



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1103OK-1 for Fort Gibson Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Application describes a consortium-based program that is focused on improving teaching and learning, with strong emphasis on improving human capital strategies to place strong teachers and leaders in schools.</p> <p>While there are statements that acknowledge the importance of personalized education, and supporting teachers, and those areas are listed as focus areas, there is no indication in this introduction to the vision that explains the approach to obtaining the stated goals.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Application describes a consortium-based program focused on improving teaching and learning, with strong emphasis on improving human capital strategies to place strong teachers and leaders in schools.</p> <p>The Consortium is an existing partnership between the Oklahoma Department of Education's State Superintendent of Education, and is called Regional Educators Advancing College, Career, and Citizenship readiness Higher (REAC3H). The program was created by the OK DOE prior to the RTTTD application, and focuses on creating a collaborative approach to support transition to a new teacher and leader effectiveness system, and to adopt the common core and its assessments.</p> <p>Fort Gibson was selected by the OK DOE as the LEA for one of the networks, and describes having seven total schools which are listed in the application. While it states there are seven schools, the list almost looks like districts, as they are all listed as "Braggs Schools, and Hillsdale schools for example. As the MOUs read, they appear to be districts rather than schools; a bit confusing. Although the application explains that the entire school population will be included within each selected school, the only explanation provided on school selection is that the existing network created by the OK DOE appeared to work well. However, the question still remains why these particular schools or districts were selected.</p> <p>The schools represent 5684 students; all are PK-12 grade schools. All the required areas are accounted for, the % of low income students in each school is 43% or more; and in most cases markedly more.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section of the application restates its four goal areas, but does not explain what district-wide change will occur to meet those goals. In looking at the "Learning" section in C1, the application references mechanisms put in place by the state, like the future creation of a Turnaround Office, which the application identifies as the mechanism that will be used to turnaround the Okay Public Schools; a school on the state's low-performance list.</p> <p>The application references a turnaround team created by the state for Okay High School; that team provided and trained the school to use a tool to improve school effectiveness, although there were no details about the tool.</p> <p>New activities proposed in the application include hiring of a Turn-Around Liaison, who will support "all areas" of the four components, as well as interface with families through home visits to provide needed supports. For at-risk students, the Network will provide additional highly effective teachers to reduce class-size, thus adding more opportunity for personalization.</p> <p>Using the Network collaborative, the proposed activities are planned to scale across seven K-12 schools. The fact that most of</p>		

the plan is to follow what is already in place by the Department of Education may make adjusting the program to personalize needs for students and schools difficult, and reduce flexibility and autonomy.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Summative assessment data is presented, aggregated up by grade and subject across the 7 K-12 schools. Proficiency increases between 2010 and 2011 in many grades and subjects show very modest gains; which may be attributed to nuances being washed out due to aggregation across schools. Providing the data disaggregated by school would be helpful for better understanding the level of need in the various network schools.

The application describes several challenges network schools experience with gaps between various advantaged and disadvantaged groups. Presenting this information at the school level rather than aggregated up to the Network level would provide more informative data on each school's unique challenges.

Graduation rates are also reported at the aggregate level across the 7 schools. The application cites that graduation increased between 2010 and 2011 from 94 to 99%. Projected graduation rates in 2012 and beyond are at 100% for all schools, an ambitious but difficult goal.

College enrollment is also aggregated across schools, but disaggregated by sub-populations. The application states that the consortium-wide grad rate in 2010 was 70%, but decreased to 69% the next year. Wide gaps exist between African American graduation rates, at 33%, and White graduating rates at 71% and Hispanic graduation rates at 73%.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	10

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Performance gains include an increase of proficiency in 3rd grade reading across the consortium from 82% to 87% between 2010 and 2011. The economically disadvantaged sub-group increased in proficiency from 68% to 81%; a large gain. However, it is unclear in what subject or grade; appears to be an overall composite of all subjects and grades, and across the consortium, which can wash out effects, making it difficult to tie the increase to any particular practice.

The application highlights an increase in graduation to 99%, and mentions that only 6 students out of 421 seniors failed to graduate in 2011. While overall college enrollment decreased over the last year, the application points out African American, Native American, and low-income students had the greatest relative college enrollment increases during the past two years. Overall, these highlights would be more meaningful if presented by school/district, rather than across the entire consortium. Illustrating that each school increased as a result of the overall consortium work would present stronger evidence of improvement. In this example, a few successful schools could mask lack of improvement in other schools.

This section does not mention how low-performing schools are addressed, nor does it mention how data is accessed by various stakeholders. The next section on transparency mentions that data is reported as required by the state department of education.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The OK DOE provides an annual report on each district in the form of school and district report cards. The report cards are made public on the Education Oversight Board's website, and are linked to all school websites. These report cards include student achievement data, as well as school-level personnel salary data. Additionally, school salary reports are provided to the U.S. Census Bureau.

At the local level, more detailed salary information is presented at monthly board meetings, and school budgets are reported in the annual budget book, and quarterly salary information is provided at quarterly budget hearings.

This transparency follows required guidelines, but appears to not extend, except perhaps only minimally, beyond what is it

required to report by the state. Little mention about how parents can easily access this information.

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

10

8

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Oklahoma was granted a request for waiver from NCLB, in exchange for agreement to raise standards, improve accountability, and undertake essential reforms to improve teacher effectiveness.

The state recently created a Teacher-Leader Effectiveness Commission to develop teacher and leader evaluations, targeted for 2014. The state, in participation with other states, was also awarded funding to establish the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers partnership, and received funding to create a state-level longitudinal data system.

The application states that the Consortium work is much in line with the state, and thus has its support. It is unclear to what extent the schools will have autonomy or flexibility over the program, given that it was created by the state, who also serves as a partner.

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

10

10

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The input of multiple stakeholders was solicited during the creation of the Consortium proposal. These stakeholders had previous experience in similar engagement, as several years prior they were working together on similar reform issues. Their meetings included parent-teacher organizations, teacher unions, Head Start organizations, and various school foundations for example. Briefings on the project were also held among various school leaders, and a number of support letters are included in the application.

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

5

0

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

This response could not be found in the application.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	6
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The application states that much of their reform is patterned after the approach implemented by the state's turnaround team for Okay High School. A school support team was organized by the state, and "turnaround principles set out by Oklahoma law" were put in place. The school team attended a state-level conference, where their professional development agenda was formulated, and they were trained on the Ways to Improve School Effectiveness tool. Other principals in OK School attended leadership training, and a Community Advisory Board was formed to work on community engagement.</p> <p>Described earlier, Turnaround Liaisons will also be placed to conduct home visits and provide personalized support for families with children in struggling schools.</p> <p>To personalize instruction for at-risk students, highly effective teachers will be placed in high need areas in each school to reduce class size and provide intensive interventions for students. Online digital curriculum will be used to assess student progress and identify areas of need.</p> <p>This intervention appears to rely more on the state intervening rather than the district driving the reform. There is no mention of other types of learning environments or approaches, how students will have access to diverse cultures or deep learning experiences, or how regular performance feedback will be provided, unless it is within the digital curriculum; however, it is unclear what that is or what subjects it covers or at what frequency. There is also no mention on how students will be trained to access new tools and technology.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	10
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:		

The proposal aims to increase teacher and leader capacity by developing the Rigor and Relevance Teacher and Leader Academy. The academy is designed to help teachers improve through the use of teacher coaches, professional development, and shared best practices.

The Consortium will also adopt the new state leader and teacher evaluations, and partner with the International Center for Leaders in Education, and the Daggett System for Effective Instruction, to guide professional development.

There are a number of supports to help leaders and teachers provide personalized and meaningful instruction for students. Those supports include:

- providing literacy and math coaches to work with teachers;
- providing financial incentives to teachers who successfully demonstrate implementation of the Reading, Writing, Speaking, and Reasoning program;
- making coaches accessible to work with students in setting academic goals
- providing a personal learning advocate to work with students, parents, and teachers to identify student needs, interests, and college and career goals;
- providing technological tools to help teachers personalize learning
- developing career capstone courses to create more relevance for students

Student progress will be measured through reading and math assessments, ACT test scores, ACT Work Keys Career Readiness assessments, and a career and technology survey.

While the application lists a number of useful support activities, there is no coherent plan on how they fit together, how they align to teacher and leader needs, or how the success of these supports will be monitored and revised.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	5
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Fort Gibson Public schools will serve as the lead LEA and fiscal agent, and will hire personnel to manage the project. Project managers will collaborate frequently with RTTTD leadership teams, and participating leaders and teachers across the Consortium.</p> <p>Learning resources and interventions will be provided to struggling students, students with disabilities, and ELL students in the form of Tiered Intervention materials.</p> <p>What was not mentioned was how school leadership teams will have flexibility and autonomy over schedules, personnel decisions, or budgets. Also how students would progress from each transition level and demonstrate mastery was not mentioned. Also no discussion of how the program will be scaled across the consortium, or how the various leadership teams will interface.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The section describes in detail the new longitudinal data system being created by the state to create rich robust data systems to improve teaching and learning. The longitudinal data system will provide data coaches with information they can use to train staff on data analysis and work with instructional coaches to achievement maximum gains. Teachers and leaders will be trained to use the new system. The system is designed so that the Consortium can access data through staff members housed at electronic data centers. Overall, the new data system will provide more student-level data to users so that interventions can be better personalized.</p> <p>There is no mention in this section how students and families can access information housed on the district's website, or electronic courses if they do not have internet access at home. There was also no mention of how parents would be able to access data in the new data system, or if teachers and leaders will be able to query the data bases themselves, rather than wait for others to run requested reports.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Project coordinators will be housed at each school and will monitor that academic coaches are on track to reach benchmark test goals and ACT goals. Parent liaisons will document parent involvement with high needs students. The Project Director will be held accountable to ensure program goals are on schedule with measurable goals and benchmarks, which will be monitored through a Consortium website dashboard. Each oversight entity (unclear what that means) will provide updated monthly reports for review, and partners will provide progress data at each board meeting.</p> <p>It is unclear how much of this data will be communicated to various stakeholders, particularly parents, or how mid-course corrections will be solicited and organized. It is also unclear how often these various monitoring mechanisms gather and report out progress.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The same answer provided for engaging stakeholders in the plan development was provided in this section of the application. Additionally, the lead school will organize an outreach team to communicate with various stakeholder coordinators across the Consortium. Internal stakeholders are housed directly within the entity they are supervising, and are tasked with maintaining frequent communication with their internal stakeholder counterparts.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Performance measures are provided in the application, and span from grades pre-K through 12th grade, in both cognitive and non-cognitive areas. They are a bit difficult to follow, both in page placement, and because it is unclear if several intend to cover multiple subjects. One measure listed states, "ACT Tests." It is unclear if that is one or multiple tests, so it is difficult to determine if at least 12 performance measures are actually listed.</p> <p>No rationale provided on why each measure was selected.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section lists steps to "reach" effectiveness, but there is no mention of how program inputs, such as professional development, will be measured; it only cites that the output exists as a successful measure.</p>		

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>A detailed budget narrative and budget is provided for each major project activity. Line items are clearly detailed, it seems reasonable to support the project. The budget does not identify any other funds being used for the project, nor does it highlight which line items are a one-time vs. ongoing investment.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application explains the commitment by stakeholders to the program, and that many of the reforms included are part of a legislative mandate. To sustain costs after the project, the application states that state appropriations would need to increase, as well as local sources of revenue. The application includes a short budget to illustrate the increases that would be needed, and also states that costs would reduce somewhat, based on the existence of numerous one-time purchases. This plan</p>		

appears to rely solely on the state to make up the budget shortfall once the project ends. There is no explanation of other options for funding.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	6

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Proposes a partnership with Muskogee Head Start, an organization currently serving over 500 families through early childhood education and a number of other support services. The program would be paired with the Consortium’s Teaching and Learning Academy to provide training and tools to early learning teachers.

Specific population-level targets were not provided.

The application refers back to the performance measures as measurements that would be used.

The tools used for the Head Start program tie directly to emotional and behavioral learning needs of early learning students.

Professional development refers back to an earlier section in the application.

An inventory of needs is not provided.

A coordinating committee made up of multiple stakeholders associated with the Head Start program would provide guidance and support to the program. Parents and families would be invited to make recommendations to the committee.

The application refers back to the continuous progress section of the application to describe how this priority would be monitored and evaluated.

The application refers to the longitudinal data base as a mechanism for measuring results. It also states that 60 pre-school children would be academically prepared to enter kindergarten, both academically and emotionally. Projected measures provided increase appropriately over time.

A coordinating committee made up of multiple stakeholders associated with the Head Start program would provide guidance and support to the program. Parents and families would be invited to make recommendations to the committee.

The application refers back to the continuous progress section of the application to describe how this priority would be monitored and evaluated.

The application refers to the longitudinal data base as a mechanism for measuring results. It also states that 60 pre-schoolers would be prepared to enter kindergarten, both academically and emotionally. Projected measures provided increase appropriately over time.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

All the tenants in Absolute Priority 1 were addressed. The Consortium provides a collaborative effort to improve learning, teaching, and leading by focusing on implementation of the common core curriculum, and application of a number of mandates by the OK DOE.

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

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	6
<p>Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This optional budget is to create a Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Mathematics program to be a model for schools that will collaborate and share resources with neighboring districts.</p> <p>The program would be implemented through the support of numerous community partners, and would reach down to lower grades as well as upper grades.</p> <p>The proposed program is one that is known for its ability to increase learning personalization and student engagement, as well as prepare students well for college and skilled careers. A budget is included does not look like it really connects to coherent instructional activities, and it does not mention how this program would be replicated, or what specific population it targets.</p>		



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1103OK-2 for Fort Gibson Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant fails to present a comprehensive and coherent reform vision. While the four core educational assurance areas are denoted and acknowledged, the vision of the Consortium is not clearly articulated. Very little information is provided about the applicant's previous work in the four core educational assurance areas on which it can build its reform vision. The applicant explains that its vision focuses on students and teachers, but only offers general statements. Examples are "students will know for themselves that they are engaged and challenged in our schools" or "students will know that they are on the right track to be able to go to college or to the career center to prepare for a job for which they know they are good at" or "teachers will know that all our students have the ability to prepare for a rewarding future." While these may be goals toward which the Consortium might strive, the applicant does not present a coherent vision or plan that links these general statements to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests.</p> <p>Because the applicant attempted to respond to the requirement to present a vision, two points were awarded to acknowledge the information provided by the applicant.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposes a Consortium of seven LEAs, including Braggs Schools, Fort Gibson Schools, Hilldale Schools, Okay Schools, Oktaha Schools, Sequoyah Schools, and Wainwright Schools, with Fort Gibson Schools serving as the lead LEA. The Consortium has been in existence for over a year since Oklahoma State Superintendent of Education organized the state's 77 counties into 69 regional networks. Fort Gibson Schools was appointed by the state as the coordinating district for this specific regional network.</p> <p>The applicant proposes that the existing coordinating district will function as a Consortium, and all schools in each of the</p>		

seven districts will participate; additionally, all grade bands from preK-12 will be included, and all students and all teachers will participate.

While the applicant provides the names of the seven participating districts (Braggs, Fort Gibson, Hilldale, Okay, Oktaha, Sequoyah, and Wainwright), a list of individual schools in each district is not provided. The applicant explains that an existing coordinating districts partnership structure will be used, but it fails to explain the process by which each district engaged in and was informed of the details and opportunity for this specific grant competition.

The total number of participating students is 5,684. The applicant reports 2,238 participating students from low-income families, 943 participating students who are high need students, and 368 participating educators.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
---	----	---

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant identifies four objectives for all schools in the Consortium designed to transform teaching and learning and eliminate the achievement gap. These objectives address the educator workforce, curriculum, instruction and assessment, turn around of lowest performing schools, and alignment of educational efforts so high school graduates are ready for college, career, and citizenship.

The elements of a high-quality plan are not presented by the applicant. For example, while the applicant states that the Consortium has every element of the Logic Model required, including the vision, goals, strategies, and resources needed, these are not specifically addressed or delineated by the applicant.

It is difficult, if not impossible, to assess the credibility of the proposed plan when the applicant does not provide the required elements of a high-quality plan required in the application, including key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the responsible parties for implementing the activities.

The applicant fails to address how the proposed activities would be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant present composite data for all seven LEAs, rather than for each participating LEA as requested. Data are provided for 2010-11 and 2011-12 school years. Summative assessment data are provided for reading and math scores (grades 3-8), as well as Algebra I, Algebra II, Geometry, English II, and English III. Composite data are presented for the entire student population, and also for subgroups.

The applicant identifies ambitious yet achievable annual goals, with most goals indicating an overall increase of 3 to 12 percentage points in the percentage of students scoring at a proficient level or above from 2012-13 to 2015-16 when the grant funding period would end.

The applicant reports ACT composite test scores as a measure to consider regarding achievement gaps, but acknowledges that one participating LEA (Wainwright) did not have these scores available, thus providing an incomplete data set. District averages range from 17.2 ACT composite score to an ACT composite score of 21.2 in Fort Gibson School District, the only district with a higher composite than the state average. The applicant projects only modest increases, with mean ACT composite scores for the districts increasing only .9 to 1.5 points by 2015-16.

The graduation rate in the participating 7 LEAs was 94% in 2010-11, and increased to 99% in the 2011-12 school year, with only 6 of 421 seniors failing to graduate. The applicant projects continuation of its 100% graduation rate in all participating LEAs.

Data indicate that only 70% of students enrolled in college in 2010-11, with a decrease to 69% in 2011-12. A pronounced gap is evident among African American students (only 41% in 2011-12). The applicant projects that the number of graduates continuing on to college enrollment will increase to 78% by 2015-16, with the most substantial increases projected for African American students and economically disadvantaged students.

The applicant reports that the state of Oklahoma is currently developing a longitudinal P20 data system, but postsecondary degree attainment data are currently not available.

The applicant does not link presentation of data to specific outcomes or proposed grant activities to allow the reader to determine the efficacy of the proposed plan in meeting the proposed percentage increases. Additionally, because only

composite data are presented, it is difficult to determine if the applicant expects equally achievable yet ambitious gains in each participating district.

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	3
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant refers the reader back to data presented in section A as evidence of its success in advancing student learning and achievement. The applicant notes that, across the participating LEAs, students have demonstrated increases in proficiency gains for many grade bands and subgroups of students. For example, all 3rd grade students increased in proficiency percentages, with the largest gains occurring for students with IEPs. While 3rd grade reading gains are evident for all subgroups, this is not the case for all grade bands when reviewing the reported reading and math assessment data. Proficiency gains were evident for high school students on the Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II summative assessment. Graduation rates are currently at 99%, with only 6 of 421 seniors failing to graduate in 2011-12.</p> <p>The applicant does not make a compelling case of its record of success in the last four years, but presents evidence that shows an upward trajectory, though often uneven across grade levels or student subgroups on summative assessments for school year 20110-11 and 2011-12. While most elementary math and reading gains were modest, it should be noted that fourth grade math proficiency increased from 60% to 83% in one year. One other notable gain was in Algebra II end of instruction scores where overall proficiency increased from 64% to 79% in one year. All other areas demonstrated stable scores or small gains, with the exception of English III scores which declined and fifth grade reading and math scores which both declined. ACT composite scores are presented as evidence of closing achievement gaps, but no subgroup data are included. Data are only provided for two years.</p> <p>While the applicant acknowledges that Okay High School is on the state's turnaround school plan to move from the lowest-performing designation, it does not propose reforms that would be specifically implemented for Okay High School; rather, the applicant only pledges the Consortium's support to help Okay High School complete its turnaround requirements.</p> <p>The applicant does not address the degree to which it will make student performance data available to students, educators and parents to inform and improve participation, instruction, and services.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant explains that Oklahoma's Education Oversight Board/Office of Accountability releases an annual report card and district profile report for each school district. Oklahoma law requires that each school site must notify parents of its school performance levels on state standardized tests. The districts' report cards are posted on the Education Oversight Board's website and typically linked to websites of individual schools. The applicant reports that actual personnel salaries for teachers, for instruction staff, for administrators, for capital improvements, and for all other subsidiary funds are presented on a monthly basis at each school board meeting. Each public school in the Consortium reports salary information based on the U.S. Census Bureau's classification used in the F-33 survey of local government finances to the Oklahoma Department of Education. This information is used to prepare the district report cards and reports.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant reports that Oklahoma was granted a waiver from No Child Left Behind mandates. The applicant highlights passage of Oklahoma Senate Bill 2033, the Teacher-Leader Effectiveness Act, which mandated a statewide teacher-leader evaluation system to be fully implemented by 2014-15 and created the Race To The Top Commission. The state submitted a Race To the Top Early Learning Challenge grant proposal, but it was not funded. Funds were secured from the United States Department of Education for the Race To the Top Assessment competition, and the Oklahoma Department of Education was awarded funds to develop its state longitudinal data system.</p> <p>The applicant also cites its collaborative relationship with the Oklahoma Department of Education and with Oklahoma education leaders to support the proposed reforms. The applicant does not address how each of the participating LEAs has demonstrated evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy to implement the personalized learning environments</p>		

described in the proposal; rather, the applicant focuses on describing the overall state context as demonstrated in legislation and recent grant applications.

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

10

6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant fails to provide evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal. It does not address how students, families, and teachers in participating schools were engaged in development of the proposal, or invited to provide feedback.

The applicant only states that briefings were held among superintendents, school board members, as available, and numerous school principals. The applicant does not address how (B)(4)(a) was met through provision (i) or (ii).

Letters of support are provided from International Center for Leadership in Education, Indian Capital Technology Center, Braggs Board of Education, Fort Gibson Board of Education, Hilldale PTO, State Representatives Brown and McPeak, Senator Garrison, Bacone College, Connors State College, OEK Health Care Coalition, Green County Behavioral Health Services, Junior Achievement, Principal Chief of Cherokee Nation-Sequoyah School of Choice, Fort Gibson Education Foundation, PTO presidents, parent committee members, and many others.

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

5

0

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant fails to present any evidence of a high-quality plan for an analysis of the applicant's current status, including identified needs and gaps that the plan will address.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	4

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes to create a REAC3H UP Academy, modeled after the turnaround efforts employed thus far at Okay High School. The applicant proposes contracting with a Turn-Around Liaison who will conduct home visits with families of low-performing students, assist with creation of individual student personal learning plans, and link area coaches to students and teachers to facilitate effective mentoring and instruction aligned with Common Core State Standards. The applicant also mentioned employing additional highly effective teachers to reduce class sizes in the highest need areas of each school as well as utilizing online digital curricula.

The applicant does not provide the required elements of a high-quality plan, including key goals, proposed activities and rationale for them, timelines, deliverables, or responsible parties.

The applicant does not demonstrate how its proposed activities would engage and empower all learners, in particular high-need students, to achieve the learning goals enumerated in section (a), (b) and (c) of (C)(1).

The reader is left with more questions than answers regarding what the applicant proposes given the limited information provided. The required information necessary to evaluate (C)(1) is not provided by the applicant. More explicit information is needed, including all the required elements of a high-quality plan, for the proposed REAC3H UP ACADEMY initiative. The applicant fails to provide a definition of highly effective teachers or identify specific online digital curricular options. None of the proposed options are linked specifically to college- and career-readiness goals or personalized learning.

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

20

5

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes creation of a Rigor and Relevance Teacher and Leader Academy to elevate all teachers to highly

effective status through the use of teacher coaches, professional development, and shared best practices. Other than proposing the Academy, the applicant provides very little information and the elements of a high-quality plan are not presented.

The applicant mentions many action steps, including using the Teacher Leader Evaluation System to identify and evaluate best practices, incorporating Daggett's System for Effective Instruction, purchasing and implementing pre- and post-assessments in reading and math, providing literacy and math coaches for each participating district, giving teachers financial incentives for implementing Reading, Writing, Speaking, and Reasoning (RWSR), provision of personal learning advocates to create personal learning goals for each student, purchasing technological tools for digital curricula, creating student portfolios and career capstone courses.

While the applicant has identified many initiatives, it is not clear how they link into a cohesive high-quality plan aligned with the applicant's vision to support personalized learning environments and ensure all students graduate on time and college- and career-ready.

The applicant states that success will be measured by increased scores in reading and math state assessments, ACT test scores, ACT Work Keys Career Readiness assessments, OKCIS and Career Technology Center career awareness surveys, but no plan is presented concerning frequency of data collection, monitoring, analysis, and use of assessment data to inform the grant's implementation. It is not clear how the proposed Academy activities would be coordinated and implemented or how they would improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness.

While the applicant acknowledges the need to employ more highly effective educators or move all teachers to highly effective status through the Academy, the applicant fails to present a high-quality plan to explain how this goal would be accomplished.

The lead LEA has experienced success with Daggett's Rigor/Relevance model, but it is not clear how it would inform the proposed Academy. The applicant mentions Quad Squads, but no information is provided to explain their function or purpose.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	4
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The Lead LEA, Fort Gibson Public Schools, will serve as the applicant and fiscal agent for the Consortium. The Lead LEA will employ a Project Manager and a Project Delivery Manager/Secretary to coordinate fiscal matters among schools. These two employees will coordinate with each district's leadership team which will include leaders and teachers from the district. Each participating school will be staffed with a funded Project Coordinator that will report directly to the Project Director. The Project Coordinator at each school site will be responsible for management and oversight of activities at the school level. Oversight will be provided by each local board of education, the Fort Gibson Education Foundation Board of Directors, and project partners.</p> <p>The applicant proposes a comprehensive literacy improvement project for tiered interventions to serve below proficient students. A schematic in the application lists resources from Scholastic, including Read About, Expert 21, Read 180, and System 44, but it is unclear how, when, where, or why these would be implemented throughout the Consortium. It is not clear what the project would entail or how it would be implemented or by whom. No mention is made specifically of math achievement concerns nor are the needs of students with disabilities or English learners specifically addressed.</p> <p>The applicant does not adequately address the governance structure of the Consortium; for example, it is not clear how school leadership teams would be identified and interface with project managers or the funded staff member at each school. The applicant does not address the decision-making roles of school leadership teams.</p> <p>Items (c) and (d) are not addressed by the applicant.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant reports that the state currently uses several systems, including WAVE transactional system for student data, as well as other systems, including Assessment, School Personnel, Special Education, Financial, and an aggregate reporting system known as the School District Reporting Site.</p>		

Oklahoma State Department of Education was awarded a \$5 million three-year federal grant to create a longitudinal data system to be fully operational by the 2014-15 school year which will build off of real-time, transactional data collection from local school districts.

The applicant explains that in fall 2013, initial access will be limited to teachers and administrators, with parent and students having access to site- and district-level reports. The Oklahoma State Department of Education will gradually provide parents and students access to their data as it relates to student-level accountability for third grade and high school graduation.

The applicant proposes that it will fund data coaches for participating schools to help facilitate data collection and sharing.

The applicant does not address how students and families with limited internet access will be provided access to necessary tools, content, and other learning resources, or how they might gain access to data if internet access is a challenge.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	5
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Project Director, along with Project Coordinators at each participating school site, will monitor progress toward grant goals and benchmarks. The Project Director will oversee a Consortium website dashboard that will track financial accounting, academic benchmark progress, and program progress in grant initiatives. The applicant does not discuss responsible parties or timelines for progress monitoring, assessment tools, responsible parties for development of the dashboard, or plans for communicating information on the quality of investments to stakeholders and the general public.</p> <p>Updated information and progress reports will be presented at each board meeting and monthly reports will be prepared.</p> <p>While the applicant describes some structures for communication and sharing, it is not clear how a rigorous continuous improvement process with timely and regular feedback to inform the grant's activities will be accomplished. It is not clear how the grant will be regularly monitored, how data will be collected and analyzed, and how information will be shared other than through board meetings.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposes to utilize existing structures to communicate with stakeholders, including Parent-Teacher Organizations, collective bargaining organizations, teacher conferences, professional development workshops, school foundations, Head Start partnerships. The applicant proposes that the Project Director will communicate with Project Coordinators at each participating school site who will work with internal stakeholders in each building. Parent liaisons will be appointed from each school's PTO organization. The Project Coordinators will provide updated data and progress reports for regular monthly board meetings.</p> <p>The focus seems to be on communicating information with little information provided regarding engagement of internal stakeholders in the implementation of grant activities.</p> <p>The applicant does not clearly explain how it plans to communicate with and engage external stakeholders. The applicant only states that the Project Coordinator will provide targeted support to Consortium Partner organizations with no further elaboration of how this will be accomplished or coordinated with the Project Director.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide a rationale for selection of any proposed performance measures. The applicant does not explain how the proposed measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information to inform success or identify areas of concern. Lastly, the applicant does not describe how it will review and improve the measure over time as needed.</p>		

The applicant proposes increasing the percentage of students with highly effective teachers and principals from 35% (2011-12) to 75% in 2015-16. While extremely ambitious, the applicant does not clearly present a plan to achieve this goal. No subgroup goals are presented.

The applicant identifies a performance measure directly tied to improving student outcomes for specific grade bands. For example, the PreK-3 performance measures are Literacy First/State Reading Level and Health/Well Being-Spark Test. No subgroup data are presented.

In grades 4-8, the applicant reports that 50% of students were on track to college- and career-readiness in 2011-12 and projects that 90% will be on-track by 2015-16. Performance measures include the Oklahoma Core Curriculum Tests and the Health/Well Being-Spark Test. No subgroup data are presented.

In grades 9-12, the applicant reports that 70% of students completed and submitted the FAFSA form in 2011-12 and projects that 100% will do so by 2015-16. The applicant proposes to track career-readiness using the ACT Work Keys assessment. Current data presented by the applicant reveal 50% are on-track and the applicant projects 100% on-track by 2015-16. Other performance measures proposed include the ACT and the Your Risk Behavior Survey. No subgroup data are presented.

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

5

0

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not provide any information to address how it plans to evaluate the effectiveness of grant-funded activities and evaluate the effectiveness of its investments.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	4
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The Consortium presents a line item budget with a four-year total of \$21,282,623.01. Line item amounts are provided for all required budget categories for each of the four project years for personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, and contractual costs. Indirect costs at 3.24% are calculated. Funds from other sources are noted that would be used to support the proposed project, but these appear to be in-kind/non-federal share matches, such as office and classroom space, administrative oversight, and office equipment and furnishings.</p> <p>The applicant proposes hiring numerous personnel, including 1 Project Director (\$90,000 per year), 1 Project Administrative Assistant (\$30,000 per year), 5 Site Coordinators (\$15,000 per year stipend each), 20 math and reading coaches, 6 College and Career Advocates, 6 Data Coaches, 5 turn-around liaisons, and 10 high needs teachers. It is not clear if the Personal Learning Advocates are new positions or ones that already exist. The applicants requests dollars to fund financial incentives for teachers who implement the RWSR program in their classrooms. It is not clear why the applicant is requesting funds for 5300 laptops, \$50,000 for Advanced Placement testing, or \$480,000 for career capstone course supplies to include digital curriculum. Additionally, a total of \$620,00 is requested for Scholastic Tiered Intervention Program Materials with no further explanation provided. Contractual costs are listed, but no budget narrative is presented to explain their relevance to the proposed reform activities. In the REAC3H FOR DATA PROJECT, the applicant requests \$100,000 for contractual costs for a technology support company to provide pre-planning and ongoing support, but no additional information is provided.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant does not present the required elements of a high-quality plan (key goals, activities and rationale for each, timeline, deliverables, and responsible parties) for sustainability after the funding period ends. The applicant explains that grant funds will comprise 16.667% of the current annual budgets, combined, of the 7 Consortium LEAs. The applicant's plan for sustainability is built on the hopes of a recovered economy, as well as increased state and local funds to offset the absence of grant dollars.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	1

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium proposes a partnership with the Muskogee County Community Action Agency's Head Start, operated by the Green County Behavioral Services of Muskogee. The applicant proposes a special package of classroom tools will be made available to Head Start classrooms and teachers will be provided professional development. The applicant proposes a coordinating committee comprised of parents of enrolled Head Start children, community service providers, Head Start personnel, and Consortium teachers and administrators to provide guidance to the partnership. The focus, though unclear, seems to be an assessment system that may involve classroom observers. No performance measures for the population-level desired results of academic preparation for kindergarten, as well as social/emotional preparation for students are identified. The required elements for this section are not adequately addressed.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents an application that focuses on improving college- and career-readiness, improving graduation rates, creating personal learning plans, and increasing the number of effective educators. The applicant also seeks to decrease student achievement gaps and increase overall proficiency percentages related to student achievement. Personalized learning environments are supported through creation of personal learning plans and proposed use of digital curricular resources.

Total	210	73
-------	-----	----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	2

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes a REAC3H for STEAM program. The STEAM acronym represents the disciplines of Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math. The STEAM program will require students in Consortium schools to increase from 3 math and science credits for graduation to 3 math and science credits plus an additional STEAM course to qualify for high school graduation. Each school will also participate in the area regional engineering contest. Two STEAM coaches will work with students, establish clubs and activities, and identify community partners.

The applicant requests an additional \$2,405,439 for this project. Funding costs include 2 STEAM coaches, an administrative assistant, stipends for 7 STEAM teachers, travel, a photocopier, LEGO labs and FIRST Robotics kits, and 100 computers for a STEM lab. A detailed budget narrative is not provided.

The applicant provides a very limited rationale for the proposed project, only citing the need for more American students to enter into the engineering field. The applicant does not present a high-quality plan for the proposed project, but rather provides a brief description of the proposed activities.



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1103OK-3 for Fort Gibson Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	2
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: <i>The applicant presents a vision that focuses on both teachers and students. This is important in recognizing that greater personalization occurs at multiple levels of the educational system (2 points). The vision statements, however, are general. There is little attention specifically to the four core assurances of the solicitation.</i> Total = 2/10		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	4
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant has organized the participating districts into groups that supported by a lead district that will coordinate with the applicant lead district and participate in meetings similar to other state-wide collaborations that they have used in the past. This is a sensible organizational approach for a large, but sparsely populated, region (4 points). The applicant has proposed to include all grade bands and populations, which simplifies the selection process and also makes the project more ambitious. The applicant therefore does not provide a rationale for selection of the participating districts. The implementation details in terms of curriculum design and technology are not provided in this section and so this reviewer finds the proposal does not demonstrate how this project will support high-quality LEA-level and school-level participation. Total 4/10		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: <i>The applicant presents ambitious goals for attracting a strong labor force, for providing curriculum and instructional resources, and supporting teachers in turning around low performing schools (2 points). The plan that is presented, however, is so general and lacking in details that this reviewer cannot provide greater credit. There is no formal logic model or theory of change that describes how the applicant proposes to meet their ambitious goals.</i> Total 2/10		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	6
(A)(4) Reviewer Comments: The applicant presents a history of performance on summative assessments and goals for years of this project (2 points). The goals presented are reasonable in terms of overall growth, but raise some concerns in that the Hispanic subgroup has lower expectations in some cases than those with IEPs and those that are economically disadvantaged. The reasons for this are not clear. The application does address graduation rates and college enrollment (2 points). The application also makes specific detailed reference to the state longitudinal data system and how it will figure into its achievement of goals (2 points). This reviewer is concerned that the 100% graduation rates shown in table A4 may not be realistic goals. Total 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	3
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The applicant has produced evidence of some successes in the last two years both in overall achievement and in closing achievement gaps (2 points). The applicant has not presented a clear track record of success over four years in advancing learning or equity. With only two years of data rather than four, the applicant has not shown that it has broadly improved student learning. The applicant has not shown evidence of achieving ambitious and significant reforms, and the applicant has shown that it has made some progress in making information and data available (1 point), but has not shown this has been done in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction and services.</i></p> <p>Total 3/15</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The applicant has presented evidence of increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments. In addition to providing detailed staff and other expenditure information across the districts, the applicant relies upon a state-issued school report card that provides similar information across the entire state (5 points).</i></p> <p>Total 5/5</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The applicant has presented some evidence of successful state context for implementation. While the narrative in the application body is largely non-responsive to the requirements of the solicitation in this area, the letter of support from the state superintendent of education is a strong indicator of support for this effort and the leadership of this district in it (5 points).</i></p> <p>Total 5/10</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	8
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The applicant has produced evidence of stakeholder engagement and support, including letters from advocacy groups, municipalities, and elected officials (7 points). This reviewer was unable to locate a discussion about LEAs with collective bargaining and evidence of direct engagement with those organizations. The application also did not provide evidence of how stakeholders helped to shape the proposal.</i></p> <p>Total 7/10</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	0
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Section not provided.</p> <p>Total 0/5</p>		

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

--	--	--

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	1
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application does respond to this section in a minimal way (1 point). The application presents a discussion of turnaround of low performing schools rather than a specific plan for personalized learning. There is little evidence of an understanding of a how students will pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college and career readiness. There is no discussion of instructional strategies and how the program’s approach to learning will impact student engagement and empower learners. Later sections discuss a personalized learning plan (PLP), but do not provide any detail on what it is and how it integrates into a theory of learning.</p> <p>Total 1/20</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	8
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The applicant presents evidence of a teaching and leading plan build upon a concept of rigor and relevance (2 points). These are important principles and the applicant. The teaching and leading plan discusses some new and potentially important concepts such as a personalized learning plan and specialists to work with parents to assess student needs and develop customized approaches (2 points). The teaching and leading plan presented also has explicit reference to college and career goals and specifically references several forms of information, including test scores, in managing this process (4 points).</i></p> <p><i>Where this proposal is less successful is in providing evidence of an approach for implementing instructional strategies for all participating students. Measured to the standard of a high-quality plan as described in the solicitation this application is less successful. It does not describe in any detail the implementation of personalized learning environments or strategies to meet each student’s academic needs. There is little detail on the adaption of content and instruction or opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks based on academic needs, interests, and optimal learning approaches (e.g., discussion and collaborative work, project-based learning, videos, audio, manipulatives);</i></p> <p>Total 8/20</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	2
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided a skeletal response to this requirement (2 points). One of the challenges this proposal faces is that it is a consortium of LEAs that each may have individual organizations and processes. With this type of proposal it would be helpful for each of the districts to provide some discussion of their practices, policies, and rules or some discussion of how this program will work effectively across so many organizations. The kind of detail about organizing a central office or the consortium governance structure has not been provided in detail in a way that shows how the structure will support personalized learning, flexible school solutions, and changes in role structures.</p> <p>Total 2/15</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The applicant has presented evidence of LEA and school infrastructure that can be the backbone of a successful implementation. By emphasizing the state longitudinal data system that already is compatible with the networks the program wishes to use the consortium is placing their bets on an important infrastructure. Given the wide geographical territory the consortium is operating under, this strategy appears to be one of the best possible (6 points). The application is less specific about the technology used in the individual schools and about the tools that practitioners would use. The applicant also does not provide many details about supporting different parties regardless of income. This represents an opportunity for improvement.</i></p>		

Total 6/10

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	2
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided minimal description of the continuous improvement process with a discussion of several roles and responsibilities (2 points). There is little detail in the application to show how the applicant will monitor, measure, and share information about the projects funded under this program. While the proposal does describe individuals being held accountable, it does not provide sufficient detail on the accountability measures taken.</p> <p>Total 2/15</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan for ongoing communication and engagement details important roles and communication channels (2). This section of the proposal provides not much more than high-level strategic information. There is some text related to the process of engaging stakeholders leading up to the proposal and there is some text that seems copied from the prior section so that the relevant detail in this proposal for this area is not at the level needed for full credit.</p> <p>Total 2/5</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal presents some descriptions of performance metrics and some detail about the number of students that fit into various categories (1 point).</p> <p>However, there are not 12 total measures and many of the cells in the table are filled in with boilerplate text from the RFP rather than text that specifically responds to what the notice inviting applications was asking for.</p> <p>Total 1/5</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided skeletal descriptions of an evaluation plan (1 point). This plan, however, is missing important details like methods and data sources that can be used to guide the evaluation process.</p> <p>Total 1/5</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	4
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The applicant has provided a detailed budget that covers the years of the project (2). The budget identifies sources of funding and ongoing costs (2). The budget also raises some concerns with this reviewer. For example, teacher stipends are described as an incentive amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars. Not only is the rationale for this type of expenditure not clear, in the budget tables the stipend row indicates no amounts so that there are questions about internal agreement.

Total 4/10.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant discusses the issue of sustainability over several years and considers how they might be able to continue the reforms (2 points). The proposal details an economic scenario suggesting increased revenue from economic growth rather than a high-quality plan for sustainability.

Total 2/10

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	1

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does discuss partnerships with local organizations that could provide complementary services (1 point). The partnership presentation, however, does not show evidence of being a coherent and sustainable approach. It does not present population-level results that can be tracked across districts and the states and it does not track the indicators at the aggregate levels within the LEA or consortium. It does not target its resources to improve results for participating students, specifically students facing significant challenges, such as students with disabilities, English learners, and students affected by poverty (including highly mobile students), family instability, or other child welfare issues. There is no discussion of a strategy to scale the model beyond the initial project. There is no discussion of how the partnership and LEA or consortium would build staff capacity and no discussion of annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population-level. It does not describe desired results for students.

Total 1/10

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

In this reviewer's opinion, this applicant has barely met the absolute priority. While personalized learning environments are discussed, the evidence of a rich program with specific designs for personalized learning is not presented in this proposal.

Total	210	66
-------	-----	----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	2

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The applicant had developed an optional budget supplement proposal that involves a type of innovation that could be scaled nationally (2 points). The description for it is not clear in how it can be replicated in schools across the Nation, however. The rationale for the specific area or population that the applicant will address is not presented. Rather, it looks to be the use of a robotics program that has some value in elementary school as the basis for an elementary/middle school program. There is no high-quality plan for how the applicant would carry out activities that would be co-developed and implemented across two or more LEAs. The proposed budget is in excess of the \$2 million limit.

Total 2/15