



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1285VA-1 for Isle of Wight County Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide a coherent nor comprehensive reform vision. Little evidence is provided regarding the four core educational assurance areas. The plan does not address how the approach will provide personalized student support, nor how equity would be increased. Several inconsistencies in the brief plan raises concerns; the plan targets elementary schools, arguing for their importance as foundational to other reform efforts. Yet the only example of the i-SLI 21 project, a division-wide initiative, is at the high school level, and college prep and dual enrollment courses are cited as "a top priority." The plan highlights that "creative techniques for instruction" will be developed, and the culture will "encourage creativity." How this aspect of the plan aligns to the effort to continue to have teachers "embed best practices for test taking across all formats" remains unclear.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant approach to implementing its reform proposal supports a moderately high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation, per the criteria. The applicant provides the list of participating schools, along with the numbers and characteristics, per above, of the participating students. The process the applicant used to select the schools is not provided.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide sufficient evidence of a high-quality plan for scaling up the reform proposal, nor for translating it into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools. No goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties are indicated. The core district plan has been initiated from the high school level, with a one-to-one technology program, and the proposal seeks funding to support the elementary schools in unspecified ways, such that local and state funds "can be directed at launching the initiative at the remaining three schools." Several sections of the text provided repeat verbatim prior text of the proposal. No evidence is provided for the plan's logic model or theory of change.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides limited evidence of ambitious yet achievable annual goals. No evidence is provided of goals for graduation rates nor college enrollment rates. The sub-group goals vary significantly; baseline division scores rise 103% and 46% for students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged student respectively, while white student goals are for a 14% increase. It is abundantly unclear how the vision relates to such disproportionate impact.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	3
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides very limited evidence of a track record of success in the past four years. The narrative provided focuses primarily on high school-related indicators, though the applicant seeks support for four elementary schools. SOS levels show some quite moderate progress until the standards were adjusted in the last testing cycle; even prior to the adjustment, percent proficient remained constant, though failure dropped and advanced level increased from 33-41%. Further data is provided in seven appendices in tabular form, without analysis or commentary. Limited data for all four elementary schools is provided, given the three different grade level configurations across the four sites. Three AY's are provided, and progress appears uneven, with some drops and recovery, along with some moderate rises, across the three year span. Evidence is provided of how scores are reported to students and families; the formats include performance-level descriptors and per question response reports. Evidence is provided (though the student population is not identified) showing student achievement by sub-groups; most sub-groups show declines across the three year span, AY10 to AY12 - Black, Hispanic, Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantage and LEP - across English and Mathematics performance.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides moderate evidence of a high level of transparency at the district level, and a detailed articulation of the budget history and challenges over the last three years. Limited evidence is provided, however, of transparency at the school level for actual personnel salaries of instructional and support staff, for teachers only or non-personnel expenditures.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides strong evidence that State legal, statutory and regulatory requirements provide the conditions and autonomy needed to implement a personalized learning environment, that certainly sufficient to the extent that personalized learning environments are indicated in the proposal.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	4
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a moderate level of evidence of stakeholder support and moderate/low evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement. Letters of support from teachers are minimal, though what percent is represents is unclear; evidence of student and family support is not provided. Principal support is not indicated. Some eight community organization support letters, including from a local business or two, are included.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide evidence of a high-quality plan for an analysis of the applicant's current status. No goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties are indicated. No means nor processes are described for identifying needs and gaps, and no theory of change or reform model logic is provided.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	7
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides low to moderate evidence of a high-quality plan for an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students that 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. Very limited evidence of specific goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties is provided. The plan evidence includes proposed learning devices for all participating students, increased professional development for faculty, and additional support positions to facilitate integration (Instructional Technology Resource Teachers at each site, and Math Intervention teachers at each site). Math Intervention teachers would be hired immediately upon receipt of the grant, in order to help prepare students for end-of-year assessments; while the timing makes sense, issues such targeted use of the proposed personnel pose to efforts to personalize the learning environment are neither noted nor addressed. The data system, by applicant testimony, will need to be replaced/updated to serve personalization purposes, as appears to be an in-house configuration based in Excel and Access; it would not appear capable at this time to meet the ongoing and regular feedback criteria above, nor does the plan provide evidence the applicant has more than general solution criteria developed. It remains unclear the strategy for the effective implementation of the resources requested, nor the logic model for the reforms within the larger district plan now initiating at the high school level. Little evidence is provided for the sub-criteria a-c above. Very limited evidence of specific goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties is provided.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	8
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides moderate evidence of a high-quality plan for a teaching/leading approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students that 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. Some limited evidence of specific goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties is provided, particularly for initial professional development and ongoing review/adjustment processes. Evidence is provided for some professional collaboration opportunities, and includes use of frequent measures of student achievement, teacher evaluation system feedback (none indicated for administrators), and incorporation into existing professional community activities. It remains unclear from the plan how specifically the plan addresses the creation of personalized learning environments and strategies; e.g., data from state standardized tests will be used to identify "pacing and curriculum alignment" issues, so that teachers may adjust their instruction. How such adjustments relate to personalization is not clear. The content/approach of the onsite/online professional development proposed, beyond basic operations of the device and a general indication of "leveraging the full potential of the one-to-one initiative" based on needs assessment at each school, is unspecified. The impact of the rollout of a new teacher evaluation system raises implementation questions unaddressed, including the relation of that system to the goals of this proposal. The plan does not address how the applicant will address hard-to-staff schools, subjects and specialty areas.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides moderate evidence of a high-quality plan to support project implementation. Evidence is provided of a restructured central office organization, with a clearer delineation of academic and non-academic functions; considerable additional central office staffing appears to have occurred as well, and appears addressed toward functions supportive of the overall plan. Site autonomy appears moderate, with input, participation and "ability to recommend," but little evidence of sufficient flexibility and autonomy regarding schedules, personnel decisions, staffing models, roles, budgets, etc. Policy supports the opportunity for students to progress via demonstration, more than one opportunity/format appears to exist for doing so, and training/resources are provided for students with disabilities. However, it is unclear how actual opportunities for progressing via mastery, opportunities beyond benchmarks/SOL's, and training/resources regarding ELL's are provided.

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

10

6

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides moderate evidence of a high-quality plan to support project implementation per this criterion. The application indicates access to iPads, related training and common resources for all students and parents, along with four-tier technical support. Evidence is not provided to show that a plan exists to provide the information for export in an open data format, nor for interoperable data systems.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	9
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant provides moderate evidence of a high-quality approach to continuously improve its plan. Continuous feedback and evaluation are to occur on a quarterly (overall initiative, professional development), annual (digital content) and unspecified basis (grant funded positions). While multiple sources of evidence will be used, including student/parent/teacher surveys, and a conceptual framework is cited, the means by which feedback will inform revisions/corrections to particular components are not specified. The applicant commits to sharing information publicly in several ways. Post-grant activities are not specifically addressed.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant provides clear evidence of strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. The applicant provides a strategic communications plan for the coming school year that addresses this criterion well.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant provides a dozen achievable if not necessarily ambitious performance measures, one with an unclear set of targets. More than one measure includes targets that result in increased sub-group/all-students inequities (e.g., the number and percentage of participating students whose teacher of record and principal are an effective teacher and effective principal; gaps for economically disadvantaged/all, disabilities/all increase; black/all is flat over the span of the grant to post-grant year). The applicant provides a rationale for the measures, though without indication of the linkage to the plan's theory of action. No plan is provided for the review/improvement of the measures should they prove insufficient to gauge implementation.</p>		

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides limited evidence of a high-quality plan to evaluate effectiveness of RtT-D funded activities. The applicant indicates evaluation will take place at the building level, and that the division technology adoption committee, division software committee and division procurement officer will evaluate respective aspects of the plan as well. How the various components will be evaluated in any systemic way across sites is unstated. Prior sections provide some evidence of addressing this criterion.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a clearly described budget, identifying all funds that will support the project, and providing a reasonable rationale for the investments. The budget seems aligned in a sufficient and reasonable way with the actions proposed in the plan, though it provides only moderate distinction between one-time and ongoing costs. The degree that the budget ensures long-term sustainability is unclear, given the heavy dependence on grant funding for the devices and personnel for implementation. Over 80% of the budget goes to personnel and contractual services, and 74% of the latter is for leasing of the mobile devices. Digital materials development depends in part on \$1,000,000 in teacher stipends, in large part for the development of electronic textbooks by district teachers. This "critical component" is not given prominence elsewhere in the proposal, and so its role in the larger theory of change is unclear. A few expenses seem relatively unspecified or unclear in their relation to the reform strategy; e.g., the purchase of 200 LCD projectors. Sustainability seems an achievable commitment made in the plan, assuring that local funds will be allocated to maintain current levels of supplies, professional development and operational costs; the project plan represents 5.6% of the district's FY12 budget.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	1
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide a plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. A pledge to allocate local funding is made, though with uncertain timeframe.</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>No evidence is provided of an effort to integrate public or private resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students, giving highest priority to students in participating schools with high-need students.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: Per prior comments to the level of coherence and comprehensiveness of the applicant's plan, the applicant does not provide overall a coherent and comprehensive plan per the absolute priority stated here.</p>		

Total	210	88
--------------	------------	-----------

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	0
<p>Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments: No optional budget supplement is provided.</p>		



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1285VA-2 for Isle of Wight County Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant is targeting four elementary schools with this proposal and the students in those schools meet the requirements for this Application. The goal is to provide students with a strong foundation at the elementary level to develop skills and knowledge that will lead to successful graduation and entry into careers and college. Each school will develop creative techniques for instruction that allow for engagement and interactive environments. A plan will be created to increase instructional time, teacher training, early childhood education and secondary educational programs. This project will complement another project, i-SLE 21, which will increase instructional capacity, providing opportunity for teacher success with a cutting edge environment that fosters engagement and interactive learning progression for our students.</p> <p>This section does not adequately articulate a comprehensive and coherent reform vision. The applicant does not describe how it will specifically address the four core educational assurance and the plan to accelerate student achievement is discussed in vague and general terms. While the i-SLE 21 program sounds promising, the applicant does not explain exactly how it will complement and be coordinated with this project.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a detailed list of the schools and students that will be participating in this project. The percentages overall and in subgroups are identified. The total number of participating students (2,242) exceeds the 2,000 minimum required for LEA eligibility. 924 of the participating students receive free and reduced lunch, which equates to 41%. The applicant has identified our high-needs students as those who have failed one or more state assessments while in elementary school. 409 students in the participating population meet this definition of high need for school district. The applicant does not specifically explain why these schools were selected and not other schools. Because of the lack of information regarding that aspect of the criterion, the maximum number of points were not awarded.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant indicates a commitment to provide access to high quality learning experiences and resources that are personalized, targeted, flexible and available on-demand 24-7 inside and outside the classroom walls and schedules. This is proposed by utilizing technology as a tool to help transform learning in the applicant's schools. The school board has already prioritized funding to support a one-to-one technology initiative for all high school students, with the eventual goal of extending this effort down to our middle and elementary schools.</p>		

The applicant’s strategic plan includes goals for increasing academic achievement, and providing rigorous academic programs and career preparation for all students. By targeting elementary students, the applicant hopes to raise the performance of all students and ensure they have a strong background before moving to middle and high school.

The applicant's plan to scale up and translate this project into meaningful change is sketchy, lacking specific details regarding how this will be done. There is insufficient information provided regarding the process, procedures and activities the applicant will use to accomplish the requirements of this criterion. For that reason only half of the points possible are being awarded for this section.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides student achievement goals that appear to be ambitious, but should be achievable. Goals are provided for students overall and for appropriate subgroups of students. The goals are appropriate for the current status of the school district and participating students as described by the applicant. For instance, the percentile of all participating students is projected to increase 12 points in math, from 61 to 73. The increase in English achievement is projected to increase points, from 85 to 93. However, the applicant does not provide any narrative explaining the goals selected. This would give a context to better understanding why the applicant selected these goals and how they fit into the overall reform plan proposed by the applicant. In addition, there is not graduation or college enrollment data provided. For these reasons the maximum number of points were not awarded.

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	8

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes a system that does allow teachers, students and parents access to data that can be used to improve student performance. Online report cards provide detailed information on student achievement by subject and grade level. Report cards also provide data on other key indicators of school quality. The school district posts a link to the report cards on their website. In addition, the school district mails student reports of their performance on state assessments to families over the summer.

The applicant utilizes a program that compiles student data from school-based assessments, including division benchmark tests. Teachers and administrators review this data immediately to determine student mastery or identify areas for remediation. Parents also have access to their child’s grades through a parent web portal that is a component of the district's Student Information System. This allows parents, and students, to view grades at any time and monitor progress over the course of the school year.

The applicant does not address its record of improving student learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps, particularly in its low-achieving or low-performing schools. For this reason, only 15 of the total 20 points available for this criterion were awarded.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant reports that it has processes in place to communicate school-level expenditures from State and local funds. Items such as actual personnel salaries and expenditures for instruction are provided in public forums, budget documents, the school division website, presentations and collateral materials. The process described by the applicant appears to meet the minimum requirements of this criterion that a description be provided of the extent to which the applicant already makes available the categories of school-level expenditures from State and local funds. While

overall this is good response to this criterion, the applicant did not provide sufficient information at the individual school level. For this reason the entire number of points available for this section is not awarded.

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

10

7

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant notes that it adheres to requirements in state law and policies of the State Board of Education and several policies of the local school district directly support personalized learning environments for students. Current state law allows schools flexibility in awarding course credit to students without having to meet the 140-clock-hour requirement. Upon recommendation of the superintendent and demonstration of mastery of course content and objectives, qualified students may receive a standard unit of credit and be permitted to sit for the relevant state mandated test to earn a verified credit The Superintendent determines the manner in which a student may demonstrate mastery of course content and objectives, and documentation showing mastery is maintained in the student’s permanent record.

Students may also earn verified credits by taking alternative tests to the state mandated assessment. Such tests may only be those approved by the Virginia Board of Education, and the student earns verified credits only by achieving a score established by the Board of Education.

Although the applicant describes some flexibility and autonomy from state regulations and requirements these are minimal and, as described, do not rise to the level necessary to design and implement meaningful and significant reform necessary to personalized learning environments to the extent addressed in this Application.

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

10

6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes some engagement and stakeholder involvement in the development of this proposal. Principals and assistant principals provided input on its development. They responded to sections of the application, providing their insight as to where the school district is currently, and what the district needs to do to move forward. Teachers received information on the proposal and through their signature verified their support of the grant proposal.

The applicant also noted that information on the proposal has been shared with key stakeholders. As evidence of this the applicant refers to letters of support from localities, area colleges, communities and businesses are included for review in the Appendix.

While the applicant does indicate involvement of stakeholder in the proposal development, there is an inadequate description of the nature and extent of that involvement. Nor does the applicant explain how teachers provided input and support or how input was actually used in development of the program. Input and engagement appears to have taken place after the proposal was already developed.

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

5

3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant notes that the performance of its elementary students in math and English denotes a significant gap between the achievement levels of all students when compared with achievement levels in the identified subgroups, and that its proposal focuses on developing personalized learning environments these so their instruction can be prescriptive. Instruction will be tailored to take each student from his or her current level and move and to assist each student with achieving, at a minimum, proficiency in each content area for his or her grade level. The program does not have a single goal of remediating for all students. Rather, through personalized learning, students can move forward at their own pace, leading to opportunities for project-based learning, exposure to diverse curriculum, as well as a deeper understanding of content and acceleration.

While the overall goal is appropriate and impressive, this section does not meet the requirement of a high quality plan. It lacks sufficient detail regarding specific gaps in student performance; an explanation of the logic underlying the plan and specifically how the plan will address identified gaps.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	10
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposes a three-pronged approach for developing a personalized learning environment for students. The first prong focuses on providing participating students with resources that enhance personalized learning environments and support students based on where they are academically and where they need to be. The second area consists of intensive professional development for staff and students on implementation of resources, both material and human, to assist with improving student achievement. The third component of the plan involves reviewing student data to modify instruction so participating students remain on target to graduate with their cohort.</p> <p>As part of the project the school district will provide each student at the participating elementary schools with a mobile technology device. The devices will allow teachers to utilize online programs, electronic textbooks, mobile apps and digital media to develop a personalized learning environment for each student.</p> <p>Students in the school district are given both the instruction and the freedom to select their own learning resources. Through implementation of one-to-one technology, and digital resources, including electronic textbooks, the applicant intends to tailor instruction to each student’s specific needs. As a result, the applicant plans to leverage technology in support of a blended learning environment. Teachers and administrators will also participate in professional development to assist them in transforming their classroom from a standardized environment to a hybrid model by utilizing technology and digital resources. In addition, Instructional Technology Resource Teachers (ITRT) will be employed to assist with training and support in the implementation of new technology and programs.</p> <p>Math Intervention teachers will be added at the participating schools to provide content specific strategies to grade level teachers, focusing on providing individualized instruction for each child. The intervention teachers will collaborate with classroom teachers on planning and delivery, model math instruction, and co-teach with teachers when needed.</p> <p>Presently the school district is using a very utilitarian data system, which does not allow for a quick exchange of data from various sources. The applicant plans to implement a more robust system that will allow tracking student data by subject, grade, teacher, and demographic categories.</p> <p>The applicant presents a plan that provides a good overall structure for promoting and enhancing student achievement and outcomes. However, there are problems with the plan, as it is described. It does not provide specific information regarding how the applicant will use technology, particularly mobile devices, to expand and improve instruction and to create personalized learning environment. It is just noted that students will use those devices. There is no explanation of how the applicant will adapt content and instruction to provide opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks. And, the applicant does not specifically address instruction and skill development necessary for career and college success. Although a mention is made of "intensive" professional development," no information is provided regarding how all participating educators will have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	12
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The applicant presents a plan in which the implementation of a one-to-one initiative will produce a professional development program that will provide teachers with the skills necessary to transform their teaching and classroom environment into become more personalized for their students. Initial training in the Fall of 2013 will be dedicated to the basic operation of the mobile device. Further sessions will introduce various forms of digital content and how this content can be incorporated into existing curricula. Teachers and administrators will also participate in sessions on digital citizenship.

Teachers will participate in staff development where they will learn strategies to increase student engagement, differentiate instruction, and analyze data to inform student learning. According to the applicant's plan, schools will expand on teacher collaboration through the use of Professional Learning Communities, peer observation and grade level planning.

The applicant revised its teacher evaluation system for the 2012-13 school year to include a performance standard based on student achievement. The evaluation process covers all professional and instructional areas. Teachers receive immediate feedback as the administrators complete a walk-through, observation or evaluation. The teacher and administrator meet to review the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson. Strategies are shared for improving student engagement and lesson delivery if these are areas of concern.

While the proposed plan has some very strong features it lacks sufficient detail to be a high quality plan. The applicant notes that a "Needs Assessment" will determine the areas each participating school must address in their School Improvement Plans and this will somehow help guide the development of project activities. However, it isn't explained exactly how it will be done and how the needs assessment will be translated into meeting the instructional needs of individual students. The applicant notes that the objective for all the forms of training and professional development will be to improve student achievement by creating personalized learning environments for each child, but there is not sufficient information provided regarding how that will be done. The applicant does not explain, as required by this criterion, how it will ensure that high-quality learning resources, including digital resources, as appropriate, that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements, and the tools to create and share new resources will be determined, developed or provided and used. Nor does the applicant provide a plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals, including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects, and specialty areas.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	14

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence that it has in place policy and practice that provides the Superintendent with the authority to organize staff in any form that he/she believes will enhance productivity and increase school district efficiency and effectiveness. A recent reorganization added or restructured positions in order to provide a focus on the four core content areas (English, Social Studies, Math, Science), as well as instructional technology and accountability.

All schools in the district have a School Leadership Team (SLT), or equivalent, consisting of teacher representation from grade levels and/or content areas. SLT members facilitate communication between the building administration and teachers. They also assist with decision-making and problem-solving for the school. The budget process requires schools to submit itemized budget requests in which they identify how they plan to allocate their funds. Administrators, with input from staff and parents, can use their funding to support their areas of greatest need.

The applicant also provides evidence that it has the ability to give students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not solely on the amount of time spent on a topic. According to the applicant,

students in the district are given the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways.

A weakness with this section is that the applicant does not provide sufficient information regarding how it provides learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English language learners. The applicant does describe a process by which students with disabilities are included into regular education classes and notes that students with disabilities are issued an iPad for use at school and at home with specific applications tailored to meet the need of each student. However, this only provides a broad and general explanation for how learning resources and instructional practices are fully accessible to all students, and it does not address the needs of English language learners.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
---	-----------	----------

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes a district initiative leading to all students using the Apple iPad 3 as the primary teaching platform. The initiative began in 2012 in the high schools by providing iPads to all students, teachers and administrators for twenty-four hour use. The program includes professional development and Parent Nights, to educate teachers and parents on the iPad and the teaching style designed specifically for the device. The initiative is also using the Apple

Textbook initiative, combined with the Casper Suite by JAMF Software, in order to deploy textbooks directly to the student’s iPad for use both on-site and off-site. The applicant has also designed and implemented a four tier support system for students, teachers and parents if the need for iPad troubleshooting occurs during the initiative.

The iPad initiative is very promising and has the potential for opening new avenues for learning and teaching among educators, parents and students. But, as a high-quality plan to meet the purposes of the Race to the Top, it is too narrow and underdeveloped and limited in its focus. It does not meet the intent of this particular criterion of providing a “range of strategies.” The technical support described by the applicant focuses primarily on hardware issues, not on the use of mobile devices to enhance, expand and personalize learning.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes an effective evaluation plan to provide timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals. The applicant will develop a program evaluation committee consisting of key central office staff, building level administrators and teachers who will meet quarterly to evaluate and monitor progress of grant programs. Utilizing Stufflebeam’s (2002) evaluation model, evaluators will evaluate four key areas of the grant to monitor and make adjustments based on long term goals. Program evaluation areas will include one-to-one technology initiative, digital content to include data management system, ongoing professional development and grant funded positions. The one-to-one initiative will be evaluated using baseline and current student achievement data, district benchmark data, attendance data, discipline data and overall district trend data to analyze whether the implementation of one-to-one technology is narrowing subgroup gaps and providing personalized learning venues for all students.

According to the applicant, the project evaluation will guide ongoing professional development and the search for additional software and e-text supports to help reach program goals. The evaluation team will review the project quarterly in order to monitor and make adjustments as needed. Evaluation results will drive professional development plans and the restructuring of support positions to better support efficiency and consistency. Input will also be obtained from building level support positions such as ITRT’s, math intervention specialists and reading specialists

to help guide and monitor the plan. The applicant also explains that it will share ongoing information and progress regarding the project through its website, news releases and local board meetings.

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

5

4

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant reports that it has adopted a Strategic Communication Plan designed to establish a comprehensive process for delivering the school district’s message through a proactive, consistent, multi-faceted approach. The plan focuses on improving communication with the school system’s internal and external audience. Avenues to be used for this communication plan include:

Electronic: Division website, School web pages, Division Intranet site, District News (internal email), Targeted e-mail lists, AlertNow System

Social Media: Twitter, Facebook and You Tube

Broadcast and Print: Local news stations, County Public Affairs channel, local newspapers and magazines, brochures, targeted mailing lists

Interpersonal: Various meetings--Town Hall, School Board, Board of Supervisors, Staff,

Civic and Council: Leadership conferences and luncheons, County Education Foundation.

While there are a variety of excellent avenues identified by the applicant to promote communication and engagement within the school district, the applicant does not explain how those avenues will be used to promote communication and engagement regarding the activities and goals of this particular project. The district’s Strategic Communication Plan to which the applicant refers to in this section, and which is included in the Appendix, is an overall plan for the district as a whole and does not speak directly to this project.

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

5

3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant identifies performance measures for math, English achievement, discipline and attendance. The measures are ambitious, but achievable. The process for obtaining the data and the reasons for using those measures are also explained. For math and English achievement preliminary data will be collected through quarterly benchmark assessments, allowing adjustments in instruction, as well as remediation, before the end-of-year state mandate tests. The state will provide the district with comprehensive reports of student performance by standard and by question. Student performance will be tracked and compared to target performance in the RTT-D grant. Annual targets can be adjusted upward if students are exceeding proposed achievement levels. For below-target performance, teachers and administrators will review state and local reports on student performance and identify modifications to curriculum, such as alignment, pacing, and common assessments

By implementing strategies to reduce disciplinary issues, the applicant believes student performance will improve. Discipline data can be tracked and evaluated at least biannually and compared to student achievement. Schools can evaluate data and strategies in place to determine what modifications need to occur to keep the school district on track to reach proposed targets. The applicant notes that a student’s attendance also has a direct correlation to a student’s achievement. Students with poor attendance often demonstrate below average achievement as evidenced by class grades, division benchmarks and state assessments. By implementing strategies to improve attendance, student performance will improve.

While, overall, this section provides effective and appropriate student performance measures what it does not do is to connect the performance measures and the monitoring of those measures to proposed project activities. The applicant states that measures will be tracked and compared to performance in this project, but there is not a direct link between the measures described and what the applicant proposes to do through this project.

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

5

3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does describe some evaluation activities which it will conduct. Building based leadership teams comprising of administrators, teachers and support specialists will evaluate resources to look for more efficient and affordable means to support long term goals. Teams will determine instructional needs and informally assess current infrastructure to determine if supports are the most efficient and cost-effective. Recommendations for changes to current resources will be made to the district’s technology adoption committee. The district software committee will evaluate what is currently in place, how it is meeting needs and with input from the program evaluation committee, make a financial comparison. The division procurement officer will then seek out best prices and negotiates contracts to ensure if budget funds are available and appropriate for division needs.

A major problem with this section is that it focuses primarily on technology evaluation and does not look at other factors as listed in the Application criteria, such as compensation reform, school schedules and other project funded activities. The applicant mentions a program evaluation committee, but does not sufficiently explain that committee’s role in the evaluation process in terms of its membership, procedures or responsibilities.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant provides a budget that is reasonable and should be sufficient to support the development and implementation of its proposal. All expenditures are adequately explained and are connected to identified project activities. The applicant also describes additional funding outside of the RTT-D grant that will be utilized in support of the project. State textbook funds will be used to assist with the purchase of electronic textbooks. The applicant will also allocate some of the State Standards of Learning Technology Account to increase wireless network coverage at participating schools. Local funding will be allocated by the School Board to maintain the current level of support at participating schools with regards to supplies, professional development, and operational costs. In this section the applicant does not identify other sources of funding that might be used to help fund the project, such as other federal funds (Title I, IDEA) and any business/community partnerships that may be formed and utilized to support the project. There is also inadequate identification of funds that will be one-time investments versus those used for ongoing operational costs.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant does not address this section.		

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 address this priority.		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a plan that describes some excellent goals and activities that could, potentially, result in improved teaching and learning and promote the development of more flexible, personalized learning environments for students. Its main problem is that it is too sketchy and narrow. The primary function of the project, as described in this proposal, is to provide iPads to students in the target schools, download mobile apps on those iPads, and train teachers, students and parents in how to use the iPads and the apps. There is not a comprehensive, cohesive plan to reform and restructure learning in a larger deeper context as the criteria for this application requires. There is not a clear, specific description provided of the connection between the iPads, and their associated apps, and academic performance in term of the development of knowledge and skills that will lead to better outcomes for students in careers and college. The applicant currently has a district initiative to provide iPads to all its students and has already done so for those in high school. It wishes to use this project to do the same for elementary school students. That does not meet the absolute priority of this Application.

Total	210	126
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1285VA-3 for Isle of Wight County Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has not set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision. Although the proposal is geared toward funding several elements of an infrastructure that can effectively support reform, there is no plan or meaningful approach for how this infrastructure will be used to create personalized learning environments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal leverages an existing 1:1 iPad plan currently being implemented in High Schools to create a similar program in four elementary schools. • The 1:1 program is motivated by increased engagement and empowerment through 21st century skills within authentic opportunities, but there is no plan, approach, or description of what this might look like for the proposed elementary school program • The proposal notes that creative techniques for instruction will be developed, along with a plan for increasing instructional time, teacher training, early childhood education, and secondary educational programs, though there is no approach to these described. • The proposal supports personalization through educator development of digital textbooks in lieu of purchased textbooks, which is not a scalable approach for the 2500 students included in the program <p>Overall, this proposal identifies important infrastructure components for a personalized learning vision, but fails to lay out a clear approach to how they will be used to personalize learning for the students involved. Therefore, this section receives a low score.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application does not describe the process for selecting participating schools.</p> <p>The application includes the actual schools that will participate as well as the total number of participating students, students from low-income families, high need students, and participating educators, ensuring that they meet the qualification requirements.</p> <p>Because the application does not include a description of how schools were selected, or provided other evidence of high quality LEA-level and school-level implementation, this section receives a low score.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal does not include a high-quality plan for how the reform proposal will be scaled up.</p>		

The response to this section indicates that scale, which the LEA is committed to regardless of whether they win this grant, will be accelerated since this funding will take care of 4 primary schools, making funds available sooner to the remaining schools. However, the proposal fails to provide a high quality approach, much less a plan, for the implementation of personalized learning in primary schools. The overall theory of change is weak, simply noting that improving student outcomes in primary schools will impact later outcomes with respect to academic performance for those students rather than laying out a theory for how the primary school student outcomes might, themselves, be improved.

Due to the lack of a high quality plan for implementing, much less scaling the program, this section receives a low score.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal does not provide evidence that the vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance.

- In the area of personalized learning, the proposal focuses on access to technology and digital content without describing how instructional practice will support improved learning and performance using these tools.
- However, there is also an element of the proposal to provide Math Interventionists to improve math instruction and increase differentiation which is likely to improve student performance in math

The proposal does not explicitly address decreasing achievement gaps.

The proposal has identified ambitious goals for student performance. However, the proposal does not include a rationale or theory of change for how the proposal elements will make these goals achievable.

Overall, there is little support in the proposal that the applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance, rather the proposal depends on an assumption that the availability of technology will improve learning. Therefore, this section receives a low 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	2

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal does not demonstrate evidence of a clear record of success in the past four years.

- The reading and math scores tracked over the past 3 years were largely flat, with a small numbers of exceptions that evidenced a marked improvement or decline
- Graduation rates and college enrollment rates, on the other hand, showed very significant increases, though the narrative does not link this improvement to any specific reforms or conditions nor address how these results might be translated into success for elementary school students

The proposal does not address reforms applied to low-performing schools

The proposal successfully demonstrates that student performance data is made available to students, parents, and educators

- Educators have access to student summative assessment data, including quarterly benchmark tests that are used to identify and intervene in the case of deficiencies
- Parents have access to grades via a parent portal which allows them to monitor progress through the year
- Parents and Educators have access to student test data by question, which specifies which particular skill each question tested and whether or not the student was successful

Overall, the proposal is weak in demonstrating improved learning outcomes, closing achievement gaps, or reforming low-performing schools, although it is reasonable in providing student performance data to educators and parents. Therefore this section receives a low score.

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

5

1

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal has not provided evidence of a high level of transparency.

- The budget documents that were included in the proposal do not break out actual salaries at the school level, but at the aggregate district level
- The budget documents do not describe non-personnel expenditures at the school level, but at the aggregate district level
- The proposal states that actual personnel salaries and other financial breakdowns are available in public forums but does not provide examples of that information that can provide evidence that those financial breakdowns are adequate to meet the requirements of this criterion

However, the budget does describe aggregate and overall expenditures and revenues at the district level and the presentations based on the budget include meaningful information regarding budget decision-making. Therefore this section receives a low, but non-zero score.

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

10

8

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal demonstrates evidence of sufficient autonomy to implement the applicant's proposal

- First, the proposal has been reviewed by the office of the superintendent of instruction and found to generally comply with state and federal requirements as evidence by a letter included in the appendix
- Second, the proposal is based on expanding a program which has already been implemented in High Schools, providing further evidence for general support of the approaches in the proposal

However, the approach does not provide enough information to evaluate how the program will be implemented at the primary school level for meaningful assessment. Nevertheless, the strong support and track record of implementing a similar program at the High School level lead to a high score for this section.

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

10

5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA has demonstrated evidence of moderate stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal

- The proposal states that principals and assistant principals provided input which was used in the formulation of the proposal, but provided no description of how or whether other stakeholder input was used or how the proposal was revised based on feedback
- The proposal includes signatures from teachers from participating schools as well as e-mails from additional teachers. Assuming there are no duplicates among the signatures and e-mails, and using the total number of educators involved from the table in section A (178), about 2/3 of the teachers have indicated support, just slightly less than the 70% called for by the criterion.
- The proposal has letters of support from some community leaders, business leaders, and institutions of higher learning, though these are largely form letters and so demonstrate a limited level of engagement

The moderate level of engagement of stakeholders results in this section receiving a medium score.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	0
---	----------	----------

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's response to this section does not provide an overview of the current status of implementing personalized learning environments, an analysis of the gaps, nor a plan for developing such an analysis. Therefore, this section receives no points.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	6

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Overall, the proposal does not include a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment. A high quality plan would require some detail regarding the proposed instructional approaches, timelines, deliverables, and processes. The plan would describe how student data will be collected and shared, how students would receive personalized learning recommendations, and specifically which elements of the learning process would be personalized.

However, some of the high level goals described by this proposal are aligned with a plan for personalizing learning:

- The proposal intends to provide students with personalized learning environments based on where they are
- The proposal intends to provide professional development to improve student achievement
- The proposal intends to develop automated data systems to provide access to student data to inform instruction

Though some goals are less well aligned:

- The proposal intends to use data to ensure students graduate on time with their cohorts

Some of the specific provisions are aligned with personalizing learning:

- There is a specific approach described to provide students with 1:1 devices and existing digital content and apps as well as content and apps that will be developed
- Teachers will receive professional development in working in blended learning environments
- It is notable that personalization is supported by allowing students to choose their own learning resources and to use a personal device for learning.

Though these provisions have some weaknesses

- There is not sufficient description of the professional development to serve as evidence that the approach for developing educator capacity is of high quality
- There is no provision for home Internet access for those students that don't already have it, so they will be disadvantaged by having to physically come to the school during evening hours in order to gain access

There is also a provision for differentiated instruction in Math by adding a Math Interventionist to each school to provide strategies for improving math instruction and differentiation through small group instruction, but there is no evidence that this would rise to the level of personalized instruction for each student

The proposal successfully addresses the requirement to have mechanisms in place for training and support through the addition of Instructional Technology Resource Teachers available to each school.

Although there is the clear intent to address each of the human and technical infrastructure elements required for this approach to personalized learning, this intent is not developed to a sufficient level of detail to identify the intended mechanisms, processes, and approaches to support personalized learning strategies, personalized learning recommendations, or access to deep learning experiences based on academic interests. Therefore this section receives a low medium score.

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

20

3

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal does not include a high quality plan for improving teaching and learning through personalizing learning environments. The proposal focuses on providing access to and training in using the tools that can provide a foundation for personalization. Though the proposal asserts that educators will receive training in personalizing learning for each student, there is no description of the overall instructional approaches and support structures that will make this possible. In short, there is little evidence that personal devices and Internet access will be used to shift instruction to a personalized environment rather than to merely provide some differentiation and gaining efficiencies by reducing manual processes.

Although the proposal is somewhat responsive to some of the specifics of this criterion, such as adopting evaluation teacher evaluation systems, and planning to develop improved data systems, those elements are not combined within an overall plan with sufficient detail to identify the instructional approach to personalization. Therefore, this section receives a low score.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

The applicant has demonstrated evidence of policies and rules that provide sufficient authority, flexibility, and autonomy to implement the specific provisions of this proposal. However, the proposal is focused largely on the tools and resources needed to support existing instruction with technology rather than a shift to personalized learning.

The proposal has some strengths

- The LEA would restructure to put new positions in place at each school to support all facets of technology implementation
- The LEA provides autonomy to school leadership teams with respect to personnel, roles, and responsibilities
- The LEA has a mechanism whereby students can earn credit based on mastery
- The LEA uses technology to adapt learning resources to be accessible to students with disabilities

The proposal also has some weaknesses

- Earning credits by demonstrating mastery requires the recommendation of the superintendent and demonstrated mastery in order to receive permission to sit for a test to earn credit
- Students have only one way, other than seat time, to demonstrate mastery for credit
- The LEA has limited flexibility with respect to school calendars

Overall, the proposal has demonstrated evidence of appropriate infrastructure to support the individualized use of tools to improve learning within traditional cohort-based structures and limited support for greater personalization. Therefore, this section receives a medium score.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal has demonstrated partial support for personalized learning through school infrastructure.

Strengths of the proposal include:

- Personal technology devices are provided for all students regardless of income
- A strong 4-tier support structure for technology issues has been developed and is being used at the high school level

Weaknesses include:

- There is no provision for all stakeholders, regardless of income, to have equal access to the Internet at home
- There is no evidence of a plan for allowing parents and students to export their information in an open data format
- There is no evidence of a plan for using interoperable data systems

The proposal deserves credit for ensuring equal access to technology with strong technical support systems, though the value of that is limited due to unequal access to the Internet. This, combined with a lack of open and interoperable data systems give this section a medium score.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application has demonstrated evidence of many elements of a strong strategy for implementing a continuous improvement process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The process has responsible parties identified, a program evaluation committee • The process identifies specific areas to be monitored, including the 1:1 initiative, data systems development, ongoing professional development and grant positions • The strategy identifies the methodology that will be used to measure the effectiveness of these areas • The strategy identifies frequent (quarterly) measurements of the effectiveness of grant investments • The strategy includes a credible communications plan <p>However, the application does not explicitly address the feedback loops that will be used to improve the program based on these metrics.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the overall approach to understanding the effectiveness of the program is strong and it is likely it will result in ongoing improvement. Therefore, this section receives a high score.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has demonstrated evidence of a thorough, detailed and comprehensive plan for communicating goals and strategies to stakeholders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan includes multiple mechanisms for communication including digital, media, and interpersonal • The plan includes analyzing the communications needs of a wide array of stakeholders • The plan includes detailed points and messaging • The plan includes branding of the overall program <p>However, the plan is focused far more on messaging than on engagement, and is also focused on the rationale for the program more than on the ongoing implementation. Nevertheless, the plan provides for a wide array of contact points with a wide array of stakeholders. Therefore this section receives a high score.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal includes performance measures that address the requirements for primary school students.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The metrics have credible rationale • The metrics include math and English achievement as well as attendance and discipline metrics • The metrics include achievement at 70% or higher in both math and English as an indicator of on-track for college and careers, although this metric does not yet have goals associated with it as baselines have yet to be established 		

However, some of these metrics show flat to increasing achievement gaps.

Also, the proposal does not explicitly address the logic behind each metric as a leading indicator nor a process for improving the metrics if they do not turn out to be effective indicators of program implementation progress. Therefore, this section receives a medium score.

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

5

3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal has demonstrated evidence of a plan to evaluate the effectiveness of RttT-D funded activities

- The proposal has described a plan with responsible parties, evaluation methodology, and mechanisms for collecting data regarding the performance of grant funded investments in the introduction to section E.
- The proposal response to this particular section also described additional efforts that more productively use resources, though no specific plan was described for evaluating their effectiveness

The proposal does not explicitly describe how evaluation outcomes will feed back to improve programmatic implementation. Therefore this section receives a medium score.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's budget is largely reasonable and complete.</p> <p>Strengths include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient funding to lease or license personal digital devices and modern data systems • Sufficient funding to provide adequate technical support for the implementation • A breakdown of the sources of all funds, including those from this grant <p>Weaknesses include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very limited funding for educators in coursework or other professional development supports for shifting to personalized learning environments • A high reliance on educators developing e-textbooks as a key mechanism for personalization • Limited funding for high quality digital content • One-time versus ongoing funds are not explicitly described (for instance, are the data systems an ongoing lease or a purchase) <p>Overall, this budget supports the implementation of technology-based tools, but is weak in providing the professional development supports that will support a shift in professional practice to leverage those tools. Therefore, this section receives a medium score.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal does not address the project's sustainability after the term of the grant. Therefore this section receives no points.</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 application did not address the competitive preference priority</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This proposal has not met Absolute Priority 1.</p>		

Overall, the proposal addresses primarily gaining access to tools that can be used for personalization; including personal digital devices for each participating student; access to digital content for each student; modern data systems that provide individual and aggregate student information in a form that is effective for improving instruction and continuously improving the program; professional learning communities and some training to improve educator capacity; strong technical support for the implementation; and Math Interventionists to support teachers in differentiating math instruction.

However, the proposal does not describe the shifts in instruction that will lead to personalization, nor the school structures that will support those shifts. The proposal is weak in addressing non-seat-time based student progress demonstrated via mastery. The proposal does not explicitly discuss how the use of personalized tools will accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning in the primary classroom. The proposal does not address a theory of change for how the approach will lead to decreased achievement gaps.

The program investments in human and technological infrastructure are necessary but not sufficient, without the attendant plan for changing instruction, to implement personalized learning environments.

Total	210	76
--------------	------------	-----------

