



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0492KY-1 for Garrard County School System

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant provides clear, concise information regarding several activities/initiatives that address Core Assurance Area #1. The level of participation in these efforts, and the impact on student achievement is unclear. Professional development opportunities, advanced course options and adult mentors for secondary students are listed as options that allow teachers and students to go beyond state requirements, however, it is not clear whether these options are offered to and/or required for all teachers and all students. The applicant's plan to provide additional formative, summative and interest assessments is commendable. The proposal provides information regarding how students will access these assessments and includes a plan for ensuring that economically disadvantaged students will have access to both technology devices and internet service - the vision articulated regarding personal assessment and support is high quality and reflects the applicant's understanding of the needs of the students in the district (rural; internet access; access to technology; access to mentoring and assessment that assists them in college and career planning). The applicant articulates significant steps in Core Assurance Area #2 - The data system and associated reports provide detailed data that allow school district personnel to analyze student progress, link less on planning and Rtl information to individual students, and create professional learning communities that can build on previous lessons learned. The applicant provides a compelling description of how these data systems and technology tools will be used to continue to address this assurance area. The applicant does not present as compelling a description of how Core Assurance Area #3 is met - activities already completed, and the applicant's vision seem typical of most public school districts. The applicant briefly addresses low achieving schools (Core Assurance #4) but the described district vision focuses primarily on college and career awareness and does not include a clear description of how efforts will turn around low performing schools. In addition, the description does not include information about elementary feeder schools and whether there will be a vision (and associated efforts) that address achievement gaps and personalized learning at elementary schools in the district. The applicant included a stronger response to core assurance areas 1 and 2. Core assurance areas 3 and 4 are addressed through somewhat general descriptions of typical school district activities and not comprehensive coherent reform directed toward individual student achievement. As a result, this proposal scores in the medium range. 		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant indicates that all district schools and all district students will participate in the proposed project. The applicant provides a high level of detail regarding the students in the district, including a thorough description of participating students/families, broken out by subgroup. This is a strength in this section. This section includes all the required elements, along with a detailed description of subgroups. As a result, it warrants a high score. 		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section provides comprehensive information about how the district will implement the proposed reform efforts and then share successful practices with other school districts. The key areas identified show that the applicant has considered a variety of approaches to accomplish significant 		

change.

- There is a clear connection between the four needs identified and the proposed activities.
- The applicant states that these needs were identified by examining existing data. More information would have been helpful. However the the rest of the section is very strong and the information provided creates a compelling case that the applicant has accurately identified important areas of focus.
- The applicant does not describe a logic model or theory of change, per se, however, the applicant includes a high quality plan that illustrates the district's approach to change.
- This section warrants a high rating.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- The performance measures described include all of the areas required in this section.
- The applicant has very ambitious goals for increasing student achievement (performance on summative assessments; graduation rates; college enrollment). These goals seem somewhat unrealistic within a 4 year time period, however, the applicant's attention to developing a well-rounded plan may allow the district to make significant gains in the measures identified.
- The proposed goals clearly lead to decreases in achievement gaps, if attained.
- This section includes the required elements and warrants a high score.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- The applicant presents data that show increases in student achievement - especially for students with disabilities. This is a strength in this section.
- The applicant describes a process of identifying low-performing students and providing intervention that leads to growth in performance. This is an important part of this particular element, and the applicant's description indicates that district personnel are attentive to the needs of students and focused on identification of students in need of additional support.
- The applicant describes several initiatives underway in the district, but does not include data to provide supporting evidence that these initiatives are producing the desired results.
- In addition, the applicant does not provide an explanation of how it makes data available to students, parents and educators.
- This section warrants a medium rating due to the lack of information regarding the impact of district initiatives and regarding making data available.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- The applicant describes typical district transparency required of public schools in most states – open meetings; annual financial audits; district website, etc.
- The applicant does not include any information regarding personnel salaries and states that non-personnel expenditures (for the district) will be posted on the district's website, in the future. The lack of information and evidence regarding the four categories of school-level expenses required in this section is a weakness.
- This section warrants a low score due to failure to address the described selection criteria.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	6
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- The applicant presents information regarding how statutory requirements for academic achievement, employee evaluation, procurement and technology currently impact district operations and will impact proposed grant activities.

- Requirements that support personalized learning plans and highly qualified, effective teachers and administrators seem to be in place.
- No information is provided regarding district autonomy.
- This section warrants a medium rating – applicant briefly describes a number of statutory requirements that impact the district but does not present a clear state context supporting change and reform.

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

10

8

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- The applicant includes a list of meeting dates and topics related to the development of the RTTD proposal. It is unclear, from this list, when community stakeholders and parents provided input, but other school district stakeholders seem well-represented. A summary of comments received at meetings or minutes from meetings would have been helpful. As is, the meetings listed provide clear evidence that there were multiple opportunities for discussion and input, but not evidence of how many stakeholders participated, which stakeholders participated, or what input was received. Overall, the efforts listed seem excellent, and the lack of evidence is a minor weakness given the letters of support from a variety of stakeholders (addressed in the bullet below).
- The district submitted the proposal to local and State officials for their review and received indication of support from local officials and acknowledgement of meeting general grant requirements from the State.
- The applicant has included many letters of support in the appendices. From the evidence provided, many different stakeholder groups support the proposed activities. This is a strength in this section. In addition, the applicant met the requirement for support from teachers.
- This applicant provides a significant amount of evidence indicating a high level of stakeholder engagement and support for the project. As a result, this section warrants a high score.

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

5

5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

- The applicant describes current (and past) efforts to conduct needs analyses and develop plans for continuous improvement. A current plan is included in the appendices and seems to be comprehensive.
- The applicant describes additional steps taken to assess current needs and develop proposed RTTD activities that would be aligned with the district's improvement plan and address both personalized learning environment and closing achievement gaps.
- The applicant provides sufficient information to address all items in this section. The district presents evidence that it has a history of analyzing data and identifying needs, and built upon that foundation for the RTTD application. As a result, this section warrants a high score.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- The "Reform Plan Summary" provides a detailed and comprehensive list of all of the activities/strategies the district will engage in to improve student learning and accomplish the goals established by the applicant. This portion of section C1 includes specific descriptions of plans that address most of the items outlined in this section. This is a strength in this section.
- The applicant merely states that accommodations and high-quality strategies will be implemented to support high need students and these students will be identified and monitored through an RtI process. No specifics are provided regarding these students, and how a personalized learning environment that allows them to meet rigorous standards, with support, will be created. This is a weakness in this section.
- The plan does not specifically how parents will be involved in supporting their children, however, the applicant provides very specific strategies to ensure that students analyze their own data; monitor their own progress, and set goals based upon their needs, interests and goals. This is another strong part of this section.

The applicant does an excellent job of providing goals, with strategies to specifically address each goal, and a summary of reform plan elements that addresses the requirements of this section in detail. As a result, this section warrants a high score.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- The applicant provides an extensive list of training, collaboration and professional development activities that all teachers will engage in, with a timeline for implementation included.
- Activities and strategies identified thoroughly address all items required in this section.
- This applicant provides a strong description of an extensive plan to ensure that adequate support for teaching and leadership are in place to help accomplish the RTTD goals. As a result, this section warrants a high rating.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	2

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- The applicant briefly describes organization of the LEA central office and school leadership teams with flexibility and autonomy. Some of the description indicates that these things will be developed as part of the RTTD plan, however, the applicant does not address items (a) and (b) sufficiently. This is a weakness in this section.
- The applicant does not address allowing students to demonstrate mastery at multiple times and in multiple ways, or allowing students to gain credit through mastery. This is also a weakness in this section.
- This section lacks sufficient information regarding most of the specific items identified in D1 a, b, c, d and e. As a result, this section warrants a low rating.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	6
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- In this section, the applicant describes steps that will be taken in order to implement the proposed plan. Some of these steps seem to build upon infrastructure and policy that is already in place. Most, however, are described as things that will be put in place as part of the RTTD plan.
- Given the description provided, it seems like the district would like to use the RTTD plan to develop infrastructure necessary to create the personalized learning environments and continuous improvement strategies designed to increase student achievement and close achievement gaps. This is a weakness in this section due to the concern that many elements of this infrastructure would need to be developed in order for the overall plan to succeed.
- The applicant describes specific strategies and support that will address both the LEA and school infrastructure and the specific identified needs of district stakeholders. This is a strength in this section.
- The plan includes a description of technical support and data systems that meet the requirements of this section. The applicant notes specific data systems and processes in place to allow participating students, parents and educators to have both the tools and the technical support to allow for successful implementation of the RTTD plan (D2 a and b).
- The applicant briefly describes using technology systems to export information (D2c) - it is unclear whether the necessary systems are in place to adequately support exporting data for use in other learning systems, but it is clear that that is the intent of the applicant.
- The applicant describes interoperable data systems and focuses on student information and instructional improvement. It is not as clear how budget and human resources information is incorporated into this system.
- This section provides a strong description of some of the necessary infrastructure tied to need. That is a strength of the section. The applicant misses some information that would be helpful in fully addressing all items within this section. As a result, this section warrants a medium rating.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant provides a detailed plan to evaluate all components of the proposed RTTD plan. The plan is realistic and includes information about who is responsible and how the information will be shared. In addition, plans for sharing information with district stakeholders and with the larger community, are reasonable and provide frequent updates to all stakeholders. This response to this section is strong, comprehensive and well-planned. It warrants a high rating. 		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant's response provides an adequate plan for communicating information with district stakeholders. It should be noted, however, that the plan does not address specific groups of internal stakeholders. It also does not include a timeline or information indicating the frequency that specific stakeholders (such as teachers) will receive information. The plan does include multiple methods of communicating information with community stakeholders. The applicant includes the addition of a Director of Public Relations to district personnel. The applicant states that this person will be responsible for communication efforts. This seems to be a good approach to ensure that specific communication regarding RTTD occurs. Due to the lack of specificity in plans to communicate within the district, but the strong response overall, this section warrants a high rating. 		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant provides a brief description of performance measures for each specific goal (and grade-level band). While the proposed measures provide some indication of performance in the specific area, the measures seem limited in addressing the overall effectiveness of the RTTD plan. The tables included in this section are not clear and some seem to have goals that may not be ambitious enough. For example, the percentage of HQT for all students, students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students is low (baseline), indicating that right now, many of the students in the LEA are not taught by highly qualified and/or highly effective teachers. The proposed plan includes some increases, but the percentage of students taught by highly qualified and highly effective teachers does not significantly increase until after the grant (when it moves to 100%). This is concerning as highly qualified, and highly effective teachers are essential to increasing student achievement. The table regarding effective teachers and principals seems to indicate the percentage of effective educators will decrease during the years the district implements the proposed grant. The proposed performance measures for benchmark performance in 4-8 graders seems to widen the achievement gap between all students and high need students. Due to concerns regarding specific performance measures and the ability of those measures to provide evidence of effectiveness of the applicant's proposal, this section warrants a low score. 		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This section does not seem to be included in the proposal - however, there are indications that evaluation will be completed by an external evaluator in section E1. Due to the lack of information in this section, this section warrants a low score. 		

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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expenses listed in each budget category seem reasonable for the proposed activities. The applicant identifies a variety of expenses, within each category, that tie specifically to the proposed plan and would allow for the personnel and technology needed to support the proposed efforts. Specific line item expenses are also reasonable for proposed activities, personnel, technology and supplies. The applicant includes costs associated with additional personnel (including cost of benefits) that seem consistent with costs of similar positions/personnel within the district. Cost of technology equipment and software is consistent with the current cost of personal computing devices, laptops, etc. The applicant ties expenses to proposed activities, and the amount of support (or number of items, personnel, etc.) are appropriate given the student population and RTTD plan. Information regarding other sources of funding is not included. The applicant does a good job providing a tie between investments, priorities and project plans. A specific description of a rationale for these is not included in this section, however, the applicant does a good job of creating connections between this section and the proposed activities in other sections. These items (ci and cii) are implied - however, an explicit description would have strengthened this section. The applicant addresses all components in this section in adequate detail – this section warrants a high score. 		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant does provide a plan for sustainability. The plan requires the establishment of a foundation which will provide funding to cover costs of sustaining some of the elements of the project plan (for example, technology). Training in instructional strategies and reform efforts will be provided to all staff members and the applicant notes that this will also assist in sustaining the district's efforts. This is somewhat realistic, however, detail regarding training follow-up and additional training for new staff members is not addressed in its plan for sustainability. This section warrants a medium score. 		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	2
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant describes several partnerships that will be (or are) developed (1). These partnerships are with local community organizations and sound like they would support the RTTD plan. More detail about what the current partnerships (if they already exist) provides to the district, and what, specifically, partnerships would contribute to the RTTD plan would strengthen this section. There is not adequate information provided to address items 2-6. The selection criteria asks the applicant to identify population-level desired results (2). These are not included. No information is provided regarding data use (3), or integration of education and services (4) in the partnerships. The applicant also does not address how the partnerships would build capacity by assessing needs, creating decision-making processes, engaging parents, or assessing implementation efforts (5). Finally, the applicant does not include ambitious performance measures and desired results. As a result, the applicant's score on the competitive priority preference is low. 		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not	Met

	Met	
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant, overall, addresses how it will build on the core assurance areas to create personalized learning environments; achieve growth; close achievement gaps; align instruction with college and career ready standards, and improve teaching. In some sections, the information is very general and descriptions are brief. In other sections, the applicant provides a high-quality, detailed description of items that address the core assurance areas. When evaluated as a whole, the proposal includes information that meets this priority. 		
Total	210	144



Race to the Top - District Technical Review Form

Application #0492KY-2 for Garrard County School System

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presented a discussion of district progress and vision in each of the 4 assurance areas and a comprehensive vision of reform. Considerable work has been done in each of the assurance areas, and the reform vision builds on that foundation, while at the same time pushing the district to change the way teaching occurs in the district.</p> <p>Regarding assurance 4--Despite the fact that Garrard MS failed to meet standards in reading and special education, there was no reference to targeted strategies and programs implemented or planned to address these specific learning needs. Although Garrard County HS was included in the discussion of assurance 4, no evidence of the school's improvement status was provided, so it is unclear as to whether the high school has been designated lowest performing.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Schools were provided the option of choosing to participate in the project, ensuring buy-in and commitment on the part of those who will have the primary responsibility of implementing project activities. All schools and students will participate, allowing for a consistent, systemic focus across the district.</p> <p>The percent of participating students from low income families exceeds the 40% threshold for eligibility. The number of teachers participating (just under 200) will make teacher training, monitoring, and support manageable for project and district staff.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The presentation of information in response to this selection criteria was confusing. A discussion was included of key areas (student progress, technology usage, staff training, and student/staff ratio), and a reform plan for personalized learning (PEGS Reform Plan) was included in the appendix. There was no alignment between the key areas and the reform plan.</p> <p>It appears that the strategies and activities outlined in the reform plan would help the district transition to personalized</p>		

learning, but because strategies and activities were not tied to goals, it is impossible to determine whether strategies and activities are likely to lead to project goals.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The annual goals for students with disabilities in math (Prek-3, 4-8) and reading (4-8) appear to be too ambitious and not achievable. The district's assertion that the grant funding would accelerate the rate of student progress is true. However, the acceleration in student outcomes would likely come during the later years of the grant period, as personalized learning environments become fully implemented. A five-year increase of 73.4 percentage points in 4-8 math, for example, seems unrealistic.

(b) On Table (A)(4)(b), the K-8 proficiency rates for students with disabilities in reading and math are the same. This would appear to be an error in data reporting. The projected 2016-17 proficiency rates for K-8 FARMS students in reading and math do not seem achievable, increasing 48.9 and 52.7 percentage points, respectively.

(c) The projected 5-year graduation rate for students in the aggregate (100%) represents an increase of 26 percentage points. This is ambitious, but probably achievable, as the effective implementation of personalized learning should put graduation within every student's reach by 2016-17.

(d) Annual goals for college enrollment are ambitious, yet achievable.

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:

(a) The district's track record of success in improving student achievement is mixed.

- Five-year increase of approximately 15.5 percentage points in math proficiency rates, but only 6 percentage points in reading proficiency. (Reported reading and math proficiency rates from 2007 and 2011 for students with disabilities are the same, as are reported proficiency rates for FARMS students. This would appear to be an error in data reporting.)
- Graduation rates increased by 5.2 percentage points over 5 years, which reflects successful targeted programs and interventions.
- All schools except one posted increases on the academic index over a 4-year period. Of particular note is the significant 13-point increase in Garrard County High School's academic index, again reflecting successful programs and interventions.
- Regarding novice reduction from fall to spring--data reflected an equal number of instances in which the percent of novice students by grade level decreased as increased or remained the same during the 3 years for which these data were reported for fall and spring.

(b) PBIS, GEAR UP, and a 21st Century Community Learning Center program were implemented in Garrard Middle School. These are evidence-based, student-centered programs designed to improve school climate, support the establishment of college-going cultures, and provide extended day learning opportunities for students. These programs address identified needs in this school.

Selection criteria (c) was not addressed.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Transparency is achieved through open meetings of Board of Education, online streaming of meetings, and the posting of audit reports on the district website. No evidence of selection criteria (a), (b), or (c) was presented. Information regarding school level non-personnel expenditures (selection criteria - d) would be available at Site Based Decision Making School Councils. Overall, this reflects a low level of transparency in district processes, practices, and investments.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>No state requirements or statues would prohibit Garrard County Schools from implementing the proposal, and the district has sufficient autonomy to implement personalized learning. The district plans to pursue a waiver from the Kentucky Department of Education that encourages flexibility through innovative programming, in support of the proposal.</p> <p>The district is seeking to revise its policies to support components of the proposal: 1) to provide students will expanded options for fulfilling graduation requirements through receiving credits for online learning; and 2) to allow the use of digital technology and student-owned devices during the school day and on school buses. This demonstrates the district's commitment to removing barriers and creating successful conditions in support of the proposal.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	2
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>(a) The applicant presented evidence of communication regarding the proposal with various internal and external stakeholders. Student representatives had an opportunity to provide feedback, however, there is no evidence of communication with parents regarding the proposal. While it is important to solicit feedback from stakeholders, it is just as important to engage stakeholders in the development of the proposal. There was no evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal.</p> <p>95% of Garrard County teachers support the grant proposal, which demonstrates teachers' commitment to work toward transforming their classrooms into student-centered, personalized learning environments.</p> <p>(b) Over 30 letters of support are included in the appendix. For twenty-seven of those letters, stakeholders used a template, which included an introductory paragraph and 9 support options from which the stakeholder could choose. In most cases, letters from representatives of organizations were not printed on letterhead. This method of securing letters of support suggests that the district's goal was to collect as many letters as possible. An acceptable letter of support is unique to the organization and is printed on the organization's letterhead.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5
(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant augmented the annual needs assessment with a series of meetings with stakeholders to identify additional needs for the project. These 2 processes, plus an analysis of several measures of student achievement, resulted in a thorough assessment of needs and gaps.</p> <p>The logic model provides a clear articulation of proposal activities, outputs, outcomes/benefits, and impacts. The outcomes/benefits and impacts would address the needs and gaps identified.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>(a) In the personalized learning environment described in this proposal, students would take an active role in their learning. Under the guidance of adult mentors, students would develop goals which they would monitor during weekly advisory sessions. This process would allow students to assess their own progress, develop actions that they can take to enhance their learning, and to take responsibility for improvement.</p> <p>Students would have rich opportunities to master critical content by engaging in learning customized to their interests and learning needs. Challenging activities would be planned to foster deep learning in which students would apply information and interact in meaningful ways with adults and peers. Teachers would receive training in and use the 4-step learning cycle (Zull and Kolb) to facilitate deep student learning.</p> <p>Sub-criterion (A)(iv) was not addressed.</p> <p>(b) An individualized learning plan (ILP) required for students PreK-12 would be used as a powerful tool to plan and manage a rigorous learning program for each student. Parents would be involved in the development of these plans, and would receive regular updates on student progress toward goals. Student learning needs would be met through digital learning through</p>		

learning platforms, wireless technology, and online learning, all of which allow for both acceleration and remediation.

The plan for high need students would address their unique learning needs and support their achievement of college and career-ready standards. They are identified through district data in the state Persistence to Graduation report, and appropriate accommodations and interventions are provided through Response to Intervention, a research-based multi-level intervention system.

Sub-criterion (B)(ii) was not addressed.

(c) The applicant has anticipated the need to train and support student-centered learning environments. They will be provided with technical assistance in using technology and web-based programs and training in setting personal and academic goals geared toward college readiness.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	13
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a) Teachers would receive extensive training in creating personalized learning environments, technology integration and resources, analysis and utilization of data, teacher evaluation system, mentoring and coaching students, and standards-based grading practices. This would prepare them well for their role in personalized learning.

(b) The district plans high quality resources, including the creation of a bank of learning activities that demonstrates deep learning and funding resource teacher and teaching assistant positions to develop and share resources at each school. The quarterly administration of the MAP assessment would provide teachers with actionable feedback regarding student progress that would enhance instructional planning and differentiated approaches.

(c) The state data system would be a valuable asset to school leaders and leadership teams, since it has the capacity to track student growth, connects standards, curriculum, formative assessment, and professional learning to improve student outcomes, teacher effectiveness, and leadership.

Information regarding specific training for leaders and leadership teams, policies, and resources to support their role in structuring effective learning environments was not included.

Selection criteria (d) was not addressed.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	10

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A plan, including goals, activities/rationale, timelines, deliverables, and persons responsible, was not included.

(a) The applicant indicated that central office will be reorganized to provide support needed to develop personalized learning environments, though the details of this reorganization were not provided. Several grant-funded positions would provide dedicated support to direct and manage the project, develop and distribute learning resources, and to support teacher and student use of digital learning devices. These positions are essential for effective project management and program implementation.

Selection criteria (b) was not addressed.

(c) (d) The district is working toward increased flexibility and expanded options to support student success. Policy changes are underway that would allow students to be promoted through the mastery of content standards and to allow for early graduation. Also, the system is seeking ways to provide multiple opportunities for students to demonstrate mastery.

(e) Students with disabilities and ELL would receive a high level of support in participating in personalized learning and innovative educational approaches to address their learning needs. Supervisors and staff who currently work with these students would be responsible for ensuring equity of access and opportunity in this new learning environment.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A plan, including goals, activities/rationale, timelines, deliverables, and persons responsible, was not included.</p> <p>(a) District plans demonstrate a strong commitment to addressing equity issues among Garrard County residents. RTT-D funding would be used to upgrade the technology infrastructure and resources within the district and in Garrard County through new network switches that would increase the ability to have stable connections at all ports This increased power to wireless connections and telephone systems would result in increased internet access in Garrard County. In addition, school buildings would be open for extended hours to increase access to tools and learning resources.</p> <p>(b) Appropriate and timely technical support would be available to families and other stakeholders through a HELP desk which would operate every evening and offer assistance with problems with technology, learning platforms, and connectivity issues. Online support would also be available to families. A high level of technical support for educators was described in sections (C)(1) and (C)(2).</p> <p>Selection criteria (c) was not addressed.</p> <p>(d) The district uses 3 state interoperable data systems: Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (learning materials, student assessment, content, resource sharing) MUNIS (accounting, human resources), and Infinite Campus (student data). To ensure continued interoperability, all programs purchased through the RTT-D grant will be required to have the capability of being interoperable.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	14
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposed a rigorous, comprehensive protocol for continuous improvement which would assess and monitor: 1) implementation and impact; 2) perceived effectiveness, and 3) multiple data sources. The plans for improvement developed as a result of the assessment would be shared with stakeholders through numerous venues (website, local newspaper, Board meeting presentations, school professional learning community meetings).</p> <p>There is also a credible plan for monitoring, measuring, and sharing information about key components of the PEGS Reform Plan (technology, staff, professional development, modeling and sharing the reform).</p> <p>An independent evaluation of the project would be funded by the district. There was no indication as whether this evaluation would be formative or summative.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant identified multiple methods for the engagement of both internal and external stakeholders, ensuring regular and timely communication to maintain community support and transparency. Communication with internal stakeholders includes: professional learning community meetings at the district and school levels, direct e-mail, and videos of exemplary lessons. Communication with external stakeholders includes: district web site, parent/community nights, distribution of informational materials.</p> <p>A grant-funded Director of Public Relations position would be responsible for ongoing stakeholder communication.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provided a rationale for each performance measure selected; all were appropriate and consistent with project goals and outcomes. The rationale for the use of the academic index of the school district as the overall measure of success of the project is sound, since it encompasses annual assessments of all grade levels and subject areas.</p> <p>Projected KPREP proficiency rates for students with disabilities in math (PreK-3, 4-8) and reading (4-8) appear to be too</p>		

ambitious and not achievable. A five- year increase of 68.4 percentage points in reading (4-8), for example, seems unrealistic. For the effective teacher and principal performance measure, the percentages for the grant period decrease instead of increase. It would seem that the district would be working toward increasing the percent of students whose teacher and principal are effective during the 5-year period. Currently, the projection for the post grant period is 0%.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

This section is not included in the application.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The budget appears to be reasonable and sufficient to support the implementation of the project. The district identified funds from a variety of other sources that would be used to support the project, such as salaries of district staff who would implement the project, state technology funding, federal funding-school improvement and Title I, and state funding.

As would be expected based on the focus of the proposal, the largest requested expenditure is for supplies (electronic tables, laptop computers, wifi installation on buses, etc.). Most of the allocation for supplies would be expended in the first year of the grant period.

A rationale for investments and priorities was not presented.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district proposed that sustainability of the project beyond the grant period would be maintained mainly through the formation of a foundation whose purpose would be to raise money through donations, special events, and memberships. Community partners have already pledged monetary donations to sustain the grant, though the amount of these pledges was not specified. It is impossible to determine how viable the foundation would be as a support for sustainability, since an estimate of the cost of sustainability was not provided.

The applicant asserted that initial and follow-up training during the grant period would support sustainability because the need for training for personalized education would lessen after it is fully implemented. The logic of this assertion is faulty; training will need to continue beyond the grant period to refine teacher skills, train new teachers, and familiarize teachers with new resources and technologies.

The applicant suggests that technology will be serviced and replaced, when needed, with foundation funding. Again, depending on the success of fundraising through the foundation, this may not be a viable option.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	2

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

(1) Instead of identifying one partner that would work with the district to support the plan outlined in Absolute Priority 1, several partners and their contributions to the school community were discussed briefly.

Selection criteria (2) and (3) were not addressed.

(4) The various partners would provide such services and resources as enhancing technology resources, teaching anti-bullying

classes in secondary schools, and providing funding for teacher training. While these supports would be an asset to students and teachers, they would not address student's academic, social, or emotional development in a meaningful way.

Selection criteria (5) and (6) were not addressed.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presented a proposal that build on the core assurance areas and would use personalized learning to help students meet college-ready standards. The proposed project would provide students with opportunities to master critical content and address the unique needs of each learner through digital learning platforms and online learning. This project, well implemented, would result in accelerated student learning.

Total	210	127
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0492KY-3 for Garrard County School System

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The plan has a fairly clear and credible vision that addresses all four core educational assurances, and articulates a clear and credible approach to meeting the goals of this grant including accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning and increasing equity. The vision is to create a comprehensive, data rich, online learning environment that manages assessment data, administration data, and core curriculum for personalized learning where students will be able to set their own learning goals, direct their own learning pace and direction and manage their individualized learning using a laptop, notebook or tablet.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) All the schools will be involved in the project. 98% of the teachers signed letters of support for the project. (b) A list of the schools that will participate was provided. (c) The plan included the participating school table which showed 63% low-income students across the district with individual schools ranging from 53% low income to 75%.

This district is taking an equal opportunity approach. All schools will participate and all schools will have access to the new technology and the new on-line learning tools and the new assessments. The personalization is expected to differentiate learning for example, fast students will go fast, slow students can use more time. This grant project will not necessarily ensure that students who have been struggling the most to learn in this district get more access to personalized supports, but instead the on-line learning is expected to eliminate some of the instructional barriers that caused some students to struggle to learn.

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

10

7

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The reform this plan is purposing is to open up access to on-line learning resources so students can pursue personalized learning. In order to accomplish this, the plan addresses the lack of internet access. The district hopes to get all students and families hooked up to 24/7 learning options. Students will have on-line curriculum, as well as the wide range of learning tools available on the web generally. Students will be taught to set their own learning goals and direct much of their own learning with the support and facilitation of a teacher. In the purposed electronic environment students can work at their own pace, and in their own space. For example, snow days no longer have to limit access to a teacher or learning materials. The scale up is connecting the whole community to the internet as a rich learning resource. For the many rural school districts in the country, if this approach does increase and improve student motivate to persist in school can generate a college ready transcript, and enroll in college it could be scale able in many other rural districts (given \$3,000,000.00 extra dollars for electronic devices)

The plan indicates that Internet access is not available throughout the district but this may also be a choice families make to not connect to the internet. If that is the case, this reform may not scale to the whole community.

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

10

7

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(a, b,c,d) The district has set goals, measured by summative achievement tests for closing the achievement gap between low income students and non-low income students and disabled student non- disabled students. They have less ambitious goals for the number of student achieving high scores on the ACT, but they intend to increase graduation rate to 100% and increase college enrollment up for these high need populations from the low 30% to 65% over the course of the grant. These goals align with the expectations of the grant, but would need to be higher if they were to align with the national trend toward college going.

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:

B (1) The district demonstrates a moderate pattern of improvement. The plan addresses all schools equally and aims to address low performance across all schools. (student motivation to engage and persist in formal learning seems to be a district wide concern). This plan aims to increase the availability of student achievement data for teachers, students, families and school leaders.

The plan presents a table with a pattern of success for all students, students with disabilities and low income students. The numbers do not match the tables presented in A (4) which makes it a little confusing to understand. For example in A(4) the district shows low income students in 2011 at about 30% proficient with a goal of 64% of low income K-8 students proficient on the KPRE in 2014. On the B(1) table showing growth over four years low income students are shown at 61% in 2011. If these numbers actually add up, it is not clear how.

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

5

3

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The plan describes the districts' commitment to transparency, as evidenced by the district's open and public business meetings which are also video-taped for the community to access after the meeting. While general business is open to public view,

there was no mention of how, if at all, the district makes salaries public. In the plan there were no salaries described.

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

10

8

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The district appears to have the authority to provide personalized learning as long as it is aligned to the state's standards and students demonstrate proficiency on the state tests.

The district included policies that govern student internet access and sharing student data. This maybe evidence that the district is thinking in detail about some of the potential challenges of implementing a transparent data driven on-line learning program.

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

10

7

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The plan provides a detailed list of grant planning meetings including the safety committee, the drug task force, the district attorney, the students on the superintendents' student advisory committee, district literacy team and math team and the school board- to name a few. There was no specific parent in-put unless the parents were a part of the family resource center meetings. There are letters of support from some community stakeholders but they convey only general support in tone and content. While the plan reflects that stakeholders were informed of the plan, other than the internet company, and the policy for protecting the devices, and a new foundation for supporting electronic learning after the grant, there is no direct contribution or involvement of stakeholders in helping the district accomplish the goals. That said, 95% of the teachers, the most imporant group, support the plan.

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

5

4

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The plan describes an annual needs assessment process. A recent assessment process identified students need to learn to show what they know on academic achievement tests, the district needs to increase graduation rate, the district needs to create a pro-education culture of college going and career readiness, and the district needs to find ways to motivate students to learn. The logic in this plan is to address all of these needs through personalization, online learning platforms and connectivity to the broader world through the internet. The plan seems to have the right activitites in place to address their needs and accomplish the goals of this grant.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) This plan adequately addresses all but the criteria "exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning." This is a homogenous community and this criteria is important if these students are preparing to integrate into the larger world. The only mention of this criteria was stated in support of access to the internet so students could see the diversity in the world over the internet. Virtual exposure to diversity is insufficient to prepare students to live and work in diverse communities. Rural communities are faced with the challenge of preparing their students to stay in the community and increase and enhance the communities economic base or to leave the community to pursue work and learning elsewhere. This plan does not suggest that it is preparing students for one or the other but with high unemployment in the community students need to be prepared to work and even live outside of the community, even if they choose not to. Virtual expose to the world, may be better than no exposure to the world, but these students would still not have an equal

opportunity to learn to participate in the bigger world if they do not have direct access to diverse cultures and perspectives. Some students will take college visit trips, this is a step in the right direction but insufficient to meet this criterion.

(i) This plan satisfies this criteria. It includes teaching students to set personal learning SMART goals which are used to guide and personalize their learning plans.

(ii) As a part of Gear-up this district plans to use the ACT plan to help establish college going motivation and to provide personalized academic and test prep aiming for high scores on the ACT in Junior year. There is no mention of the state's college readiness standards, but there are multiple activities aimed to cultivating student interest in going to college.

(iii) The plan has a design for age appropriate "deep learning experiences" primarily provided through student computer interactions and on-line learning.

(iv) This criteria is not addressed. The district demographics appear to be fairly homogeneous making this a particularly important area to address.

(v) The focus in the plan is primarily to personalize student's academic experiences. Teamwork, critical thinking, creativity and problem solving are not directly addressed.

(b) (i) This plan intends to put in place an a sequence of instructional content that students can master in a personalized manner.

(ii,iii) The district aims to access state produced content aligned to state standards, and a wide variety of on-line resources for example, instructional videos, educational apps and college courses.

(iv) The purchased electronic learning environments and the state's assessment and data system are expected to provide regular feedback to students, parents and teachers

(A) The state's Infinite Campus frequently updates individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery of grade level and content standards.

(B) The elearning environments intend to personalize learning based on students' current interests and available content.

(v) The opportunity to personalize learning is intended to support all learners and allow students to pace and direct their learning. The district does have some practices in place to monitor student progress and intervene with additional supports, other than providing wifi access in locations that do not have it, there is little description of how the district will differentiate instruction for students who struggle to learn in the district.

(c) This plan provides appropriately generous support to teachers to learn to teach students to use the these etools and devices to learn to personalize their learning.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) This plan does provide for teachers to work collaboratively to learn to personalize instruction. Teachers have either a grade level team or a PLC to collaborative group to work with. New teachers also have mentors.

(i) The plan provides appropriately generous professional learning supports using a variety of coaches, collaborative teams, school visits, and training.

ii) The plan emphasizes students setting their own goals based on their own interests at the same time as describing personalized learning aligned standards and assessment to the state expectations. How much a student can personalize the direction and focus of their learning seems limited to content within the standards that can be assessed on the state tests. This could be a challenge.

(iii) This plan calls for an increase in assessments including AIMSweb and MAP. These assessments are constructed to test different things and they use different test methods. They will both provide test scores, but the test scores are not comparable. Adding in the state tests and the think link assessments will provide teachers more test scores but not more coherence between their assessments. The plan provides training on personalization and elearning but no training on statistically analyzing test scores.

(iv) The district has supports in place to provide teachers and leaders feedback. The budget includes money for video cameras for teachers to record their instruction and create a model lesson library. This has the potential to provide powerful

feedback to teachers.

The new principal evaluation system was piloted in 2011. It seems to be tied to similar expectations as the teachers' to use multiple measures and demonstrate student growth.

(b) Yes there seems to be adequate support for teachers and principals to learn to use the new tools and all the data environments, but as mentioned above there is no apparent data analysis training.

(i) This idea of actionable data has everything to do with how well teachers and leaders understand what the data show. This is often a problem making even specific, accurate and timely data incoherent. Without specific training in statistics much of the data is likely to be misinterpreted and underutilized.

(ii, iii) Yes, these have not been chosen yet, but assuming they choose high quality resources from the ample choices available on the market, this expectation should be met.

(c) Yes, the plan provides ample resources for this.

(i) Yes, the teacher evaluation system, the state's assessment and data systems, the information from students' elearning tools, teachers' meetings and trainings should all provide ample information for principals to design and take steps for continuous improvement assuming they have training to do so.

(ii) The plan targets teachers learning to teach students to be effective learners in a highly tested and personalized learning environment.

(d) The plan does not mention hard to staff schools or problems with finding math and science teachers but the district is not showing strength in mathematics (No attention in this plan goes to increasing and improving math teachers' content knowledge.)

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	13
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: There seems to be complete support from the district school board and the state school board as indicated by the statement "The Garrard County Board of Education with assistance from the Kentucky School Boards Association, will revise all the policies and rules needed to advance the Race to the Top PEGS initiative." (a) The plan recognizes the challenges of the proposed reform and the reorganization of the central office to support the transformation to personalized learning. Positions include District Director of Innovations, and Resource teacher. Current positions of tech director, central office supervisors, assessment coordinator, and supervisor of ELL will be repurposed to support the grant. (b) All school and district leaders are expected to support the PEG project. (c ,d,e) In addition to the increase in assessments and establishing a comprehensive elearning environment students are expected to learn to set their own goals, monitor their progress toward meeting standards, direct their learning based on their own interests and their own pace.		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (a) <i>This plan takes an equal opportunity approach, providing the same opportunities to learn to all students with the expectation that personalization will differentiate for students' different needs. There is some discussion in the plan about using instructional strategies suggested by Eric Jenson to address the needs of low-income students.</i> (b) <i>The plan provides adequate support for training teachers who will train students and parents to use the new tools. The plan also provides adequate support for remote access to wifi in places in the district where wifi is not available and for technical support in the classroom for teachers are using devices and online resources.</i> (c) <i>Yes, this plan has attended to to the need for teachers, students and parents to export and import data and to use data</i>		

as a part of the personalization process. There is adequate support for this as has been described elsewhere in this review.

(d) Yes, the state provides this for all school district through infinite campus.

In order to provide access to online learning resources 24/7, to all of the students and families in the district, the district proposes to partner with the local internet company to eliminate two barriers to the internet 1) no connectivity 2) high cost of internet services increase access to the internet throughout their community. Additionally, the district will equip school buses with wifi, for the 58 minute average bus ride. The buses will be available to remote parts of the district afterschool, weekends and over holidays for remote community access to wifi. This strength in the vision is also a weakness. The intent is not aligned to high standards and though students may be motivated to work on a laptop or table, these devices are unlikely to help students prepare a college ready transcript.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: There is a detailed plan to monitor and adjust grant activities based on the implementation/learning needs of teachers, changes in students achievement and changes in programs. Survey's will be used to collect feedback from students. parents and community members. Continued analysis of student achievement data will also determine needs for improvement. With the plan's increased attention to and reporting of students' achievement data the community should be well informed about the changes in program and outcomes of the grant. The grant involves all teachers working in at least one professional learning communities which will generate a network of teacher interactions which will be another informal although source of monitoring and reporting on the grant's investments.		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: The plan puts a lot of weight on the power of communication. The budget has funds for a PR professional. The budget narrative states that the project will not be success without this postilion. This position is a full time communication specialist focused on informing the community and the public at large how the grant is proceeding. The success of the project might speak for itself in a small community but the district clearly values the power of a well crafted and position message. The plan also describes regular public meetings, the development of a website to communicate grant activity as well as the use of the teacher network to communicate. There is more than enough attention to on-going communication with the public about in the grant activity.		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: Yes, this plan provides detailed lists of the students achievement measures the district will use over the all grades to monitor and report student acheivments. This plan includes increasing performance measures available to teachers, leaders, students and families. The measures that have been identified are common in many school districts and provide a variety of feedback including Immediate feedback, student growth over a year, annual summative, benchmarks and the like. Additionally, this plan includes the need to train teachers to learn to use new instructional strategies. Teachers will be video taping themselves which can provide powerful feedback about their progress toward using effective instructional strategies- but there is no training directly oriented toward teachers' learning to analyze video records of their own instructional practice. Research suggests this is challenging to learn (see Winshitl and Thompson, 2011).		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	4
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:		

The focus is on measuring success as improvement in student tests, reducing the differences in test scores between the dominant group of students and subgroups, graduation rates and college enrollment. This plan's theory of action is to introduce internet based learning and in order to do that they district will reorganize and hire multiple positions to support the transformation of the district into an organization that supports personalized learning. These are probably wise choices, but the measures in this plan will not help the district evaluate which of their activities contributed to their goals. Much of the work of the project targets changes in instructional practices and learning environments for students and achievement test scores will not provide useful information about which, if any, changes in instructional made the difference.

The plan does not specify professional development training through technology or the use of community partners or compensation reforms- although there is funding in the grant that does in effect modify teacher time and pay and the school schedule for professional development but the grant does not focus on innovations in schedules, training or compensation.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: The budget is reasonable and sufficient for the reforms proposed. There is sufficient attention to teacher training, and the costs associated with transitioning to a technology based instructional practice including equalizing access to internet for all students. The one time investments are primarily in the purchase of electronic devices and broadband infrastructure development. These costs are likely to reoccur after the grant is completed although it is hard to know where the internet/cloud technology will be in four years, there are plans in place for a foundation to pick up these costs of sustained online learning opportunities.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	4
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: <i>The district included the replacement of 75 tablets and 75 laptops over the course of four years. The plan also describes scanning student's equipment when t on each bus ride and to have law enforcement help with the protection of the electronic devices. This seems like a high level of concern for the safety of these devises given that districts with one-to-one computing generally report little to no loss or damage to these devices. If students do not attach to and take care of the devices this plan is not sustainable.</i> <i>The plan for sustaining the project's costs, after the grant, is to create a foundation for which funders have already been identified. In four years these devices will be outdated, their operating systems will be outdated and the assessments and learning platform subscriptions will need to be paid for every year as will the new positions that are created under this plan and are likely to need to continue. While the district plan makes sense while it is supported by the grant, it seems unlikely to be sustainable.</i>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	4
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:		

1) This section of the plan is weak. This plan does provide a description of partnerships with public and private organizations, including child care providers, law enforcement, health department, chamber of commerce and a foundation. These partnership are not arranged for the particular purpose of leveraging or sustaining the grant funds to accomplish joint goals. For example, in the description of the partners there was no mention of working together to promote the value of education and 24/7 learning throughout the community or to jointly promote college enrollment. The partners are described more as add on, or community assets rather than integrated as a part of the project goals.

(2, 3, 6) There were no measurable outcomes identified for partners.

(4) The health department and the theater had direct education connections but neither were integrated into the core focus of the grant.

(5) Not elaborated

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

This plan does address real educational needs in the community in a way that is comprehensive and logically coherent. The plan puts appropriate resources in place to address the core assurances, the needs in the district and it aims to meet the goal of increasing college readiness and enrollment for the students in this school community.

Total	210	147
-------	-----	-----