



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1089OH-1 for Gallia-Vinton Educational Service Center

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
| <p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes a comprehensive and coherent vision for reform. The vision is strongly aligned to the RTT-state initiatives, and expands those priority areas and builds teacher capacity to ensure personalized learning environments for all students.</p> <p>At times, the proposal seems overly focused on teacher capacity and instruction, as opposed to the learning of students. While obviously connected and such a practice enhances the chances for sustainability, it can also present a misleading message of the goal of the grant/initiative.</p> <p>The vision includes a description of the various strategies and practices that would be implemented, but lacks a description of what a personalized learning environment would actually look like.</p> | | |
| (A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points) | 10 | 9 |
| <p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) All schools in the five districts will participate. Rationale for why all grade levels, and why the lead partner was selected, is included and is adequate. The districts have a history of working together and have demonstrated success in the past. The applicant also proposes that each district will have different focus areas, based on their own needs.</p> <p>(b) A list of schools is provided.</p> <p>(c) The total number of students and educators is provided. It is unclear how the "high-need" students were determined.</p> | | |
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 9 |
| <p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant includes a high-quality plan of the various implementation steps, goals, timelines, and persons responsible. Each district will have it's own focus area(s), based on their own needs. As practices are implemented in each district, they will then be scaled up to the rest of the consortium. The outcomes for the RTT-D grant program are fully aligned and enhance the SEA-level improvements made during RTT-state implementation. The applicant proposes to use train-the-trainer and on-the-ground coaches to make the needed instructional changes. An overall monitoring and implementation structure is defined and includes a variety of stakeholders.</p> <p>As stated previously, the applicant's strong focus on improving teacher instruction places student learning on the sidelines (as opposed to front and center). While learning is the ultimate goal, the theory of change can be slightly misleading.</p> | | |
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
| <p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) Proficiency status percentage goals are provided. The goals for economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities could be more ambitious, especially as both groups have strong performance in some content areas. Otherwise, the goals seem reasonable and achievable. It would be useful to include the baselines and goals for additional student subgroups.</p> <p>(b) Economically disadvantaged and students w/ disabilities subgroups are provided for the summative assessment data. It would be useful to show other subgroup baselines and goals to better understand achievement gaps both within the consortium's districts, and compared to the state. The applicant also proposes college-readiness goals (ACT), but does not</p> | | |

break down the performance goals by subgroup. The goals provided seem reasonable, ambitious and achievable.

(c) The graduation rate goals could be more ambitious (i.e. only 1% growth between 2014-15 and 2015-16). Additional subgroup goals are not provided.

(d) Goals for college enrollment are not provided.

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

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 7 |
| (B)(1) Reviewer Comments: <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 5px;"> <p>(a) The applicant demonstrates some ability to improve student achievement. This finding could be better supported by additional data to demonstrate changes over the years. Some of the districts do not show strong value-added performance, which implies a lack of growth. Achievement gap data is only provided for two subgroups, yet all students will participate in the grant program. Performance data for college enrollment rates is not provided.</p> <p>(b) There is no discussion of implementing ambitious or significant reforms in low-performing schools. Many reforms are cited, but they do not reflect a focus on the lowest-performing schools.</p> <p>(c) There is no discussion on the availability of data to students, educators and parents. Data accessibility and use is discussed vaguely in various sections of the proposal, but it is not explicitly addressed.</p> </div> | | |
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 5 |
| (B)(2) Reviewer Comments: <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 5px;"> <p>All school districts make all four subcategories of information to the public. The specific salary schedules are available to the public, but not widely distributed. Each district releases a variety of report cards and updates, which include financial information over the course of the year.</p> </div> | | |
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points) | 10 | 9 |
| (B)(3) Reviewer Comments: <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 5px;"> <p>As an RTT state, the SEA has demonstrated evidence of providing LEAs with sufficient autonomy. Several programs, including the State Instructional Improvement System, are currently being developed by the state, and the LEA will have the ability to choose the state's system, or develop their own. The proposal will build upon the implementation of the SEA's adoption of the common core curricula, assessments, a new teacher evaluation system, and a variety of other state-led programs. The SEA also allows the Chief to waive specific statutory provisions in order to implement innovative programs. The local districts have requested (and received) such waivers in the past. It is unclear if any of the LEAs anticipate requiring such waivers or use of autonomy to implement this initiative.</p> </div> | | |
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points) | 10 | 9 |
| (B)(4) Reviewer Comments: <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 5px;"> <p>a) The applicant states that unions have or are willing to consider changes, even if they may be radical. The unions have signed on to support the initiative and will be involved throughout implementation. Union participation began during the state's RTT bid and has continued.</p> <p>Other stakeholders were included throughout the development of the proposal, including parents and students. The plan reflects requests from parents, but it is unclear how feedback from other stakeholder groups was incorporated into the</p> </div> | | |

proposal.

(b) A broad range of nonprofits, district teams and other groups are included in this proposal.

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

5

3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant completed a needs analysis and has determined that each of the participating districts has different gap areas that will be the focus of implementation, which informs a well-thought out plan. But, how that needs analysis was completed is unclear. It does not appear that a high-quality plan existed or does exist for this type of needs analysis.

The applicant misunderstood the types of gaps this section refers to and addressed achievement gaps, as opposed to structural gaps.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) (b) The applicant proposes to make the curriculum fit the child, as opposed to have the child fit the curriculum.

All students will begin developing their own personalized learning plans, which will include short-term goals, annual goals, and college and/or career goals. Teachers will work with the students to develop these plans. Teachers will also work with students to help them learn to monitor their own progress.

College and career planning will take place starting in eighth grade and will utilize a statewide online system to help students connect their current coursework with future goals. The system also includes resume builders, areas for students to practice college application essays, scholarship searches and links to ACT/SAT preparation and practice sites.

Students will have access to university site visits as well.

The major source of personalization will come through the use of the Universal Design for Learning Process, which uses a common lesson and then differentiated activities based on student skill levels and interests. UDL includes a variety of technology tools and lessons will also link to other IT databases and tools.

Formative assessments will be used to track progress. Summative assessments will also be used. All assessments will be shared with students and parents.

Students will also have increased access to interactions with work force members and work experiences.

Science will be inquiry-based, hands on, and will scale up a pilot program currently being implemented in a few of the schools. The pilot was supported by an external grant.

Increased interactive and in-depth opportunities for history will be provided through the scale up of an existing grant program through the Teaching American History grant.

Students will have additional options for credit recovery, post secondary credits, and flex credits.

Afterschool programs will allow students to pursue deeper areas of interest. Programs such as Model UN, STEM focused projects, field trips to enhance cultural awareness and career opportunities will be featured. Parent academies will also be part of the afterschool program and will focus on providing college and career information to parents.

Students who struggle in an academic area will also be responsible for creating individualized improvement plans (with assistance by teachers) to increase awareness of the problem and accountability for improving.

Flex credits may be used to assist at-risk/off-track students the ability to earn credits via virtual learning programs (with the support of tutors).

Students may also earn college credits while in high school. It is unclear how many students utilize such programs, if they're supported by the school, or how they become aware of additional learning options.

Students with Disabilities will have the opportunity to participate in school or community based work experiences to develop employable skills. SWD will also each have a transition plan to assist with the transition into adulthood.

The applicant does not propose solutions for access to technology for low-income students, yet has stated that this accessibility is a problem in the region.

(c) The applicant does not include supports to ensure parents and students understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them (i.e. help desk).

| | | |
|---|----|----|
| (C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points) | 20 | 17 |
|---|----|----|

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) (b) The applicant has a history of train-the-trainer and teacher-led PD sessions. Various PD options include face-to-face trainings, workshops, peer coaching, as well as on-line modules. It is unclear how the applicant proposes to manage the various PD pieces of the proposal. While all strong pieces, there is a lack of an overall plan to determine which teachers will provide which supports and services, and how all the pieces and programs fit together.

The applicant proposes a 3-tiered strategy to change the methods of instruction to ensure personalized learning for all students: formative instructional practices, Universal Design for Learning, and integrating technology for instruction and learning.

PD will be provided in a variety of ways, including being embedded in the classroom with coaches. Study groups of educators will be utilized to build teacher capacity. Teachers will be compensated for time outside of their normal contract hours.

Principals will participate in PD to build their own capacity to lead.

UDL training will include a variety of techniques for students to demonstrate their learning (i.e. project-based work, videos, etc.)

A variety of formative and summative assessments will be used to monitor student progress. An external consultant will lead formative instructional practice training to link assessments with instruction.

Feedback from the teacher and principal evaluations, in addition to other sources of feedback, will be used to determine ongoing PD needs.

Additional training on literacy will also be provided.

(c) The applicant states that school leaders will participate in the PD sessions to learn the various techniques that will be used to personalize learning environments. The applicant also states that teacher evaluations will be used to make removal decisions as well. It is unclear what specific supports the principals/leadership teams will have, outside of the weekly and monthly building and regionally-based meetings.

(d) The applicant proposes a regional plan to recruit, hire and develop effective teachers and leaders, which will be facilitated by an external partner. A variety of technological programs will also be used to retain and keep quality educators. The applicants also proposes to redistribute quality staff across the region as needed, to remove poorly performing teachers and to build a pipeline of new teachers. The details provided do not meet the requirements for a high-quality plan.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points) | 15 | 11 |

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a) The applicant proposes a strong organizational structure to oversee, monitor and implement the proposed practices, including structures at the school, district, and regional levels. The lead entity has a history of successfully implementing large-scale projects and grants.

(b) The school leadership teams have sufficient flexibility and autonomy over conditions. The local school boards are supportive of the initiative and have demonstrated the willingness to pass and implement reforms.

- (c) Based on SEA policy, students are able to earn high school credit based on competency as opposed to seat time (Flex Credit). All five LEAs provide a center or academy to allow students to recover credits. Dual credits are also available through the University of Rio Grande.
- (d) "Giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways" is not addressed.
- (e) Ensuring that Students with Disabilities have adequate resources is central to the applicant's proposal. The applicant does not address other accessibility issues meeting the unique needs of English Language Learners.

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
| (D)(2) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>(a) (b) All students will receive a laptop or ipad and will have access to those devices during the day, afterschool and during summer school. Additional assistive equipment may be provided by special request. Ensuring that students have access to technology/internet at home or in the community (outside of school) is not addressed. All educators will also be provided a laptop and other tools.</p> <p>(c) (d) The current LEA data systems gather a variety of data points and can be used and accessed by educators, students, and parents. As the new IIS is developed, it will better support personalized learning opportunities, will ensure better tracking for at-risk students, and will be inter-operable with other data systems.</p> | | |

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 13 |
| (E)(1) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>The applicant proposes a well-defined tiered monitoring system to oversee progress and address any changes at the classroom-level up to the broader district-level.</p> <p>The applicant proposes a variety of structures that will monitor implementation by analyzing data, overall implementation steps, and making mid-course corrections as needed.</p> <p>The applicant also proposes the creation of a website to share the process with the public. It is unclear exactly what information will be provided on the website, such as information on the quality of investments.</p> | | |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 5 |
| (E)(2) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>The building and district-level teams include a variety of stakeholders, including teachers, and will meet on a regular basis to monitor implementation. Building-level progress reports will be gathered monthly and distributed to teachers. The districts will also meet with community-based organizations each month. RTT-D updates will be included in staff meetings, PTO meetings, and newsletters. Although not required, the application could be strengthened by a specific communication strategy for the local school boards. Otherwise the applicant proposes a strong communication and engagement plan.</p> | | |
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points) | 5 | 3 |
| (E)(3) Reviewer Comments: | | |
| <p>The districts are currently transitioning to the new teacher and principal evaluation systems, so baseline data does not exist.</p> <p>The applicant proposes a variety of performance measures that address academic progress, social-emotional needs, career/college readiness, and overall district improvement.</p> <p>Performance measures for grades k-2 are not provided, but instead start in grade 3.</p> <p>Subgroup goals are not provided for all measures (racial/ethnic subgroups are not provided at all, and economically disadvantaged measures are only provided for some of the relevant measures).</p> <p>Due to the fact that each district will have its own academic content focus areas (based on the district's individual needs), it</p> | | |

would be useful to develop separate performance measures and goals for each LEA.

The rationale for the various measures is included throughout the narrative and the measures align to the applicant's proposal.

Most performance measures seem reasonable, but some could be more ambitious.

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

5

4

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes a bi-annual review of the grant's implementation and progress against the specified goals. The reviews will be comprehensive and will gather a variety of information. The resulting reports will be compared to the grant program's budget to determine the effectiveness of specific investments. The report will be made publicly available.

It is unclear if this report will also include areas for improvement or suggestions/modifications to the original plan.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 6 |

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The applicant proposes to use a variety of existing funds to implement specific pieces of the plan. Those funds are identified in the narrative of the proposal, but the actual budget does not list the other sources of funds.

(b) As a whole the budget seems reasonable for implementation. A few specific budget areas could be further refined, i.e. the budget includes the same cost for personnel and contractual services for all four years. If capacity is being built in the system, these amounts should decrease over time. Also all equipment purchases are included in year 1. While most equipment would be needed in year 1, additional equipment may be needed during the other 3 years of implementation (based on changing needs). The budget is broken out by category areas, as opposed to the requested project-based budgets.

(c) The applicant does not include a budget narrative. The rationale included in the budget descriptions for each personnel position, and the associated cost, seems appropriate. The budget line items align to the proposed plan and are well thought-out, and are supported by the proposal's narrative.

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

10

4

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not discuss the long-term sustainability of the project's goals. It is assumed that capacity will be built in the system due to the strong focus on PD and building knowledge within the system, but there is no explicit plan for sustainability (of resources or practices/structures) after the grant period ends.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not include a competitive preference priority.

Absolute Priority 1

| | Available | Score |
|---------------------|-------------|-------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | Met/Not Met | Met |

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes a variety of strong programs and practices that will create personalized learning environments for all students. Students will be responsible for defining their own learning plans, and will be supported by a newly trained teaching staff. The applicant proposes to use a variety of tools, technologies, and instructional practices to differentiate instruction for students. The applicant presents many programs, practices, structures and methods of instruction that are innovative and would be extremely beneficial to students and teachers. The application is especially strong in its recognition of individual focus areas for each school, the alignment to the state's RTT initiative, and developing capacity within the local systems. Additional attention could be paid to the performance measures and ensuring the sustainability of the initiative, but as defined, the applicant meets absolute priority 1.

| | | |
|-------|-----|-----|
| Total | 210 | 153 |
|-------|-----|-----|



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1089OH-2 for Gallia-Vinton Educational Service Center

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that builds on its work in the four core educational assurance areas. The applicant presents a sound plan that builds upon their existing reform efforts, that have improved student achievement. The plan highlights:

- Support and adoption for Common Core standards in math and literacy and revised standards for Science and Social studies,
- Acknowledged and accepted accountability from teachers who recognize their roles in the improvement process
- Adoption of teacher and principal evaluation system and results will be used to measure teacher effectiveness in order to: inform student achievement, retain and develop effective educators, remove ineffective educators and redistribute educator talent in order for students to be afforded access to success,
- All district schools have achieved an effective rating on the Ohio Department of Education report card which indicates that low performing schools are receiving the necessary supports in order to help students be achieve,
- Increasing student options for learning using alternative methods for achievement such as credit recover, Post secondary and flex credit,
- Data system to design and deliver instruction as a way to use data to improve student achievement and teacher effectiveness

Overall, the applicant has articulated a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that is focused on building upon the success of its four educational assurance areas.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's approach to implementing its reform proposal will support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation is supported and demonstrates a thorough and comprehensive approach to implementation.

- all schools across every grade band from K-12 be involved in this project in order to insure that all achievement gaps

are remediated

- twenty-seven schools will participate in the grant activities. Documentation supports the inclusion of all schools are represented by one of the five districts included in this application process.
- the applicant's plan identifies the total number of participating students, low-income, high-needs and participating educators.

Overall, the applicant has supported this criteria with the appropriate evidence.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided the reviewer with satisfactory evidence that supports a high-quality plan that fully describes the reform proposal and how it will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools. The applicant's plan logically models the impact and for meaningful reform, and how the methods prepares students for a life beyond their schools and does not limit their learning to the confines of the physical school.

- The first reform and change prepares educators to facilitate students to college and career readiness
- Teachers have increased access to professional development opportunities that are aligned to curricular content and receive the needed necessary feedback and support on-site to support and sustain positive change
- Using parent academies broadens local and regional awareness through increased parental participation
- Scaled up transformation through Increased professional developments for educators beyond the traditional school year allow teachers opportunities to do a laser-like focus using data to to inform and improve student performance

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has demonstrated a high quality plan of LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes. The plan describes specific data that supports improved student learning and performance and increased equity and access to learning. This has resulted in all LEA students and student subgroups baseline data demonstrates the following:

- The applicant has demonstrated a proven history of positive growth in the areas of student achievement for literacy and math, with strong results in the subgroups for students identified as economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities.
- The methodology used for determining growth from baseline to post-grant is ambitious yet achievable, given their past achievements.
- The applicant continues to lag behind the district's achievement gap based. An area that is targeted for improvement and discussed in great length in this plan
- The applicant has demonstrated positive growth for graduation rates. The data is not available for SY 2011-2012 but projections are consistent based on the projected increased percentages of students scoring proficient and above,
- The applicant reports there is no data available for college enrollment and post-secondary attainment rates and this is an area of weakness relative to tracking this data, and the expectation is with the implementation of this plan and all its curriculum components, college enrollment rates will progress throughout the grant and beyond

Overall, the applicant has presented a a vision that is ambitious yet achievable based on the goals and outcomes detailed in the proposal, and how the plan is closely aligned with proposal and builds on its strategic plan for improved student achievement. However, it would have been helpful if the applicant had additional data for the subgroups to support some of the listed goals.

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 | 14 |

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates a strong record that demonstrates four years of success with student learning and achievement.

Each school district experienced positive results in all students and subgroups in meeting AYP. The schools improved the percentage in meeting the number of state indicators. Although not all the schools met AYP in 2010-2011, the data does indicate a cycle of positive improvement exists. 2 schools have received the designation as excellent, 3 schools moved from continuous improvement to effective. This happened because the districts approach to shared leadership and shared accountability for student achievement. The applicant has demonstrated its ability to improve student learning and raising achievement; improving its lowest-achieving or lowest performing schools; with a thorough and systematic approach to achievement.

The applicant currently provides student performance data available using the district website, newsletters and mailings. The applicant does not provide a plan to support how they will make student performance data available to students, educators and parents as a way to inform and improve participation, instruction and services. It would have been helpful to the reviewer if the applicant would have provided this information. As access to information is an integral part of personalized learning environments.

Overall, the applicant has submitted a convincing plan that clearly demonstrates the capacity to improve student achievement.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The extent to which each LEA has demonstrated evidence of high level of transparency is sufficiently demonstrated by making public all records that apply to actual school expenditures, instructional support, pupil support and school administration. The applicant goes to a great extent to insure the public is aware of their rights to this information and the how to obtain it.

- information available according to State Law and available for public inspection
- available according to State Law and expenditures per pupil are available on the Ohio Report Card information website
- The Buckeye Institute for Public Policy Solutions provides data to increase transparency in government. This information is available on their website.
- Ohio schools have to file a a Continuous Improvement Plan with the State Department of Education and this information is available for public view.
- Districts use their websites to increase public awareness and allow parents to access their child's achievement.

The applicant has demonstrated comprehensive evidence of an increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The State of Ohio and Ohio State Department of Education have produced a list of conditions and expectations LEAs must supportive of providing personalized learning environments to raise and accelerate student achievement The Ohio Revised Code section 3301.07 articulates a list of conditions and standards each each LEA to advance student achievement using collaboration, personalized and individualized learning, and shared responsibility. The state recognizes that in order for LEAs to be successful in meeting the elements of this state legal, statutory and regulatory requirements, it must provide districts with a structures and supports to meet these conditions, and therefore has provided all districts with the necessary conditions and sufficient autonomy to implement the personalized learning environments:

- Allowing LEA to customize delivery of supplemental materials in the form of Model Curricula, used to support implementation of Common Core State Standards that meet the needs of their students rather than a one size fits all approach
- Providing schools with an approved list of assessments that measure teacher impact on student learning removes any variables that would create ambiguous results, and puts in places a level of clarity by which all teachers are judged on the same or similar criteria based on the LEAs assessment method
- State legislation that requires a all teacher evaluations include a measure for student achievement
- Ohio Revised code 3302.07 grants the State Superintendent of Instruction the power to waive specific statutory provisions in order to implement innovative programs

Overall, the extent to which the applicant has provided sufficient documentation in this proposal to support its level and degree

of autonomy, as well as the conditions in which they exist, thus giving them the ability to implement personalized learning environments successfully has been justified for the score received.

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

10

8

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents evidence to support the extent to which they are able to conduct meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of this proposal and meaningful stakeholder support for this proposal. The narrative details the level of commitment for this transformation initiative, it also highlights the importance of communicating a full message of understanding to all key stakeholders. The process by which the applicant has taken to gain support for this proposal indicates the applicant's level of commitment for change. The applicant demonstrates a high level of understanding for the need to communicate clear and consistent messages to all key stakeholders. The applicant demonstrates the value of this communication process and how involving key stakeholders in the decision-making can create the much needed support for this type of educational change.

- Communications and conversations with all key stakeholders began in 2010 and current practice is still in place
- The Teachers Union collected viewpoints from teachers, Ohio Education Association and other districts in order to make an informed decision of support for this project
- Community awareness included communication with local news media outlets, who monitored and reported on applicant's decisions for participation
- Student letters of support of this proposal

The applicant's proposal could have been strengthened if the applicant had provided specific descriptions of how parents, the business community, advocacy groups, early learning programs, civil rights organizations, and local civic and community based organizations, and institutions of higher education were engaged in the development of the proposal. Based on the details in sections of the proposal which demonstrates on-going communications for this proposal since 2010, this lack of evidence is clearly not a demonstration of lack of engagement from these key stakeholders. By providing the details and letters to support from these specific stakeholders, it would have strengthened the applicant's demonstration of meaningful stakeholder engagement.

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

5

5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA has demonstrated evidence of a high quality plan for an analysis of the applicant's current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic behind the reform proposal contained within the applicant's proposal, including identified needs and gaps that the plan will address, has been thorough. The applicant's plan details the following:

- Applicant has demonstrated complete awareness of existing needs and gaps and have ensured that strategies outlined in the proposal will address the gaps
- the gradual implementation of a Standards Based Systems will specifically address the achievement gaps which applicant (identified in 2011) and expect to see results by full implementation (expected to be in 2014)
- planning and preparation to implement personalized learning environments began as early as October 2011 with the execution of new model to close achievement gaps in subgroups
- ongoing professional development (began in 2011) to insure teacher preparedness to acquire the skill sets needed to support student achievement

Overall, the applicant has demonstrated a high quality plan that is logical and thorough in its specific timeline that details what is needed, who is needed, and when it is needed, and ongoing execution presents thoughtful consideration to a complex process in order to produce the desired outcomes in implementing personalized learning environments.

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

| | Available | Score |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 20 |

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant 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 is strongly supported.

- personalized learning environment is the best path to achieve the goals as a result of the lack of success experienced within the existing structures
- The data shows that only 11.8% of its population has attained bachelor's degree which is below the national rate of 27%, demonstrates a high need to provide models to parents and students of the necessity and relevancy for college - and career -ready models
- An educated workforce statistically have a positive impact on state and local economies
- Currently more than 21% of adults over the age of 25 in the region do not have a high school diplomas, which have dramatic implications in this time when most job applicants are required to have at least a high-school diploma, and often applicants who have the post-secondary education are viewed favorably
- A shared ownership in achievement between teachers and students through short-term and long term goal-setting gives student a context for relevancy and connection between learning and achieving goals
- Utilizing individual Academic and Career plans in their eighth grade year as a student lead cognitive approach to future career interests and sets a foundation in creating the appropriate high school course of study
- Expanding access to STEM projects and activities increase knowledge and awareness, create opportunities for increased interest and broaden knowledge base
- Students with disabilities transition plans will be enhanced and be afforded greater opportunities to college -and career -ready experiences as a result of the implementation of the Ohio Career and Information System
- Universal Design for Learning process creates access to equity for all students by providing learning paths that are support their individual strengths, needs and interests. These components are often positive indicators for student engagement, which is essential if personalized learning environments are to be successful
- Ongoing assessments that monitor and track progress provide teachers and students with results that inform college - and career -readiness

The applicant presents a plan which details an approach to implementing instructional strategies to all participating students which will prepare and enable participating students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards and college- and career-ready graduation requirements and accelerate his or her learning through support of his or her needs. The details submitted in this narrative support a methodical approach to implementing personalized learning environments that provide students with the necessary supports to graduate college and career ready .

Overall, the applicant has presented a high-quality for improving learning and teaching by personalized learning environments in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career- ready.

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

20

19

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's plan for improving learning and teaching has consistently demonstrated a commitment to personalizing the learning environment. The plan's details are specific and consistently demonstrates the appropriate level of support to ensure the removal of the learning and teaching obstacles that prevent student achievement. The applicant has created a plan that provides for multiple opportunities for successful learning and teaching.

- Consistent curriculum practices as a result of adopting and implementing The Ohio Model Curricula and all support elements have yielded positive results
- By providing professional development for the curriculum model to both teachers and principal there is mutual understanding of the expectations from using the curriculum model as well as opportunities for tit affords teachers for professional improvement through consistent practice
- Students benefit by having teachers who provide them with access to rigorous curricula; prevent and close existing achievement gaps; and demonstrate ongoing progress toward college- and career- readiness.
- Emphasis on literacy validates years of proven literacy research of the connection between reading and learning, and how critical a role early intervention plays in student reading success. By adopting and implementing a Third-Grade Guarantee policy, the LEA is creating a safety-net for students with reading deficiencies
- the high level of accountability for teachers to demonstrate competency or hold a reading endorsement , insures that students have access to highly effective teachers
- The applicant worked in collaboration with University of Rio Grande to implement and determine best practices across the state currently in place, provides training and mentoring of novice teachers to in order to meet the Ohio State Competencies for Teachers as well build upon establishing a system of effective and highly effective teachers and principals. The applicant has demonstrated success by sustaining these efforts beyond the grant period.

The applicant's plan lacks specific details to address meeting the needs of students in hard-to-staff schools, subjects, and specialty areas, the reviewer has determined the applicant's approach to learning and teaching does not exclude these concerns will be directly addressed.

Overall, the applicant's plan for teaching and learning is of good-quality.

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>The applicant has a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator (as defined in this notice), and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant currently provides support and services to all LEAs in an effort to minimize disruption to teachers schedules. Support is often on-site or in campuses within the LEA's district and this model will be enhanced by greater support from existing partnerships which is customized according to the needs of the participants • In abandoning the one-size-fits all approach to professional development , the applicant will permit teachers to request professional development according to the needs of the teacher rather than the needs of the teacher. The results from this approach not only impact teachers but also delivery of student services • Continuum of support established as a result of shared collaboration between Building Leadership Teams and Teacher-Based-Teams demonstrate respect for teacher voice as experts when making decisions for regarding sustaining and improving progress • While the plan details the several methods used to provide students with opportunities for progress and demonstrated mastery through the use of dual enrollment, flex credit, online learning, but has also taken an innovative approach for students to attain physical education credits by participating in district organized sports (e.g. bowling) . This is a great example of a differentiated approach to physical education that replaced barriers with opportunities that give students flexibility to achieve high school credits <p>It would have strengthened the application if the applicant had provided details to support how they will duplicate the resources to be adaptable and accessible to students with disabilities and English learners. Overall, the applicant does present an innovative and creative high quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies that provide students with an appropriate level of support.</p> | | |
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 9 |
| <p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's plan clearly demonstrates a logical and methodical approach to LEA and school infrastructure. The plan has given thoughtful consideration to barriers that prevent students from having access to technology and have proposed ideas that would allow students to have access during non-traditional school hours.</p> <p>With any infrastructure, it is necessary to address any potential obstacles and suggestions on how they will be addressed or resolved. The applicant's plan has taken this into consideration and the narrative's details insure that within the personalized learning, there is a procedural system in place that will provide a quick turnaround in order to fully support students. This system insures consistent and timely information for parents, students, and teachers in order to effectively measure the project's achievement goals.</p> <p>It would have strengthened the application if the applicant had addressed how the proposed infrastructure would be able to support students who may face obstacles when trying to access the necessary content, tools or other learning resources for personalized learning environment. Such obstacles could be physical barriers that prevent student from accessing the tools and resources, such as physical, social and or environmental barriers .</p> <p>Overall, the plan for policy and infrastructure demonstrates the applicant's ability to provide the integral support and resources LEAs will need to provide to students.</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 applicant's continuous improvement process plan strategy involves a tiered level of monitoring to be lead by the applicant. The monitors have responsibility to respond to the results, insures shared accountability for student achievement. By using this tiered system for monitoring and accountability, student performance remains the focus for all results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers have ability to adjust their instruction to drive student achievement • Coaches monitors teacher practices to help teachers align their instructional practices to student results • Principals use Walk-Through's monitor implementation and progress, based on evidence from coach and teacher feedback as it relates to student achievement • Results will be communicated to the public as a result of quarterly meetings with all key internal stakeholders, and disseminated to the public in the form of newsletter and electronically <p>Overall, the applicant's plan demonstrates and justifies the rigorous and ambitious use of strategies in order to provide a continuous improvement process, that is achievable and accountable.</p> | | |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 5 |
| <p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided a high-quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholder. There will be a daily, weekly, monthly and quarterly communications derived at the building level is shared with parents, PTOS, students, community-based organizations, and other key stakeholders to remain actively engaged in this process as a result of the monthly and quarterly reports. All reports and meetings will be shared and made available either through the use of newsletters as well as electronically. The meetings are great because they create opportunities for feedback during conversations around student performance achievement.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant has demonstrated a high-quality approach to insure ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.</p> | | |
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points) | 5 | 5 |
| <p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has identified and proposed a total of 14 performance measures. In selecting these measures the applicant has determined these measures to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inform and validate the best path to Increase student achievement • Maintain successful gains as a result of the ratings on the Ohio Report card • Provide students receive the appropriate and targeted interventions be successful from grade-to-grade • Analyze the effectiveness of strategies being used to meet the targets for subgroups • Be aligned to student achievement goals that have been identified as priorities on at a local, state and national level • Inform effectiveness of teachers and principals <p>Overall the applicant's proposed performance measures and annual targets that are ambitious yet achievable targets. All performance indicators are moving in an upward direction for improvement as well as sustainability.</p> | | |
| (E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points) | 5 | 5 |
| <p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's plan proposes to employ a team comprised of consultants who will analyze data and evidence using a Project Evaluation Guide as a method to critique its progress. Data will be derived from multiple sources regarding the quality and implementation, professional development, instructional practices, students' learning experiences and communication practices. The qualitative and quantitative data will be used as evidence to evaluate how well this comprehensive approach to determine the project's effectiveness.</p> <p>Overall, the applicants presents a plan that is well thought out and assumes an approach that takes full responsibility to use time, staff, money and other resources in order to improve results to accomplish the effectiveness of sustaining personalized</p> | | |

learning environments.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 9 |
| <p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided the reviewer with a budget that specifically identifies all funds that will support this proposal, and budget presents as reasonable and sufficient for implementation of the proposal. It would have been helpful if the applicant had provided details in the equipment budget to support the rationale for the digital cameras, and other equipment. The applicant makes a very general statement as to the need but does not provide details to support this equipment. Other areas of the budget reflect the rationale for the allocations of personnel, fringe-benefits, travel, contractual, training stipends, and expenditures need to support all goals of the grants.</p> <p>Overall, the extent to which the applicant's budget is reasonable and appropriate for the purpose of this proposal.</p> | | |
| (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points) | 10 | 5 |
| <p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide a high quality plan for sustainability beyond the grant and the proposal lacks a detailed plan or continued funding. The applicant's state is a previous recipient of Race To The Top funding.</p> <p>The applicant's plan of proposal provides many instances in which capacity building is created through its ambitious professional development model and was clearly demonstrated by the sustained growth in improved professional development after a grant ended.</p> <p>The applicant does not provide a narrative for how it would support the replacement and upgrades for the personnel, technological devices, and tools and resources needed to continue supporting the project. It would have been helpful if the applicant would have provided details in the narrative to support the sustainability of the project through the use of State and local financial support.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant has not provided a plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant.</p> | | |

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points) | 10 | 0 |
| <p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has not submitted a narrative to documentation to support a request for Competitive Preference Priority.</p> | | |

Absolute Priority 1

| | Available | Score |
|---|-------------|-------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | Met/Not Met | Met |
| <p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has submitted a high-quality plan that effectively addresses the core assurances in order to create personalized learning environments by providing students and educators with a comprehensive plan that addresses the obstacles and challenges for students in rural areas, and affords them to opportunities to accelerate learning by using tools and resources that create programs that give students access to equity and insures that all students have effective and highly effective</p> | | |

teachers and principals who demonstrate a high-level of competency that meets the needs of all learners. The applicant's plan presents ambitious yet achievable goals that will result in improved student achievement through the use of personalized learning environments.

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

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

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

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The reviewer did not provide documentation to request an optional budget supplement.



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1089OH-3 for Gallia-Vinton Educational Service Center

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant has a coherent reform vision that is anchored in the State Race to the Top Grant while initiating a district-level plan that will accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning, and increase equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests. Details below support this evaluation:

- Vision is a continuation of discovery, training, review, and reform resulting from Ohio's receipt of its initial Race to the Top Grant. The Gallia-Vinton Educational Service Center has successfully coordinated previous educational reform efforts by its five districts.
- Applicant has transformational teams and improvement teams in place at both district and building levels.
- Applicant is supported by the state to commit to its reform vision as presented in this proposal. The Applicant has adopted the State teacher/principal evaluation system as well as Ohio's incorporation of the Common Core Standards as a part of the State standards.
- Educators in all five districts have been trained in using data to to determine continuous improvement.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant completely provides all requested information while meeting all competition requirements. Examples of the data which provides evidence of the high extent that the Applicant's approach to implementing its reform proposal will be successful are:

- (a) Applicant chose to involve all schools in its five districts. Applicant includes graphs with data providing evidence that the competition's eligibility requirements are met.
- (b) Applicant provides a list of the participating schools .
- (c) Applicant includes graphs with data providing all required information.

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

10

9

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The Applicant's plan is strong due to the connection with the State Race to the Top proposal. The plan continues and refines and its reform vision. Applicant is commitment to personalizing learning for all students; however, the Applicant needed additional information about its logic model/theory of change. Below are details to support evaluation:

- Applicant will utilize current partnerships to scale-up efforts across all five districts.
- Extended professional development will occur across all five districts with compensation for time outside of contract.
- Applicant will build upon reform initiated through State Race to the Top Grant while further utilizing classroom coaches, Formative Instructional Practices, and Universal Design for Learning.
- Coordination, assessment, and communication will occur as Applicant establishes a project website to strengthen its collaborative, LEA-wide reform and change.

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

10

10

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provides data that supports achievable, ambitious annual goals for:

- (a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth): Summative assessments being used are the Ohio Achievement Assessments and Ohio Graduation Tests
- (b) Decreasing achievement gaps: The Ohio Report card provides the mean scores and numbers of student participating in the ACT.
- (c) Graduation rates: School systems provide this data.
- (d) College enrollment rates: Data will be available in the system.

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

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 13 |

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provides data that supports its record of past success; however, it lacks sufficient data for its low-performing schools. Applicant provides the following successful examples of its record in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching:

(a)

Applicant includes district data that indicates successes from the 2007-2008 school year to 2010-2011 school year. Data is unavailable for the 2011-2012 school year. Applicant includes requested data. From school years 2007-2008 to 2010-2011 , all of the districts' numbers show that fewer students scored at the limited or basic levels and achieved at least a level of proficiency. Additionally, Applicant's success is further indicated by three of the five districts meeting the Ohio Standard for Graduation at 90% or greater. Also, it is a strength that the Applicant addresses not only the economically disadvantaged students within the districts, but also students with disabilities. Three of the districts met the Value-added Measure in the most recent data, indicating one year of progress was achieved. Insufficient data is included related to individual low-performing schools within the five districts.

(b)

In 2010-2011, only one of the local groups met AYP by achieving the standard for all students as well as for both subgroups. Of the four districts that did not meet AYP, each met the requirement for the Economically Disadvantaged Students but missed the mark for students with disabilities. Applicant continues to strive to improve its low-performing schools and districts. Applicant recognizes that grant funds must be used to provide not only devices for its students and teachers, but also to facilitate access to technology and training throughout its schools and communities for all stakeholders including parents

(c)

Applicant makes student performance data available to parties through periodic report cards, parent-teacher meetings, teacher-student conferences, and as aggregate data on Applicant and State websites.

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

5

5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant describes a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments.

- Applicant includes district data that indicates successes from the 2007-2008 school year to 2010-2011 school year. Data is unavailable for the 2011-2012 school year.
- Applicant includes requested data. All of the districts' numbers include that fewer students scored at the limited or basic levels and achieved at least a level of proficiency.
- Applicant has data available to stakeholders on district websites, Ohio Report Card, State Department of Education website including its Continuous Improvement Plan, and the Alliance website. Additionally, the Buckeye Institute for Public Policy Solutions displays information including salaries of individual teachers.
- All public records are available for public inspection in accordance with state law.

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

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provides strong evidence that indicates that it has both successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal. The Applicant's collaboration within its consortium as well as with the State as a part of Ohio's Race to the Top Grant is evidence of its compliance with regulatory requirements.

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

10

7

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provides evidence of stakeholder engagement and support in the development and of the proposal. Applicant describes strong examples of how students, families, teachers, and principals were engaged in the development of the proposal:

- Stakeholder engagement in Race to the Top-State planning began in 2010 prior to Ohio's first submission of grant. Collective bargaining is present in each district. Applicant teacher unions actively engage and collaborate with both the state and school districts.
- Applicant regularly exchanges information with parents and community groups through news media, websites, regularly scheduled meetings and forums like school board meetings, and parent education.
- Applicant includes letter of support from key stakeholders such as parents, students, union leadership., district personnel, and teachers; however, letters from community stakeholders are not included. engagement in the development of the proposal and meaningful stakeholder support for the proposal

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

5

4

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant offers a thorough analysis of needs and gaps by addressing the full implementation of statistics through a statewide effort in the 2013-2014 school year; however, a more detailed analysis is needed. The following are strengths of Applicant's plan:

- Applicant has accessed technology gaps in schools and communities. Additional data would strengthen the plan to identify other gaps and needs.
- Through the RTT-District Grant, students will receive instruction in goal-setting with formative feedback and tracking/recording tools for student goals and learning. The gap between the knowledge and skills of Ohio's graduates and the skills required for college- and career-readiness connects to a gap in rigor of previous academic content standards. This will lead to further identification of needs and gaps.
- The districts in the alliance will fully implement the new Ohio Academic Content Standards (Common Core, Science, and Social Studies) by school year 2013-2014. This will improve the Applicant's to address student gaps and needs with more rigorous curricula and higher standards.

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

| | Available | Score |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 19 |

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provides a strong learning plan; however, Applicant would strengthen its application to include additional details about mechanisms for student training and support. Applicant included the following strengths in its plan:

- (a)
- Applicant provides instruction in goal-setting to its students while requiring all 8th graders to design academic plans that address career and college decisions, coursework, and goals.
 - Students also have an online individual academic and career plan which is available for review, modification, and connection to student course selections, field trips, recruiting, interests, and personalized learning options.
 - Through various instructional methods/ideas like Universal Design of Learning and Binary Paideia, Applicant seeks to personalize learning for each student.
 - Every 8th grader will begin formalizing college and career plans while all students will utilize the Ohio Career Information System (OCIS) to compose an online Individual Academic and Career Plan.
- (b)
- Applicant has assessed needs and gaps in student access to technology to better provide both personal learning devices and Internet access throughout schools and communities.
 - Grant will continue to provide quality professional development to educators to provide higher quality instruction and access to excellent educators to all students.
 - Applicant will continue to build on its reform and progress as a part of the State Race to the Top Grant.
 - Students and parents receive regular assessments through report cards, daily feedback, access to student data, parent portals, parent-student-teacher meetings, and other methods.
 - Students have personalized learning recommendations using secondary transition plans as well as academic improvement and enrichment plans.
 - Afterschool programs offer extended learnings, parental education forums, and enrichment opportunities.
- (c)
- Applicant will expand its technological trainers with grant funds to guarantee that all students will understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning.
 - Grant funds will be used to provide all students college visits.

| | | |
|---|----|----|
| (C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points) | 20 | 20 |
| <p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant has a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment.. Below are examples of strong components from Applicant's plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant will support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments through continued training using the Ohio Model Curricula. Model is aligned with Common Core Standards as well as strategies including Universal Design for Learning, Formative Instructional Practices, and leadership teams. • Applicant uses evaluations that provide prescriptive and interest-based professional development aligned with the Ohio Teacher and Principal Evaluations. • Applicant's evaluative tools for educators will provide feedback and professional development to help educators meet each student's academic needs to graduate on time and college- and career-ready. • Applicant is utilizing the expanded Ohio Statewide Longitudinal Data System to provide research and data to facilitate personalized learning and instruction by frequent measures of student progress. • Applicant has students construct academic plans in eighth grade that will follow them through high school with frequent monitoring of progress towards both career and college-ready goals. • Applicant provides access to student data for assessment and review. • Applicant will provide effective principals and teachers for every student as evidenced by its past, current, and proposed professional development plans and activities. • Applicant seeks to further personalize learning, academic choices, and opportunities for all students through technology including personal learning devices. <p>Applicant's high-quality plan describes an approach to teaching and leading that helps educators to improve instruction to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards and graduation requirements through personalized learning and teaching for all students.</p> | | |

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points) | 15 | 13 |
| <p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant addresses personalized learning for all students (throughout the application) offering the following strong examples noted below:</p> <p>(a) Applicant has established organization and collaborative history to provide support and services to all schools.</p> <p>(b) Current leadership structure and teams associated with State Race to the Top Grant and accompanying Applicant reform offers strong leadership for District Grant implementation and student success.</p> <p>(c/d) Although mastery is addressed, this is an area in development that will be addressed through online courses, evaluative tests, and additional course offerings throughout the academic spectrum of levels and interests. Other programs that would facilitate student mastery and alternative methods to earn credits towards high school graduation are not addressed.</p> <p>Applicant's plan contains the following weakness:</p> <p>(e) Applicant plan lacks specificity of the adaptations of resources and instruction to accommodate all students.</p> | | |
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
| <p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant has a strong plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure; however plan lacks information about exporting data in an open format. Below are strong components of the Applicant's plan:</p> <p>(a) Applicant includes plans for expanding student, home, and community access to technological devices as well as Internet access.</p> | | |

(b) Applicant will provide technical support through contractors within the districts.

(c) Applicant will utilize the expanded information technology system the Ohio Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems as well as the Instructional Improvement System (IIS) to personalize learning environments for all students.

(d) Applicant provides extensive information related to the LEA and school infrastructure that supports personalized learning. Plan lacks sufficient information about 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.

A weakness of the Applicant's plan is lack of information about exporting data in an open format.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 13 |
| <p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant's plan has components of a high-quality plan ; however, it is missing information related to the provision of regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities to facilitate continuous improvements during and after the grant.</p> <p>Applicant provides quality information related to feedback to offer a continuous improvement process through the following examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings with district personnel • Alliance meetings and reports • PTO meetings and newsletters • District Leadership Team meetings • Alliance and school district websites <p>A weakness of the Applicant's plan is its incomplete description of the monitoring , measurement, and public sharing of information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top – District; however, partial information is included in E4.</p> | | |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 4 |
| <p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant provides strong strategies for ongoing communication with internal and external stakeholders; however, Applicant needs to provide additional details about its plan to receive feedback from internal and external stakeholders.</p> <p>Below are examples of Applicant's strong strategies for ongoing communication with internal and external stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District meetings with community organizations • PTO meetings and newsletters • Principal meetings within/ cross districts • Teacher collaborations/departmental meetings • District Leadership Team meetings • Alliance group reports • District and Alliance websites <p>Applicant's plan would be stronger if more details were provided about the process for receiving feedback from stakeholders.</p> | | |
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points) | 5 | 5 |
| <p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant provides a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve its plan. Applicant includes ambitious yet achievable performance measures with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures.</p> | | |

Examples of Applicant's high-quality approach to continuously improve its plan are below:

(a) Applicant focuses on reading and math achievement setting reading and math goals to move towards 100% mastery. Applicant includes math performance measures for its third grade students. Baseline is 93% with a 2013-2014 goal of 95% to 99% in 2016-2017 post-grant. Applicant recognizes the importance of excellence in STEM subjects with connections to student achievement, high school graduation, and post-secondary success. Applicant offers strong approach and goals to increase student achievement in STEM subjects.

(b) Applicant describes its process to design curriculum to fit students through the use of performance measures. Applicant will use the Universal Design for Learning to personalize learning for its math students to increase student achievement and mastery. Through performance measures and analyses. Applicant will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information to achieve math numeracy for all third grade students. Applicant offers strong approach and goals to increase student achievement in math.

(c) Applicant describes its process to review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress. Applicant addresses its need to extrapolate data to address economically disadvantaged students and students with disabilities. Applicant offers strong approach and goals to identify gaps in special populations.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant offers a plan to continuously improve its plan; however, a weakness is lack of specific information related to evaluation of financial investments.

Below are strong components of plan:

- Applicant plans to evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top-District through a Continuous Improvement Team that will regularly convene and report to all Alliance members and the community.
- Applicant will include all possible stakeholders through surveys, open forums, and educator/principal evaluations.

A weakness is the Applicant's omission of specific information related to evaluation of financial investments.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant's strong budget identifies and describes all supporting, project funds with thoughtful rationales for all investments and priorities.

| | | |
|--|----|---|
| (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points) | 10 | 9 |
|--|----|---|

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Throughout its plan, Applicant addresses sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant.; however, it was not represented in this section on sustainability of project goals. .

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Applicant did not make a submission.

Absolute Priority 1

| | Available | Score |
|---------------------|-------------|-------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | Met/Not Met | Met |

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Applicant offers a plan that builds on past reform as a part of the State's Race to the Top Grant. The Applicant's plan includes acquisition of varied personal learning devices for both student and educators to improve both learning and teaching that supports educational opportunists that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards. The Applicant has the vision, past successes, and collaborative mechanism to execute its proposal to achieve reform that will accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student; increase the effectiveness of educators; expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

The Applicant meets Absolute Priority 1.

| | | |
|-------|-----|-----|
| Total | 210 | 182 |
|-------|-----|-----|

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

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

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

Applicant made no submission.