school districts together under one cohesive and coherent proposal. 100% of unions representing teachers in the Consortium gave their support. 85% of Consortium teachers not represented by unions gave their support. A very large list of community leaders (110 municipal leaders), gave their support. Additionally, the Consortium's effort to reach these people via mail, email, or phone shows a commitment to find a way to engage these people. However, the Consortium does not seem to focus on incorporating the voice of students, families, or even teachers in some respects. Yes, parents seem enthusiastic about the proposal, as evidenced by excerpts of parent support letters, but there is little mention of how parents or students played an active role in shaping the plan. The Consortium should be rewarded for reaching out to hundreds of people through out multiple-school

districts to get their support, but their lack of true engagement from the people most affected (students, parents, and teachers) make it so that this section is rated in the middle range.

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

5

5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium has done very good work in creating a structure for analysis and identification of needs and gaps and then creating a plan in how to address them. The Consortium has done "an extensive analysis of data" around student achievement, needs, and gaps, which is attached to the proposal. With this analysis, the Consortium has a clear list of priorities and goals based on the data. And the proposal has specific projects tailored to address the highlighted needs gaps found in the data. There is a clear progression from analysis, to plan, to action items in both this section and the plan as a whole, thus putting this section in the high range.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium has chosen to focus much of its work improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the supports necessary to graduate college- and career-ready by using Tony Wagner's "Essentials for Preparing Students for the 21st Century" framework. In the application, the Consortium gives examples of how this framework would provide real life application and high-level instruction. The examples were rigorous and respectful of the rural background of the Consortium students. There seems to be a real commitment to create curriculum that is authentic and personalized. The three sections of the Consortium's Blueprint for implementation are also very geared toward personalizing the learning environment. The Consortium will develop a model personalized learning system as well as create 1:1 technology access for all students in the Consortium. With both a traditional environment in addition to a blended learning environment being supported with interdisciplinary project based learning, the Consortium has made a compelling case that a fully function, supportive, rigorous and personal learning environment will exist because of the proposal. Such examples are the use of high quality video distance learning classes to over 2,500 students per year and blended and flipped classroom initiatives. The Consortium provides examples of where this has already worked and has shown a clarity in how these beacons of success will inform the rest of the Consortium. The failing of the Consortium's proposal in this section however, is the lack of focus on college and career readiness and graduation requirements. Because the Consortium is focused on K-8 students it is hard to balance the rubric with the actual student body. However, there is leeway with this as per the notice. The Consortium does speak in small part about distance learning for Advanced Placement curriculum being shared between high schools as well as the Consortium's post-secondary partners, which include five University of Wisconsin campuses and five Wisconsin Technical College System campuses. Thus, the strengths of the strategies and curriculum will provide for students to graduate college and career ready, but the lack of a real high school and career curriculum hurts this section somewhat and thus the section receives a score of 16/20.

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

20

18

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium has a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. The Consortium makes it very clear that professional development of its teachers in order to support the individual needs of each student is a critical part of the proposal. The Consortium has four action projects designed to support this goal: Professional Learning Communities, Common Core State Standards and Common Assessment System, RtI, and Educator Effectiveness System. These four goals seem to be supported strongly by well crafted PD plans. Specifically worthy of highlighting is the understanding in the Common Assessment System of the need for Formative Assessments, Interim Benchmark Assessments and Summative Assessments. The Consortium shows an understanding of the current best practices of assessments. In addition, the Consortium through the newly enacted Wisconsin education laws, will be using an annual educator evaluation model that ties in student performance toward being college and career ready. The evaluation system that will be enacted by 2014 is a performance-based evaluation system that will support a system of continuous improvement that leads toward "improved student learning." The Consortium also explains how it will use grant funds to provide "intensive and individualized professional development opportunities" that are geared toward the goals of the RTTT-D program, such as "improving teacher effectiveness in areas such as planning and implementing common core curriculum," "improving assessments of student performance in multiple ways," and employing

strategies for engaging families in the learning process." The Consortium amply shows a high-quality plan for improving learning and thus receives a score in the high range. (18/20)

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	15
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Consortium has a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure. From a MOU signed by each participating LEAs to the establishment of an "Office of Rural Reform and Innovation," the Consortium has shown a clear desire to think strategically and creatively around the issues of high-quality support through policies and infrastructure. The Consortium will also create a Collaborative Council, which is a cross-section of teachers, board members and district administrators from throughout the schools that comprise the Consortium. The idea of creating a specific Office of Reform and Innovation along side the traditional CESA for this grant to then be supported in perpetuity is a prime example of creative and supportive policy that makes this application strong. As part of the Consortium's Blueprint sections c-e are discussed and supported. The third goal of implementing "performance based accountability . . . to ensure . . . conditions for continuous improvement" coupled with the Action Project listed in section C of the proposal coalesce nicely to support the students and teachers in the Consortium. Because of the flexibility and personalized nature of the Action Projects and the Rtl work of the Consortium, all students, especially Special Education and ELL students will be supported. Their needs are taken into consideration throughout the multiple facets of the proposal. This section shows a strong high-quality plan including real systemic support and thus is in the high range of scoring. (15/15)</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Consortium has a high-quality plan to support project implementation. It is clear that all participating stakeholders will have access and support during the project. The systems used for information sharing are open and easily accessible to all stakeholders as well. The Consortium has a team of Educational Technology consultants who have already supported over 25% of Consortium teachers on Moodle. (An online learning management system.) Educational Technology consultants are also made available 8am to 10pm Monday through Friday and provide Sunday evening support as well. It is clear that the Consortium is going above and beyond the traditional supports in both time, effort, and staffing. Additionally, the Wisconsin data systems, specifically the Longitudinal Data System, (the new statewide data warehouse) allows dashboard control and has features to create a variety of reports about individual students as well as the system as a whole. Because of this system wide and granular support this section is in the high range. (10/10)</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Consortium has a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve its plan. The Consortium's strategy includes timely and regular feedback on the progress made and multiple opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements. There is adequate and strong monitoring and measurement that is shared publicly. The Action Projects of the Blueprint are designed to be continuous on-going living programs that adjust to the needs of the student, the school, and the districts. The Consortium has undertaken the use of the Kaizen system which encourages everyone to come up with improvements to the program. And Kaizen is built into the Blueprint for the proposal. The professional learning communities, the Blueprint Director, the Reform Coordinator, and Instructional Coaches will all serve as receptacles for the feedback made across the Consortium, which will then be sent to all of the stakeholders through multiple avenues. With the incorporation of constant feedback throughout the proposal and a structural way to both receive and give feedback to the entire Consortium, this section is in the high range. (15/15)</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium has an adequate plan which includes strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. With such a large group of different school districts located over a huge land area, communication is vital for the success of this program. Understanding this, the Consortium has taken some steps to support high-quality communication and engagement. Quarterly reports will be disseminated on-line as well as presented to all of the districts and other community groups across the Consortium. A newsletter will also be prepared along side press releases to the local media. However, there is little mention of strong communication to the parents, students, and other local stakeholders. There is also little mention on how these stake holders could suggest or help improve the plan once it is in motion, thus this answer is in the medium range.

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

5

4

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium has identified 14 performance measures to gauge the effectiveness and efficiencies of the project. These measures meet the requirements of the (E)(3) sections. Additionally, the Consortium has provided ample clarity as to why these performance measures were selected, how the Consortium's measures will provide rigorous, timely, and formative information leading to tailoring of its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern; and how the Consortium will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress. For each of the Performance Measures, the Consortium provides a clear and concise "Rationale/Measure/Continuous Improvement" section. The one draw back of this section is a self ascribed " lack of comprehensive teacher and principal evaluation system" that made it so that Consortium was "unable to acquire some of the baseline data that was requested." Because of the strength of the Blueprint and its ability to be reviewed and improved depending on the specific needs of the student, the school, or the District, this answer falls in the high range. (4/5)

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

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium has a high-quality plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the RTTT-D grant activities. The Consortium, as part of its plan, has asked for deliverables from the Districts where the monies are being spent. Thousands of teacher days of professional development will occur because of the grant and the Consortium rightly wants to know the effectiveness of the investment. Each Action Project has steps to gauge readiness and capacity. Readiness reports, summary reports, and implementation plans which include information specific to each Action Project will be collected from all subsections of the Consortium. With the strong Blueprint and accountability measures, the Consortium shows its ability to evaluate the effectiveness of the funded activities and thus this answer scores in the high range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium's budget identifies the funds that will support the project, is reasonable and sufficient to support the proposal, and clearly provides a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities. Additionally, the Consortium is supporting this proposal with monies outside this grant showing a real commitment to this project. The monies that are to be spent make sense and support the proposal, be it funding for the Personalized Learning System, the creation of the Office of Rural Reform and Innovation, or the investment in technology and technology consultants, all of the allocated fiscal resources seem to support the proposal, but the application did not have a true clarity of the differentiation between one-time investments and ongoing operation costs. Because of this, the budget is scored in the high range. (9/10)

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

10

10

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. The Consortium goes through great lengths to focus on "Capacity-building" during the time of the grant so as not to lose momentum and structure when the award runs out. The Consortium makes special note that the grant monies are not used for operation costs other than those specifically associated with the activities of the proposal. Furthermore, the Consortium specifies that all of the

action plans that are part of the proposal will be sustained using state and local resources or will be "operationalized" at the local level with existing resources. The Consortium seems to be making a clear point that everything that starts with the grant and the proposal will continue once the Federal monies are finished. For instance, once the software and access to the software exists, the Consortium will be able to maintain the access and the software with its existing personnel. Additionally, when surveyed, most parents said they were willing to support their student with the purchase of a mobile device that could be used in the curriculum and during assessments. The Consortium is even working together with the component schools to share best practices and support to reduce energy costs which will help with the education budget. The Consortium shows that it will be able to sustain the program after the money is used and thus this section is graded in the high range. (10/10)

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium proposes an ambitious yet achievable re-alignment of special education services being supported by a number of local and regional support organizations. Because the Consortium represents a 5,000 square mile service area made up of mostly rural communities families have traditionally had trouble using and receiving special services. These services, though of high quality, were centrally located far from many of the students who needed the services. Under this proposed program "Connection Workers" would be placed at the schools so as to better serve the students. Under the guidance of a MSW along side support from county human service agencies, these new site based supports have a great chance of bringing the help students need to the actual student rather than forcing the student to leave their school and their community. With a strong partnership among the Consortium and multiple county social and community service providers this is an ambitious yet achievable partnership that would serve some of the most at-risk students. Because the Consortium's Blueprint is aligned to assess performance measures for each student it will be clear to the Consortium if this program is working as the success rate for the students with disabilities would increase. This is a well developed and needed program and thus receives a score in the high range. (10/10)

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium's application meets Absolute Priority 1. The proposal is high-quality in almost every aspect, from a strong pedagogical understand of what needs to be done on the school, district, and Consortium level to a seemingly true desire to work collaboratively for the best interests of the students with an understanding of the needs of each student. Many of the proposed plans are far-reaching and ambitious, but seem to be well thought out and planned. The only hesitation about this proposal is that so much of it focuses on K-8 students and schools that there might be an issue about college and career readiness as well as graduation success and requirements. However, the strength of the proposal outweighs any lack of clarity about the high school student issue. Thus, this proposal has met the Absolute Priority 1.

Total	210	184
-------	-----	-----

Race to the Top - District
 Technical Review Form



Application #0511WI-2 for Cooperative Education Service Agency 10

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>For (A)(1), the applicant does include a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that focuses on the four core areas defined in the notice, and their approach does articulate a clear and credible approach.</p> <p>Within their plan, they are proposing to implement reforms within a consortium of 28 rural school districts and their educational service agency. Evidence for their plan being comprehensive and coherent is that they propose to implement a personalized learning system, including shifts in the organization and delivery of curriculum as well as integrating technology and innovative models; to transform the art of instruction as supported by Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), and Response to Intervention (RTI); and to implement performance-base accountability systems to ensure the conditions for continuous improvement are in place and learning can be customized.</p> <p>Evidence for their plan being a credible approach comes from them proposing strategies which recognize there are different levels of initial readiness and expertise across a project involving over 15,000 students within 28 different districts. They have proposed three levels of district involvement, with all districts committing to implementing the <i>Foundational Reform Components</i> (i.e., CCSS, Common Assessment System, RTI, PLCs, Educator Effectiveness and Accountability). The second level will involve some districts already demonstrating the capacity for leadership and increased student achievement, and who will serve as <i>Structural Leaders</i> for the project. The third level of those districts who will serve as the <i>Innovational Engineers</i>, leading the way to immediately implement reforms that challenge current structures in order to engage students at higher levels and personalize the learning experience.</p> <p>Given the evidence cited above, and the details they have offered in their proposal, their response overall for this criteria falls in the high category.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>For (A)(2)(a-c), the application provides evidence regarding the applicant's approach to implementation will support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation of their proposal.</p> <p>In reference to item a, the process to create the consortium and to determine which schools would participate was led by the educational service agency which helped lay out the initial vision and sought input from the districts. Districts then joined the consortium one-by-one as the word spread, and educators within got excited. Ultimately all 28 districts in the area signed a Memorandum of Understanding. In total 56 individual schools across 28 districts and the educational service agency are targeted to participate.</p> <p>In reference to items b and c, the proposal listed all 56 schools and the required school demographics for each. The proposal contains evidence that collectively, over 50% of the students come from low-income students (thereby meeting that grant minimum standards).</p> <p>The overall response falls within the high range for this category.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>For (A)(3), the applicant proposes to implement their reform strategies in all schools within the 28 districts that serve grades K-8, with the exception that a few districts had K-12 based schools and decided to involve all of their teachers and students,</p>		

and one other district had multiple elementary schools, and decided to include only their 3 lowest performing schools.

Since the focus on their grant is K-8, and since nearly all schools in every district is involved, only limited evidence was provided that focused on scaling up all of the reforms within a given district (other than the note that the reforms will follow each K-8 student into their high school). Instead, the proposal noted how a consortium of this type could become a model of how to scale-up important reforms within the many small and rural schools across their state. Evidence includes an excerpt from the executive director of their state rural schools alliance, which pledges his organization's support in disseminating their successes to others in the state, and to work with their national affiliate to help spread the information to other rural areas in the nation.

Overall, the response was not in the form of a high quality plan, but core elements of such a plan were apparent in the response. The application scored in the lower level of the upper range.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

For (A)(4) (a-d), the applicant nicely details baseline and target goals for a number of assessments and indicators, including students overall and as broken down by various important subcategories (i.e., White, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Black, Hispanic, LEP, students with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged). This is done for each of the 56 schools to be involved in the project, as well as the high schools in the districts so that data on the students served while in K-8 can be tracked into high school.

For performance on summative assessments (item a), the applicant plans to use proficiency status data from their annual state exams in 3rd - 8th & 10th grade reading and math (including the % Proficient or Advanced), as well in the change in the % of students who are proficient and advanced each year (in comparison to previous year). The proposal notes that the target goals listed for each year are in direct alignment with the state's ESEA goals, but that it is the consortium's intent, as a whole, is to exceed the state's ESEA targets.

In reference to decreasing achievement gaps (item b), the application includes baseline data for each of the assessments and student subcategories noted above, and includes small incremental projected gap decreases each year.

In reference to graduation rates (item c), the application includes baseline data for each subcategory of students, but does not project any changes in those rates during the term of the grant. Their rationale is that they are targeting grades K-8, and those students will not have graduated from high school during the term of this grant. Yet, the selection criteria indicated that these goals were to cover the entire district, not just the students directly impacted by the grant.

In reference to college enrollment (item d), the application includes baseline data for each subcategory of students for the region as a whole, and notes that no goals were developed for these item since the target student population are in grades K-8 and will not have graduated from high school before the conclusion of the grant period. Yet, the selection criteria indicated that these goals were to cover the entire district, not just the students directly impacted by the grant.

Overall, the application has offered good baseline data for many assessments (within 56 schools), and their annual growth targets for each of their many subcategories are ambitious, yet achievable (offering steady and consistent growth for all students). Target goals for two areas are missing. The overall response is placed within the lower level of the high 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	12

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

For (B)(1)(a), the applicant provides some evidence that they have a record of success during the past 4 years, whereby they note that in 2012, 14 individual schools within the 28 district consortium were identified as "schools or recognition" by their state department for their success academically out-performing similarly-sized schools with similar percentages of economically-disadvantaged students. The application also contains a narrative summary of successes within each of the 28 districts (including things like score improvements on state tests, the ACT, AP numbers, HS graduation rates, and dual enrollment credits earned). However, such data was not presented in an uniform and consistent manner to provide strong evidence of a clear track record of success during the past 4 years, nor was there any data offered in the narrative about success in closing achievement gaps.

For (B)(1)(b), the applicant indicates that they do not have any schools that meet the federal definition of a persistently low

achieving school, but that they do have at least one state-labeled focus school, 46 Title I schools, and significant achievement gaps among subgroups in all participating schools. The applicant offers some narrative about the general efforts in their region to improve the learning outcomes for students with disabilities, and offered evidence that 10 of their districts achieved the state target data points for student transition between birth to 3 and preschool services, and required increased parental participation in transition planning. The applicant also offers some evidence of overall reform efforts, focused on implementing high-quality instruction, balanced assessments, and collaborative practice, with their state being the first of 40 states to adopt the CCSS (and significant teacher training associated with that).

For (B)(1)(c), the applicant notes that student performance data on locally-developed assessments are available to students, parents, and educators through mechanisms established at each district level. In addition, state assessment data is also made available to these groups through individual assessment reports and the state department website. The applicant acknowledges, however, that such data has still been limited. Their state has just implemented a new school accountability system, and beginning October 2012, each school will have received one of five accountability ratings on a public school report card. More importantly, the applicant proposes to partner with the state department to harness the ability of the new statewide accountability system, as well as the statewide student information system, to provide information to students, teachers, and parents regarding each student's personalized learning.

Overall, the applicant scores in the lower level of the high category.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

For (B)(2), the applicant offers evidence that some enhanced financial transparency has been occurring, including a recent state on-line system (Summer 2012) which allows easy access to the salaries and associated benefits for every school administrator, teacher, and other employee in the state. The applicant, however, does not indicate to what extent such data is currently broken down based on the Census Bureau's classifications.

The applicant offers some evidence that the consortium has already taken steps to create a draft model policy that would make the salary information available through the state website and other financial information including the most recent audits, the annual operating budget, and employee contacts be posted on each district's website. However, that draft policy does not indicate such data would be required to broken down to the school level.

Overall, the response reveals important salary data is now readily available via a state website, but offers no other evidence of existing school-level financial transparency as required by the criteria. The score is in the lower level of the high range.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

For (b)(3) the applicant has provided significant evidence that their state and local policy environment includes sufficient autonomy and support to implement their proposed reforms, leading to a personalized learning environment. These include the fact that their state is a local control state and thus each district has maximum flexibility for the design and delivery of instruction. It was noted that consortium members spent weeks attempting to identify legal, statutory and/or regulatory barriers to implementing their proposed reform plans, and none were found. They noted that a recently enacted state law requiring annual educator evaluations will assist in their efforts to implement their proposed reforms. In addition, their state receives high marks (from a national source) for the amount of digital personalized learning opportunities already allowed by state statute; that their statutes facilitate or promote access to high quality digital content; and that online courses and virtual schools are available to all K-12 students at any time in their academic career and are not restricted by class size ratios, enrollment caps or geography.

The application also profiles evidence regarding various reforms underway which help pave the way for the reforms being proposed (including implementation of CCSS, RTI, PLCs, and early Educator Effectiveness adoption).

Overall the applicant has provided significant evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy, and the rating is in the high range.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

In reference to (B)(4)(a) and (b), the applicant provided significant evidence that they had participated in a process to inform all key stakeholders about the proposed reform efforts, and to obtain their support. 100% of the unions representing teachers

in the consortium signed in support of the project, as did 85% of the teachers in districts with no union. For each district, evidence was offered of the exact dates meetings occurred with their board of education, their administrative leaders, their teachers union (as applicable) or groups of teachers, staff, and parents. Close to 200 municipal leaders were notified about the project, and 110 responded by a mail, on-line or phone survey in support of the project. In addition a significant number of support letters were provided from various community members, parents, early learning programs, and higher education.

Clear evidence was not provided, however, as to how the proposal was revised based on the engagement of these stakeholders and their feedback.

Overall given the significant levels of support across a vast number of districts and communities, the response is in the lower level of the high range.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

For (B)(5), the applicant notes that they underwent an extensive analysis of data around student achievement, needs, and gaps, and provided a narrative of their results. They summarize that districts have varied performance in reading and in math, but all need higher achievement levels (with the lowest subgroup scores being for those with disabilities). They conclude that their students overall are not engaged in school, and the existing paradigm for teaching no longer ensures that student acquire the skills necessary for success. Some reform efforts are underway across the districts, but the velocity of change is limited given their rural locations. They then link data from their needs analysis to their proposed reforms. Missing, however, was an analysis of their current status in implementing personalized learning environments (nor did it include plans for doing so).

Overall, the applicant clearly uses their completed needs analysis to support the logic behind their proposal, but given the one missing sub-element, their score is in the lower end of the high range.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

For (C)(1)(a-b), the applicant details the elements of a high quality plan to implement a personalized learning system, which will include shifts in the organization and delivery of curriculum as well as integrating technology and innovative models, to engage all students at higher levels in order to engage and empower all learners. The applicant describes key activities, timeline, deliverables, and responsible parties (as well as resources needed and sustainability) for 3 major action projects: 1) develop or adopt a model personalized learning system; 2) plan for the implementation of 1:1 technology access throughout the curriculum; and 3) implement project learning (PBL) pilot projects.

For (C)(1)(a) (i-v), the applicant indicates their personalized learning system will facilitate ongoing and regular feedback, enabling students and parents to access regularly updated individual student data that can be used to track their progress toward mastery of standards and personal learning goals. It will also help students identify and pursue goals are linked to college and career-ready standards, help ensure all students are involved in deep learning experiences, and will develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, and critical thinking. While there is good detail within these high quality plans for each action project, the proposal does not explicitly indicate how the implementation of such projects will help all students with each items noted in the criteria (e.g., empower all students to understand that what they are learning is key to their goals(item i); ensure that all students will come to understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals and to measure progress toward those goals (item ii); have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts and perspectives (item iv); and will master critical academic content (item v)).

For (C)(1)(b)(i-iv), the applicant details the elements of a high quality plan to implement a project-based learning activities within their schools (starting with pilot projects in some innovational engineer schools). It includes an action project providing evidence of a high quality plan to implement 1:1 Technology. They also detail how they will tap into and build upon their existing high quality video distance learning classes, including blended learning. The applicant offers no specific details regarding accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students (item v).

For (C)(1)(c), the applicant does not directly address the requested information as to what mechanisms will be in place to provide training and support to students that ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning.

Overall, there is good evidence of action project plans that include core elements of a high quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment. Given a few missing sub-elements (as noted above), the response scores in the lower level of the high range.

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

20

19

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

For (C)(2), the applicant details the elements of a high quality plan to transform the art of instruction, which they note is undergirded by professional learning communities, the common core state standards, and response to intervention, by providing educators with differentiated professional development in order for them to be highly-effective. The applicant describes key activities, timeline, deliverables, and responsible parties (as well as resources needed and sustainability) for 4 major action projects: 1) develop professional learning communities; 2) implement the common core state standards and common assessment system; 3) implement response to intervention; and 4) implement the state's educator effectiveness system.

For (C)(2)(a)(i-iv), the applicant does offer evidence that all participating educators will engage in training and in professional teams to support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments (item i), and will help them adapt content and instruction as needed (item ii). Their new common assessment system will allow them to frequently measure student progress (item iii). Their new educator effectiveness system will be implemented by 2013, and the consortium plans to offer systems of support to ensure the model is implemented with fidelity, and that enables educators to use evaluations in meaningful ways to inform instruction, professional development, and personnel decision (item iv).

For (C)(2)(b)(i-iii), the applicant does offer evidence that participating educators will engage in training focused on improved teacher effectiveness and implementing core curriculum, instructional strategies addressing multiple learning models, improved assessment of student performance in multiple ways, using data systems to track student growth and co-plan individualized or personalized learning plans, and employing strategies for engaging families in the learning process. The applicant's action plans generally cover the items in the criteria, although they do not specifically address having actionable information (item i), access to high-quality learning resources (item ii), or processes and tools to match student needs with specific resources and approaches (item iii).

For (C)(2)(c)(i-ii), the applicant does offer evidence of a high quality action plan to create PLCs and to provide differentiated professional development to help students implement personalized learning environments, including information from the teacher evaluation system to be implemented (item i), and on-going training, systems and practices (item ii).

For (C)(2)(d), the applicant provides some evidence that they plan to work with districts to move teachers and principals who are marginally effective to effective, and those who are effective to highly effective, by aligning professional development to meet their specific deficits, providing instructional coaching, and supporting all efforts through active PLCs.

Overall, given the evidence within their high quality action plans (and only a few minor missing sub-elements), the response is scored in the upper range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

For (D)(1)(a), the applicant provides evidence of a high quality plan for the organization of the consortium governance structure to provide support and services to all participating schools. Specifically they propose to establish an office of rural reform and innovation within the educational service center, that would be advised by a collaborative council as appointed by the broader stakeholder group. This office would employ, contract and support the work of a team of highly qualified educators and experts capable of managing the reform included in their proposal. The proposal also includes a very detailed MOU signed by each participating district, outlining the decision-making process, governance structure, and roles for each LEA.

For (D)(1)(b), the applicant provides evidence that participating LEAs have sufficient autonomy, as independent locally controlled districts, over matters such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators, and school-level budgets.

For (D)(1)(c & d), the applicant provides evidence of plans to create systems which allow students to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, and to demonstrate such mastery at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways. They

propose to create model policies that remove the barriers for such a system being implemented.

For (D)(1)(e), the applicant notes that the action projects to be implemented via this grant would be adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including and especially students with disabilities and ELL. They cite research that PBL classes perform better on assessments of content knowledge, and keeps students with special needs.

Overall, the applicant offered good evidence that they have a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure, and scores in the high range.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	9
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

For (D)(2)(a), the applicant notes its plan to ensure that all participating students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders will have access to the necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation of their proposal. Through their 1:1 technology access action plan, they propose to build upon existing strengths to get to 24/7 equitable access within all of their participating LEAs.

For (D)(2)(b), the applicant provides evidence of the existing technology support provided by the educational service area through several other grants, and their plans to expand access and support via this grant. A pilot expansion is planned to implement a WiMAX wireless broadband technology in a 1,500 square mile area within the rural consortium area.

For (D)(2)(c), the applicant provides only limited information as to how they would be using information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format, and to use the data in other electronic learning systems. They simply note that they would be doing so.

For (D)(2)(d), the applicant provides details for an action project to work with state department personnel regarding the implementation of the new state interoperable comprehensive data system to support the RTTT project. They note that they will build upon a new statewide data warehouse system which provides districts with tools that allow users to access dashboards and reports on a variety of topics including enrollment, attendance, student assessment data, student growth, and student profile informatoin, allowing educators to incorporate high-quality data into their decison-making processes.

Overall, the applicant provides solid evidence for all but one small subcriteria of this category, and scores in the upper range.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	14

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

For (E)(1), the applicant provides good information regarding their plan to implement a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for corrections. Their plan involves the use of a project director, reform coordinators, and instructional coaches, along with a collaborative governing advisory council PLC and other stakeholders to evaluate all components of their proposed action plans, to share such information, and to make adjustments as needed. A professional learning community framework will also guide the process, although limited details on this framework were provided.

Overall, this application offers a strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process, and scores in the upper range.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

For (E)(2), the applicant offers some good information of their plan to offer ongoing communication and updates. Monthly meetings of the superintendents and participating principals are planned, as are quarterly reports to school boards. In addition, periodic newsletters and ongoing electronic communication via e-mail and the project website are planned. Local forums for parents and other stakeholders are planned to discuss the accountability system and the impact on individual student progress. However, there is little information on how the internal and external stakeholders will be "engaged" (rather than simply "informed").

This response is the middle range.

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

5

4

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

For (E)(3), the applicant provides evidence of meeting the expectations of proposing ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures. The applicant proposed to track data for 14 performance measures, offering performance measures for all required categories. Baseline data exists for only 5 of the 14 performance areas since a number of them are related to the implementation percentage of various reform activities for students across the consortium.

In addition to the specific required indicators, for the applicant-proposed measures, the applicant described the rationale for selecting each measure, how it connects to their proposed plan, and how it would be gathered each year. It does not address how they will review and improve each measure over time if it is insufficient to gage implementation progress.

For all measures, the plan proposes small incremental improvements each year, adequate and realistic enough to be considered ambitious yet achievable. The response scores in the high range.

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

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

For (E)(4), the applicant summarized their plans to track the implementation and successes across the many schools and students in their consortium. They note that their planned on-going assessment and periodic evaluation reports will establish a framework of accountability to ensure the funded activities are properly aligned in order to improve results. The consortium will regularly assess the status of each action plan as it is being implemented, and their proposal includes elements of a high quality plan including specific evaluation-related deliverables and timelines. The response scored in the high range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>For (F)(1)(a-c), the applicant provides detailed budget sheets and narratives which identifies all funds that would support the project, appears reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the proposal, and offers thoughtful rationale for the proposed investments and priorities. In support of item c, the proposal does identify some minimal funding from other sources to help support the grant, and indicates that basically all of the activity costs are one-time costs and/or the local districts will need to sustain them once the grant is completed.</p> <p>There is one small area of the budget which does appear less reasonable (and for which some additional rationale was warranted). It is the \$1.2 million to support project-based learning in only 3 of the 28 districts. Given that this is one of the goals of the grant, to have it be implemented in only 3 districts during the time of the grant raises questions about the ability of those activities to impact student results across the entire consortium.</p> <p>Given the overall level of detail, rationale and connectiveness to the proposal, this response scores in the lower level of the upper range.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	9
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>For (F)(2), the applicant notes that the most of the grant is viewed as capacity-building, and represents a one-time investment in these rural districts to help generate transformational momentum, which they note will be maintained by the increased infrastructure, personnel leadership, and consortium partnership.</p> <p>They also note that one small aspect of the project (which was not detailed anywhere but in the budget section) is some</p>		

energy management for sustainability. This action project would work with districts to save funds via environmental and energy-saving measures which could then be used toward sustaining high-quality personalized learning systems and other reforms. The narrative for this action project indicates that no office of rural reform and innovation expenses are being requested for this action project since that activity is already part of the education service agency infrastructure. Yet, in the budget narrative and tables, about \$500,000 is requested, with no funds from other sources offered for this area.

Overall, this applicant provides good information on their proposed efforts for this area (with some minimal confusion for the one proposed action plan). The overall response scores in the high range.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

For the competitive preference priority item (1), the applicant provided evidence of a coherent and sustainable partnership with two country-level social and community service agencies to place "connections workers" (MSW trained social workers) in high needs schools (initially two schools and expanding from there), and support their efforts with crisis aversion funds from the grant. A detailed action plan includes information on the activities, timeline, deliverables and responsible parties. A key focus will be students with disabilities and their families.

For the competitive preference priority item (2), the applicant does offer several population-level goals that align with the overall proposal, and which include educational outcomes e.g., 3rd and 8th grade reading and math state-level test scores for students with disabilities), and family and community support (e.g., fewer out-of-home placements).

For the competitive preference priority item (3)(a-d), the applicant does offer evidence to meet this criteria. It notes how the data will be tracked over time for students receiving the services (item a); that the students targeted will be those with disabilities (item b); that funds from various district and county sources will become available to continue these services and scale them up once data becomes available on its effectiveness (item c); and discusses their hopes for continued results for more students over time (item d).

For the competitive preference priority item (4), the applicant does offer evidence to meet this criteria to demonstrate how the partnership with the county social service departments will be providing additional essential services to students with disabilities and their families. The connections workers will be employees of the educational service agency, and will have access to school and student data necessary to do their jobs effectively. The counties will be training this social workers, giving them insider information and knowledge of how to access county services.

For the competitive preference priority item (5)(a-e), the applicant does offer evidence to meet this criteria of building the capacity of staff. The connections workers and special education leaders from the educational service agency will train school personnel how to better interpret data, and will work together to review and revise school policies (as needed) to better provide personalized learning for students with disabilities (item a). An inventory of all resources from the local to the state level will be developed (item b). Supports will be tracked via various performance measures, and monthly meetings to review value of various activities and supports will occur (item c). Efforts to engage parents and families of participating students are offered (item d), as is a detailed action plan offering evidence of plans to actively assess progress overtime (item e).

For the competitive preference priority item (6), the applicant does offer evidence to meet this criteria. They offer goals related to 3rd and 8th grade Reading; 8th grade Math; parental IEP attendance and participation; student attendance, suspensions, and retention; out-of-home care placements; and the identification of service gaps.

Overall, given the evidence noted above, this response scores in the upper range.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

In reference to the Absolute Priority 1: Personalized learning Environments, the applicant has provided more than adequate evidence (as detailed in each criteria section) that their proposed plan does coherently and comprehensively address how they will build on core educational assurance areas to create learning environments designed to significantly improve learning and teaching in their district.

Total	210	186
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0511WI-3 for Cooperative Education Service Agency 10

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the high range as the proposal clearly outlines the Consortium's support for and articulation with the Wisconsin state Department of Public Instruction's (WI DPI) targets aimed at accelerating student achievement.

- The narrative provides as foundational the WI DPI state targets: increase graduation rates; increase college and career readiness; closing the achievement gaps between graduation and career-readiness; and, increase proficiencies in reading and mathematics. These targets establish "the call to action" set forth in the Consortium's *Blueprint for Rural Reform & Innovation: Creating Sustainable, Rigorous, and Engaging Personalized Learning Environments*, (Blueprint). The narrative makes clear that the goals of the Blueprint will be realized through the implementation of personalized learning environments.
- Clear delineation of state achievement discrepancies used as the basis for a high-quality plan to realize a bold reform vision which will be replicable in other rural settings.
- Clear delineation of core challenges as they relate to Student Learning and Engagement, Teaching and Leading, and Performance-Based Accountability in rural settings. These challenges are used as the foundation for the three goals set forth in the project Blueprint.
- Evidence of a comprehensive and coherent set of action plans with activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties, accompanied by reasonable means for assessing success and progress toward accomplishing the goals of the Blueprint.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section is scored in the high range as the narrative provides extensive detail of the consortium's (CESA10) approach to implementing the "Blueprint for Rural Reform & Innovation: Creating Sustainable, Rigorous, and Engaging Personalized Learning Environment" (hereafter titled "Blueprint").

(A)(2)(a)

The narrative includes a detailed description of the process(es) used to select partner districts.

- Rural districts were invited by the Consortium via *District Notice Inviting Application* to participate. 28 of 28 districts accepted the invitation.
- Each District LEA signed a Memorandum of Understanding providing assurances that the district meets eligibility requirements.
- During recruitment, districts were surveyed as to needs, assessment of success and "budding innovations"
- Based on the data received, the Consortium narrowed the focus of the Blueprint's scope to grades K-8.

(A)(2)(b)(c)

The narrative provides a detailed listing of schools by LEA (district), with total numbers of participating students in each of the subgroups defined by the notice.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the high range. In working toward the development of a high-quality plan, the Consortium, led by CESA 10, used a collaborative process with its partner districts, making collective decisions in formulating the Blueprint for reform. The narrative provides a concise and thorough detail of a high-quality plan delineating how the proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform beyond the participating districts. The Consortium formed by the CESA 10 with 28 rural partner districts, is shown to have significant collective experiences from which to build capacity as well as a replicable model for other rural districts/ESAs (see Appendix (B)(3)-Evidence of Successful Conditions for Reform). What is not clear is how the ESA-structure is used specifically as the conduit by which to operationalize the scaling-up work proposed and which is a significant projected outcome in the Blueprint.

CESA 10 has fostered extensive partnerships via federal grant programs and state initiatives as outlined in section (B): USDA rural telecommunications grant program; Materials Science Center within the Univ. of Wisconsin, leadership in the Early Childhood Regional Program Support and Leadership Services Network (RSN), Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports (PBIS) Network, Culturally Responsive Education for All: Training and Enhancement (CREATE), WI Statewide Parent Educator Initiative (WSPEI) and WI Statewide Transition Initiative (WSTI). These previous and/or existing programs, given as proof of closing achievement gaps and improving graduation rates, provide evidence of CESA 10's capacity to lead the Consortium forward with the proposed Blueprint.

The Consortia identifies three core challenges faced by rural schools. The proposed Blueprint seeks to fully address these challenges via three goals:

- Implement a personalized learning system that consists of mastery-based learning, high-quality content aligned with college- and career-ready standards, high-quality instructional approaches (project-based and authentic) and use of technology tools.
- Transform the art of teaching through collaborative structures and targeted professional development.
- Create performance-based accountability systems and policies that support high-quality personalized learning environments.

The Blueprint presents a comprehensive reform model whereby the three goal areas will be realized through seven action projects. These action projects contain specific measurable goals, activities, timelines, and deliverables (see section (C)(1) Action Projects 1:1 Technology Across the Consortium, Project Based Learning, Professional Learning Communities, Common Core State Standards and Common Assessment System, Response to Intervention, and Educator Effectiveness System). The project narrative indicates many of the ideas and strategies outlined in the Blueprint have been explored or tested in one or more of the partner districts. The Blueprint clearly provides a schematic outlining how partner districts will be identified as Foundational Builders, Structural Leaders, or Innovational Engineers. Each partner district self identified strengths as well as degrees of readiness for the three roles the district would participate under, thus differentiating levels of readiness based on local expertise and capacities.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

This section is scored in the high range as the Consortium's vision is projected to result in improved student learning, performance, and equity.

(A)(4)(a)-(c)

- The narrative clearly identifies grant focus on raising achievement in math and reading for all students, and closing the achievement gap between student groups including students with disabilities, Limited English Proficient, racial/ethnic groups, and economically disadvantaged students.
- The narrative includes appropriate, targeted overall growth for identified subgroups over the course of the grant. Information is provided explaining how the state of Wisconsin has re-aligned the WKCE cut scores to reflect cut scores of the NAEP, reflecting higher standards and expectations for all students.
- The Consortium's intent is to meet and exceed targets established by ESEA and the State of Wisconsin Dept of Public Instruction (WI PDI) through use of embedded professional development, and with the establishment of systems and conditions that facilitate personalized learning environments.
- The Consortium's action plan proposes specific measurable goals, activities, timelines, and deliverables.
- Indication that most of the ideas and strategies outlined in the proposal have been tested in one or more of participating LEA schools. The Blueprint incorporates the dissemination and scaling up of strategies using professional learning communities (PLCs).
- LEA districts will take on differing roles within the Consortium:
 - *Structural Leaders*: districts that have already demonstrated capacity for leadership and increased student achievement will provide leadership and support to other Consortium districts
 - *Innovational Engineers*: districts with past experiences, progress, and early innovation will be able to immediately implement reforms in order to engage students at higher levels and through personalized learning opportunities.

This reader was not able to ascertain a clear understanding of implications for graduation rates.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	12

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section is scored in the low high range as the narrative clearly shows the CESA10, serving as Consortium lead, has an established record of success in advancing student learning and achievement, and for increasing equity in learning and teaching opportunities.

(B)(1)(a)

- Improving career and college readiness and increasing access to diverse content using technology: CESA10 has 25 years of experience facilitating video distance learning classes. Recent grant awards have allowed for installation of portable video conferencing systems.
- Increasing access to science and inquiry-based learning, diverse science content and technology using technology: CESA10 in collaboration with local state university via the Materials Science Center (MSC), University of Wisconsin.
- CESA10's centralized Instructional Media Center increases access to diverse content for rural schools.
- Multiple examples provided in the Appendix of districts within the Consortium showing success advancing student learning and achievement.

While evidence is provided in the Appendix outlining examples for each District and their respective successes, this reader was unable to ascertain if all District LEAs show the required four years of advancing student learning and achievement and equity in learning and teaching.

(B)(1)(b)

The narrative indicates the Consortium does not contain schools meeting the federal definition of persistently low achieving schools, but does provide information and examples of schools in the Consortium that have made significant progress toward mitigating gaps between subgroups. These successes are attributed to grant funding secured by CESA10 to provide professional development, technical assistance, and compliance with State Performance Plan Indicators dedicated to

improving learning outcomes for students with disabilities.

(B)(1)(c)

The narrative specifies how the Consortium will partner with WIPDI to provide information to students, teachers, and parents regarding each student's personalized learning using the new statewide accountability system. The new accountability system, or Report Card, has four priority areas that are aligned with the Consortium Blueprint.

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

5

5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the high range as the narrative provides evidence of transparency in processes and practices.

The narrative indicates that information is, at a minimum, made available to the public in the four categories required in this section. The narrative provides a glimpse into the collaborative process used to formulate the Blueprint in describing how the topic of transparency of school level expenditures was discussed with all 28 Consortium superintendents. The narrative indicates a draft model policy has been forwarded to all participating LEA school boards for review. This policy would make salary information, recent audit reports, annual operating budgets and employee contracts/handbooks available via the WI PDI website.

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

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the high range as the narrative describes various ways that each member of the Consortium is recognized as an "independent political subdivision", with the autonomy to establish or change policies that affect the learning environment, or, establish the conditions for transformation. Evidence in the Blueprint shows that Consortium districts have the flexibility in design and delivery of instruction.

Laws have recently been enacted that require all districts to implement annual educator evaluations. Wisconsin statutes also facilitate and promote access to high quality digital content, online courses, and virtual schools. The Blueprint includes strategies to support the implementation in ways to inform instruction, professional development, and personnel decisions.

Evidence indicates that students are allowed to enroll in online and distance learning programs, and Consortium members have the ability to personalize curriculum and instructional delivery systems for every student.

Local evidence of progress toward establishing initial conditions of reform show significant progress made by several Consortium LEAs in implementing Common Core State Standards, Response to Intervention, Professional Learning Communities, and early Educator Effectiveness adoption. Each of these programs and initiatives are in alignment with the Consortium Blueprint.

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

10

9

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the high range as the narrative clearly shows meaningful and thorough stakeholder engagement in the development of support for the Blueprint.

- Evidence in the appendix indicates each partner district discussed RTTT-D grant opportunity with Boards of Education, principals, teachers, and labor unions (dates included). Narrative indicates each partner district completed an MOU with signatures from the superintendent, Board of Education, and labor union representative, if applicable.
- Evidence in the appendix provides a completed Stakeholder Engagement Survey from each partner district detailing dates when the proposal was discussed with each group described above, as well as with parents, parent organizations, and community organizations. Two of the 28 member districts indicate not having discussions with parents and/or parent organizations.
- A press release to local newspapers was used to elicit feedback from the public, including elected officials (copy of Press Release provided). Narrative indicates municipal leaders were sent paper copies of the draft application and a questionnaire, and that 110 of 199 municipal leaders responded to the questionnaire. A significant number of letters of support are also included in the Appendix.
- Narrative indicates CESA 10 created and posted a FAQ fact sheet for districts to share with stakeholders. CESA 10 leadership met twice with union leadership to field questions and accept input.

The exact phrasing of the criteria for (B)(4) does not explicitly detail the type of evidence required to show "direct engagement". The evidence provided via the Stakeholder Engagement Survey includes dates of discussion, and so meets the criteria of showing how families were engaged in the development. It would have helped this reader to see a listing of the discussion topics from these sessions, or at least a summarization of feedback received and/or used in drafting or revising the Blueprint proposal. Mention is made in section (B)(5) that student (as well as parent and teacher) feedback was used in crafting the goals of the Blueprint. It is not clear to this reader the processes by which students were engaged nor how their input was gathered.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the high range as the narrative provides a comprehensive analysis of needs and gaps of Consortium LEAs. Needs and gaps were identified by stakeholders: on assessment data, and on feedback from teachers, parents, and students. Extensive evidence as to the analyses and the resultant findings exists in the Appendix. A high-quality action plan is provided in detail in section (C) of the proposal.

- Evidence includes a detailed analysis of student performance data. Grade level analysis indicates lowest achievement in reading Grade 3, with five schools persistently low performance in reading at multiple levels. Two thirds of students in CESA10 ranked in the lower third of all students in the state in math. Consistently poor performance in math in several grades could be indication of problems with the curriculum and instructional delivery.
- Key findings are supported through the goals stated in the proposed Blueprint: (1) Implement a personalized learning system to include shifts in the deliver of curriculum as well as integrating technology and innovative models to engage all students at higher levels; (2) Transform the art of instruction via PLCs, CCSS, RtI; (3) Implement performance-based accountability systems and policies to ensure conditions for continuous improvement are in place.
- Examples demonstrating Consortium LEAs implementing performance-based accountability systems.
- Evidence of extensive action plans as well as a comprehensive technology readiness survey, with activities, timelines, deliverables, and listing of responsible parties:
 - to develop/adopt a model personalized learning system.
 - to improve access, resources and professional development to implement a 1:1 technology environment for every student.
 - to implement interdisciplinary project-based learning (PBL) to bring relevance to content standards.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(C)(1) Learning

This section was scored in the high range as the narrative provides evidence of a comprehensive and high quality plan to engage and empower learners in order to "Implement a personalized learning system to engage all students at higher levels in order to engage and empower all learners." The structure of the narrative reflects most poignantly the Consortium's logic model/theory of change by way of stating what will be realized. The narrative provides three action plans to support how the Blueprint will realize "genuinely disruptive innovation."

Action Project - Personalized Learning Systems (PLS) outlines how students will be involved in designing programs of study within college- and career-ready standards, developing learning goals using tools such as electronic portfolios and goal management platforms via virtual learning platforms. The narrative states students will engage with educators in developing learning goals, be provided ongoing and regular feedback, updated data to track progress toward content mastery, and a high level of student-educator-parent communication. The narrative does provide indicators (See Project Activities, Personal Learning Plans) for how PLS will address the needs of students at either end of the achievement spectrum, thereby ensuring all students are "well served". It is not clear to this reader the mechanisms in place or to be developed that will

provide training and support to students to use the tools and resources that will track and manage their learning. This reader was unable to determine whether a plan has been developed to address the need to train students in how to use these new tools. The narrative provides a high-quality action plan to support PLS, with a comprehensive listing of activities, implementation timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

Action Project - 1:1 Technology Access outlines a plan to deliver a variety of high-quality instructional approaches within traditional, blended, and personalized instructional environments. The narrative provides clear indication that implementation will be differentiated by schools/districts, transitioning Consortium schools from traditional toward personalized learning environments. The project includes developing a comprehensive technology readiness report to gage sufficiency of district infrastructure. Use of the 'roles pyramid' shown in section (A) is most clearly evident in how differentiation will be achieved via phased rollout - those schools/districts already with functioning infrastructure and skilled faculty will begin the process first, providing structural leadership and/or innovative engineering . The narrative for this action project provides a high-quality action plan to support 1:1 Technology Access, with a comprehensive listing of activities, implementation timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

Action Project - Project-Based Learning (PBL) outlines how the Consortium will incorporate interdisciplinary project-based learning (PBL) to bring relevance to the classroom. The narrative puts forth the framework that PBL promotes collaboration and the use of non-traditional, technology-based instructional methods, shifting student work toward using investigative strategies and real-world applications of knowledge. The narrative provides a clear rationale for how the PBL model is based on 1:1 technologies and the integration of 21st Century skills into traditional course work (thereby providing tangible contexts for transition toward personalized learning environments). The narrative for this action project provides a high-quality action plan to support PBL, with a comprehensive listing of activities, implementation timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

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

20

19

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the high range as the narrative provides evidence of a comprehensive and high quality plan to teaching and leading that helps to improve instruction and increase support for student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards. The Consortium Blueprint has as its secondary goal, "Transform the art of instruction (PLCs, CCSS, Rtl) by providing educators with differentiated professional development in order for them to be highly-effective." Evidence indicates teachers will be involved in four action projects in order to realize personalized learning environments for students. The Blueprint identifies:

- First action project be devoted to establishing the collaborative structures fostered in PLCs. Evidence provided that PLCs will be used as a framework for in-district work and for specific professional development activities proposed throughout the Blueprint. Narrative provides an action plan to support implementation of PLCs.
- Second action project focused on CCSS and development of a Common Assessment System. Evidence provided that curriculum mapping will take place within and across LEA districts and subject areas in order to allow flexibility and innovation to pacing, timing, and personalization of learning. Evidence provided that the Consortium is committed to developing a high-quality assessment system that serves as a measure of student growth and which informs instructional decisions, allowing for multiple opportunities to demonstrate mastery. Narrative provides an action plan to support implementation of CCSS and Common Assessment System.
- Third action project with Rtl as its basis, targeted to provide additional resources to address needs of students with disabilities. Narrative indicates CESA10 will partner with the Wisconsin Rtl Center and the RTAC provided by the State to supplement activities already taking place in Consortium LEAs. Narrative provides an action plan to support implementation of Rtl.
- Fourth action project focused on implementing an Educator Effectiveness System. Narrative indicates several Consortia LEAs currently piloting a model system for the Department of Public Instruction, a performance-based evaluation system. Narrative provides an action plan to support implementation of Educator Effectiveness Systems. However, what was not clear was how professional development would be differentiated to address training needs for site- and/or district-level administration.

The narrative provides evidence that the Consortium will provide high quality and differentiated professional development across each of the action projects mentioned above and to provide intensive PD to: improve teacher effectiveness in planning and implementing CCSS curriculum; use of instructional strategies addressing multiple learning modes; assessing student performance in multiple ways; using data systems and assessments to track growth and personalized planning; and, engaging families in the learning process.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	14
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(D)(1)(a-d)</p> <p>This section was scored high as the narrative provides detailed explanation of the structures either put into place or set in motion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed by each partner district, with detailed explanation as to the outlining the governance structure, district roles, and assurances of sufficient autonomy, locally controlled schedules, calendars, personnel and staffing decisions, staffing models, teacher role, and school-level budgets, • Establishment of the Office of Rural Reform and Innovation (ORRI) to support, serve and build capacity among all Consortium districts during the grant period. • Explanation and detailed diagram illustrating the ORRI organizational structure in relation to a partner district's organization structure. • Narrative provides an articulated Action Project - Office of Rural Reform & Innovation (ORRI). The narrative for this action project provides a high-quality action plan to support ORRI, with a comprehensive listing of activities, implementation timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. <p>What is not clear to this reader is how students will be afforded opportunities to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways, as stipulated in the notice.</p> <p>(D)(1)(c-d)</p> <p>The Consortium Blueprint has as its third goal, "Implement performance-based accountability systems (for students and educators) and policies to ensure that the conditions for continuous improvement are in place and learning can be customized." The project narrative provides evidence the Consortium will work to develop model policies that support the above-mentioned goal in order to facilitate personalized learning. Section (B)(3) indicates it is a matter of state law that all students have the ability to earn credits based on content completion and competency, and that students are allowed to blend online course work with onsite learning.</p> <p>(D)(1)(e)</p> <p>The Blueprint cites evidence showing PBL structures as critical to accessing the CCSS and to closing achievement gaps, especially for students with learning challenges (see Action Plan in Section (C)(1)). The narrative cites research showing that measurable outcomes to learning - those related to content knowledge, collaborative skills, engagement and motivation, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills - are possible for students with academic challenges. Attainment of these outcomes is used to make explicit the connections for Students with Disabilities (SwD) and personalized learning environments. SwD are not served well via the typical, predominately skills-based curricula: SwD are found to respond better (i.e., retain content) when provided PBL environments and the flexible options they make available. With regard to educator preparedness, the plan provides for intensive professional development and for extensive technical assistance required for educators of SwD in gaining understanding of the CCSS content across grade levels. Work will also be done to help educators of SwD with planning the stratification of differentiation strategies and activities, with performance assessment, data collection, and data analysis. The narrative for this action project provides a high-quality action plan to support PBL, with a comprehensive listing of activities, implementation timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section was scored in the high range as the narrative supports a high quality plan supporting implementation of policies and infrastructure to provide students and educators with support and resources. Said plan includes key goals, activities with rationales,</p>		

timelines, deliverables, and parties responsible for implementation.

(D)(2)(a)-(b)

While internet access is a significant challenge in rural districts, narrative indicates the Consortium and several of its LEAs are working to implementing 1:1 computing initiatives, ensuring parents and students have access to data about their learning plans and progress toward goals. This work includes increasing universal internet access, thereby ensuring all students, parents, and educators have access to necessary content, tools, and resources to support full implementation of this proposal. The Lead LEA is actively engaged in several initiatives (sub-grant recipient and fiscal agent for Broadband Tech Opportunity Program) to improve access. CESA 10 also provides educational technology support. Evidence shows CESA 10 providing significant professional development to many of its partner LEAs.

This reader was unable to identify a clear plan for providing students, parents and other stakeholders with appropriate levels of technical support needed to realize access goals.

The narrative for this action project provides a high-quality action plan to provide instructional support through the action project, 1:1 Technology Access, with a comprehensive listing of activities, implementation timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

(D)(2)(c)

Evidence of a high-quality plan to provide a system with multiple opportunities to link academic resources based on student interests and needs. The previously mentioned 1:1 initiative will provide students and families with access to computers, digital content, and other resources 24/7.

(D)(2)(d)

Evidence the Lead LEA is working to take advantage of two interconnected, statewide information systems that include a data warehouse/dashboard system and a student information system. Narrative indicates the Consortium will work with educators to incorporate and analyze multiple sources for assessment data in order to assist Consortia districts to make data-driven decisions. Narrative includes an action plan for Data Systems implementation, and provides a high-quality action plan to support Data Systems, with a comprehensive listing of activities, implementation timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	13
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section was scored in the high range as the narrative provides a detailed process for continuous improvement that provides timely and frequent feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrative provides details on the Kaizen system of continuous improvement (CI). • Evidence indicates mechanisms in place for the active seeking out of feedback from multiple sources. Feedback, along with measured outcomes, will be used to evaluate each Action Project (see Section C). • Using PLCs as an evidence-based example of a result-oriented CI structure, the narrative details how Lead LEA leadership will receive input and provide feedback to stakeholders using the PLC framework. • Narrative provides extensive listing of responsibilities of the Blueprint Director to support continuous improvement. <p>This reader was unable to identify the specific mechanisms that would facilitate and/or trigger feedback to inform the continuous improvement model advocated in the Blueprint. This reader was also unable to determine how the work of the External Evaluator, mentioned in section (E)(2), will be used within the Kaizen Cycle for continuous improvement.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section is scored in the high range as the narrative clearly indicates the Blueprint Director will provide quarterly reports to all Consortium LEAs on the status of each Action Plan (see Section C). The Blueprint Director will provide an annual report to the Lead LEA and all member districts upon evaluation of the program and an analysis of student achievement. The narrative indicates an external evaluator will be employed to provide status reports twice annually.</p>		

This reviewer was unable to locate the referenced communication plan.

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

5

4

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the high range as the narrative accompanying each performance measure is specific and aligned to the goals of the proposal.

- All required measures are included, each showing the Rationale/Measure/Continuous Improvement statements outlining how the action/activity will affect the desired results. One example is the analysis of needs and gaps (as surveyed) related to both 8th grade Reading and Math, identified as targets for improvement. State assessment measures will be calculated using the new system of comparison to NAEP proficiency cut scores. As stated in section (A)(4) scores will show a marked decline given the change to the benchmark scores, indicating a raising of expectations for all student in the state.
- Measures were determined to gauge effectiveness and efficiencies of the project. As example, under the Performance Measure given for RtI, the School-wide Implementation Review (SIR) will provide district administrators data regarding numbers completing the SIR, with the data and action plans reported to the Blueprint Director and external evaluator for review. Strategies will be adjust based on findings.

Indication provided in the narrative as to the inability to gather some of the required baseline data due to the lack of a comprehensive teacher and principal evaluation system, as well as other data systems. These data systems are currently being addressed at the state level, in partnership with CESA 10 and other ESAs in the state. What is unclear to this reader is how measures will be improved over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

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

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

This section was rated in the high range as the narrative includes an Implementation *Status and Timeline* table showing regular monitoring of each Action Project (see Section C), to verify all grant resources are fully and properly utilized. As actionable work moves from planning to operational phases of implementation, deliverables include reports that establish the framework for accountability in the system.

- Narrative includes an Implementation Status and Timeline projections table. Each action step contains a trigger to initiate the assessment of readiness or capacity for effective change.
- Narrative includes outline of a schedule of readiness reports, summary reports, and implementation plans aligned with the Action Plans (see Section C). An annual evaluation will include information tied to the performance measures, which Action Plan step(s) are being completed to timeline, and comments and suggestions for improvement from the external evaluator.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>This section was scored in the high range as the narrative, which includes charts and tables, identifies all funds supporting the Blueprint. Evidence includes delineation of the overall budget into ten Action Plan budgets, with each Action Plan budget accompanied by a comprehensive Budget Narrative. Budgeted costs are reasonable and sufficient to address the unique nature of rural schools in the state of Wisconsin. Description of all funds (RTTT-D and other external support) clearly</p>		

indicated where appropriate for the ten Action Plans. Budget narratives for the ten Action Plans identify, where appropriate, funding that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs. What was not immediately clear was the line item delineation for both ORRI and CESA 10 Personnel. This reader was not able to easily verify that calculations in fact presented reasonable salary levels for project administrators.

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

10

9

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the high range, as the narrative addresses budget assumptions, potential sources, and use of funds. The narrative details the vision of the Blueprint, delineating one-time investment or those portions of the project budget that will be "operationalized" at the completion of the grant. The narrative clearly states funds made available through RTTT-D represent a one-time investment in capacity building and do not include operational costs for other work. Resources are shown to be either sustained using state and local resources, or will be "operationalized" at the local level. Much of the overall budget is devoted to establishing the Action Plan 1:1 Technology with infrastructure improvements.

The application includes what this reader interprets as an innovative interpretation of "sustainability": the application includes an action project promoting environmental and energy-saving measures as a way to "shift" funds away from energy bills and back toward the instructional program, thus building in a fiscal sustainability factor into the grant's overall investments. While the overall proposal is reasonable and resourceful, this reader was not able to locate evidence in support of statements made regarding existing program successes.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	9

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the high range as the narrative provides a comprehensive, high-quality Action Project plan as evidenced by the significant partnering with local- and state-level agencies to realize results, resource alignment, and integration of services.

(1) Clear indication of partnerships formed (see Appendix) with outside agencies (Clark County Social & Community Services-CCSCS; Chippewa County Human Services - CCHS; Clinicare-alternative school) and four Consortia LEAs (designated as pilot sites). Creation of "Connections workers" Master of Social Work (CWMSW) level professionals who will be placed in two high-need schools. Activities will be focused on K-8 services and in creating personalized learning environments. The narrative indicates partnership work will scale-up to a different district in the Chippewa county area in year two. Work with Clinicare Alternative School will focus on an evidence-based approach dependent on the needs of students and their families. The narrative also includes reference to the State of Wisconsin as a partner via the Wisconsin Rtl Center. However, this reader was unable to locate indication of articulation efforts with postsecondary institutions to coordinate and/or leverage the work of CWMSW candidates.

(2) Evidence shows some direct match to population-level desired results for students supports found in the broader RTTT-D proposal.

(3) The narrative provides evidence that the Consortium will track attendance, suspension, expulsion, IEP participation and parent satisfaction, family support service referrals & follow-up, crisis aversion fund usage and supports, and out-of-home placement for any family member. Clear indication given that all student growth and achievement measures in the main proposal measure by subgroup as well: SwD achievement and gap will be tracked. The SWIS program from the University of Oregon will be used for collecting and summarizing discipline referrals.

(3b) The narrative indicates families and students in Clark County assigned to Loyal Alt School will get first priority.

CCSCS and CCHS will act as referral services. Bloomer and New Auburn districts will create a list of SwD students using the collective work of CESA10 personnel, district administration, special ed team, and CCHS. Evidence provided as to areas of consideration and/or prioritization in reviewing for services.

(3c) Clear indication as to the reasonableness and likelihood of replicating the model at the newly developed Loyal Alternative School.

Evidence there is local, state, and societal support for better outcomes in SwD, and that positioning of the project is timely and increases likelihood for being scaled up and expanded to additional five counties served by CESA10. Beyond broad statements indicating expected

value for the proposed model, the narrative does not provide any estimates as to how many partner district LEAs are expected to "see the measurable benefits" of the services provided.

(4) Evidence indicates that Connections workers (CWs) will be able to integrate education and other services. CWs will employ the WPDI Indicator 8 Survey to measure parent perception in the IEP process. Tool will be used to informally assess family needs, support and explain the IEP process and outcomes, and identify and address existing barriers to the process.

(5a) Evidence provided that partners will work to expand awareness of issues faced by SwD in academic achievement, transition, and school completion for both school personnel and for families. Partners will teach school personnel how to interpret data, thereby enabling personnel to continue efforts post grant. Evidence includes process to establish communication systems with parents to foster collaborative relationships.

(5b) Evidence provided that a resource manual, as modeled after Clark County, will be created outlining all known local- and state-level youth services by topic. Resource manual will be used as tool toward dissemination of successful collaboration in scaling up of the project.

(5c) Evidence indicates information sharing agreements between schools, law enforcement, and county partners in place in one pilot county and will be used a model as needed. All supports will be tracked using the measures identified in the Desired Results, and in the performance measures. Interventions will be evaluated using student and family outcomes.

(5d) Evidence indicates CESA10 Sp.Ed. Leadership, with CWs, will facilitate opportunities for school staff and parents to address: building relationships; providing math workshops for parents; parent/school staff focus groups to identify barriers to involvement; professional development and parent training on creating strong relationships to benefit student learning, enhancing parent engagement in middle schools, and Web resources for parental involvement.

(5e) Clear delineation of activities, timeline, deliverables, and responsible parties for the CPP Action Project.

(6) Clear delineation of annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures with desired results clearly identified for the proposed population. Ten performance measures are identified with detailed Rationale/Measure/Continuous Improvement charted for each of the ten measures.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

This reviewer deems the application as having met Absolute Priority 1 as evidenced in *The Blueprint for Rural Reform and Innovation: Creating Sustainable, Rigorous, and Engaging Personalized Learning Environments* (Blueprint).

- The Blueprint repeatedly references the priority of the project to be the implementation of personalized learning environments.
- Personalized learning environments used as the basis for creating and action plan that puts into motion activities
 - grounded in a competency/mastery-based progression through curriculum
 - flexible and tailored to the needs and interests of students
 - inclusive of project-based and/or authentic learning
 - educators and students actively engaged in customizing learning
- Evidence shows contextualizing of the Consortium's personalized learning environment via implementation of Common Core State Standards (CCSS).
- Evidence shows the Consortium will implement and use assessment and data systems that 1) ensure all students have opportunities to demonstrate capabilities in multiple ways; 2) provide data to help educators tailor programming and interventions to students' backgrounds, needs, interests, and learning styles; and, 3) provide information to students and parents.
- Evidence that the project will work to create of an evaluation system focused on the process and product of high quality instruction, standards for effective practice, content knowledge, and student achievement.
- Narrative provides an "aggressive" plan to provide differentiated professional development aimed at building capacity among

educators to personalize instruction across all subject areas for all students.

Total

210

188