



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #1288NH-1 for Keene School District

### 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>A1(a). The applicant represents a consortium in a non-Race to the Top (RTT) state to implement a program they have titled Children Achieving Realistic Goals in Education (CHARGE). The consortium proposed to implement Parents as Teachers and READY! For Kindergarten to develop readiness. (Note: READY acronym is not spelled out). In addition, they proposed a curriculum model tied to the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) to increase graduation rates and improve readiness for post-secondary education and-or career. The applicant will also strengthen the Response to Intervention (RTI) to differentiate instruction, expand the use of professional learning communities, expand the use of technology and its integration throughout the grades and curriculum, and expand a pilot program underway in one consortium member district which uses a personal learning plan for each student. An additional focus is closing achievement gaps for special education students with severe emotional and behavioral disorders. A partnership with the local state college is to be enhanced to recruit, retain and develop highly effective teachers and principals.</p> <p>The consortium consists of a unified group of seven rural districts which includes one unified group, School Administrative Unit 29 (SAU29), and two other LEAs.</p> <p>The overall vision of education is provided as a list of 9 points which include parent education, reading and math readiness, CCSS, personalized instruction, data driven decisions by educators, educator development. These are appropriate. Extensive information is provided on how the vision is correlated to each of the four core educational assurances which reflects the applicant's knowledge of how to improve student achievement and increasing equity. Although student interests are mentioned in one sentence, there is inadequate information to substantiate that this is one of the primary strategies. This was noted as a minor weakness.</p> <p>The applicant proposed to focus on one consortium member district which has the lowest performing schools and the greatest number of high needs students. Data is provided substantiating the needs of this district.</p> <p>Because of the strengths noted, it was determined that the applicant has a comprehensive and coherent vision for the RTT-D initiative aligned with the four core educational assurance areas. This criterion was rated in the high range based on the noted strengths.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) The applicant provides a chart that outlines the key components and along with implementation objectives. The consortium was initiated by SAU29 who contacted adjacent districts and three of those districts agreed to participate. The leadership of the schools along with the educator unions were informed about the RTT-D opportunity. These leaders agreed to participate.</p> <p>Specific strategies for school selection were not described and it is not clear based on the information in this section if the list of schools represents 100% of schools in the participating districts. In a later section information is provided that implies the list of the schools in the table is 100% of schools though there was no information on how these schools were targeted. A review of the A2 charts revealed that 9 of the schools listed have less than 40% low income. This was noted as a weakness for this subcriterion.</p> <p>(b) The list of schools is provided with the district and school names.</p> <p>(c) The applicant proposes to serve 4,958 students, 2,041 or 41% are from low income families and 3,489 or 70% are high needs students. 511 educators will participate. A2 charts are provided with all demographic information for each school.</p> <p>Based on the information provided this criterion was scored in the high range though weaknesses were noted in (a).</p>		

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A(3). The implementation plan provided in table form by the applicant contains the component name in column one and a second column labeled "implementation plan" which has descriptive statements but does not include key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and the parties responsible for the activities which is a requirement to have a "high-quality plan". This was noted as a weakness. The theory of change was presented in the appendices. Regarding scaling up, the applicant states that when fully staffed the components will be fully implemented across schools and districts. No information is provided regarding scaling up the model beyond the participating schools other than perhaps to reach out with professional development. This lack of information was noted as a weakness.</p> <p>A theory of change model is provided as Appendix 2 based on "if X happens then Y results." One strength was noted, -the focus on formative assessments. The one page theory of change is from one district, Claremont. Because SAU29 is the lead district and the most in need is Winchester, this theory of change is limited as it applies to the consortium. This was noted as a weakness.</p> <p>Based on the weaknesses noted, the information provided this criterion was scored in the medium range.</p>		

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

<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(A)(4)(a) Analysis of the charts provided in the appendix indicated the state has chosen to increase performance targets in annual equal increments toward a goal of reducing by half the percentage of students in the "all students" group and in each subgroup who are not proficient within six years. The data provided reflect that in the the baseline year that 91.7% of students were proficient in reading with approximately 10-11% gap for subgroups. This does not indicate high numbers of low performing students. The target is 95.9 for 2016-17 which is a modest gain. The applicant provided a statement that performance on summative assessments will improve based on the proposed uses of data, RTI approaches, PLCs, and personal learning plans to more deeply engage students. This information was too sparse to fully evaluate the subcriterion, specifically related to proficiency status and growth. A weakness was noted based on the current high performance of participating students and modest growth that is projected.</p> <p>(b) The applicant provided state data in the tables for this section, not for the participating schools. This was cited as a weakness since it was not possible to analyze the target school performance.</p> <p>By using assessment data to identify areas needing improvement among students and in the instructional programs, the applicant anticipates that teachers will be able to focus their attention and resources on individual students and student groups in key areas to decrease achievement gaps. The applicant also stated that improved uses of RTI, the implementation of personal learning plans, and curricula aligned with CCSS was designed to reduce achievement gaps. Teachers will work in Professional Learning Communities, which all participating districts have implemented currently. This was highlighted as a key element in addressing the needs of low-achieving students and focusing the collective experience and strategies to improve student outcomes and decrease achievement gaps. Without data on participating schools, this criterion was noted to have a weakness.</p> <p>(c) The applicant provides data for the two high schools that will participate and provides state averages as a comparison. Keene High School students actually score above the state average overall. Stevens High School student score approximately 9 points below the state average. Neither high school serves minority students. They do have a category for educational disadvantaged students with this group from both schools scoring approximately 10 points below the state average. Approximately 2% per year gains are projected which does not seem ambitious. A weakness was noted.</p> <p>The applicant addresses graduation rates primarily through early education. They stated that by ensuring that all students are ready to learn when entering kindergarten, master basic reading and math at grade level early in their school careers, and are engaged in their studies, the participating schools will ensure that more students find school both interesting and relevant to them and thus will remain in school until completion. In addition, they cited RTI, personal learning plans, and curricula that emphasize place-based, project-oriented experiential learning will increase student engagement, which helps students to remain in school until graduation. This information should support increased graduation.</p> <p>(d) No college enrollment data was provided in the A section tables. The applicant stated that they will use CCSS to align the curricula to college entrance standards, enabling more students to present stronger applications to colleges and score well on related aptitude and entrance exams. They will also use the personal learning plans (PLP) to tie interests to career choices. Because of the lack of data, a weakness was noted.</p> <p>(e) Postsecondary enrollment information was optional and no weaknesses cited. The applicant did state that not all students</p>		
--	--	--

are interested in college and that due to the region's large manufacturing sector which is experiencing a shortage of prepared workers, an emphasis is placed on preparing students to enter this area of skilled technical work.

Based on the information provided this criterion was scored in the medium range.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	9
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) The applicant provided evidence that in 2012, approximately 70% of Keene High School seniors took the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT). They scored, on average, 13 points higher than the state average in reading, 18 points higher than the state average in mathematics, 29 points higher than the national average in reading, and 20 points higher than the national average in mathematics. These students came from the SAU districts and the Winchester School District in the consortium. This is an increase of more than 10% in each category since 2000. Only graduation rates for Keene were provided in a separate chart in the appendix. This campus had only 2.6% dropout rate four years ago which has remained constant at 1.4 over the past 3 years. Though there was growth since 2000, the growth over the past four years was modest. A weakness was noted based on this data.</p> <p>(b) Charts were provided for reading only in the appendix. These charts reflect only slight gains overall (78.3% in 2008-80.92 in 2011 for SAU 29). Claremont had similar modest growth, though Keene students gained 6 points over the four year period. A strength was noted relative to special education students at each of the schools. The growth rates ranged from a 7 point gain for SAU to 23 point for Keene students over the same time period. A weakness was cited due to the fact that only reading scores were provided and there is no evidence of a four year success for reading. A strength was noted due to the student performance growth in the special education population.</p> <p>(c) In SAU29 districts, student performance data at the district level is made available on the districts' websites and data is published in periodic reports to the community. Building-level data is available at individual schools' web sites. Under the leadership of a new superintendent, the Claremont School District is implementing the Edline on-line information system, to provide a range of data on school and student performance to the community. Claremont also makes extensive use of local media to report data. The Winchester School reports data through annual reports, media releases, and the principal's weekly newsletter, sent electronically and in hard copy to all parents in the district. No weaknesses were noted for this subcriterion.</p> <p>Based on the information provided and the weaknesses cited in a, b, and c, this criterion was scored in the medium range.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) The seven-school Keene School District does not publish personnel salary data for all school-level staff at the school level but makes it available on request as part of the public record. All other participating school districts publish this data at the school level. This does not reflect a high level of transparency in LEA policies and practices related to this expenditure.</p> <p>(b) The seven-school Keene School District does not publish personnel salary data for instructional staff at the school level but makes it available on request as part of the public record. All other participating school districts publish this data at the school level. This does not reflect a high level of transparency in LEA policies and practices related to this expenditure.</p> <p>(c) The seven-school Keene School District does not publish personnel for teacher salary data at the school level but makes it available on request as part of the public record. All other participating school districts publish this data at the school level. This does not reflect a high level of transparency in LEA policies and practices related to this expenditure.</p> <p>(d) The seven-school Keene School District does not publish non personnel expenditures at the school level but makes it available on request as part of the public record. All other participating school districts publish this data at the school level. This does not reflect a high level of transparency in LEA policies and practices related to this expenditure.</p> <p>Based on the information provided, weaknesses were noted in all four categories and this criterion was scored in the medium range.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	7

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Citing the New Hampshire Department of Education and the participating districts' attorneys, the applicant states that there are no statutory or regulatory barriers to the consortium's partners implementing any aspect of our proposed activities in the reform plan. The New Hampshire Department of Education is leading, requiring, or encouraging school districts in the state to implement CCSS, PLCs, and the extensive use of data to drive innovation and improvement, and the integration of technology. This information does not provide evidence that there is autonomy to implement a truly personalized learning system though the strategies proposed in the plan are in line with the state's guidance. Because the information is minimal and does not address how the consortium will provide the flexibility and autonomy schools and teachers need to personalize instruction, a weakness was noted.

Based on the information provided, this criterion was scored in the medium range.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The applicant provided comments that the goals and priorities the district has chosen to implement received support from the teachers along with the areas of focus to improve student outcomes. The description provided does not indicate direct support for the proposal, however. The applicant stated that educators were sometimes led or guided by the New Hampshire Department of Education and were deeply involved in selecting the goals and priorities that the reform proposal addresses. This indicates leadership in a reform effort but not specifically the RTT-D. Meetings were held to encourage districts to participate in submitting a proposal. SAU teachers were surveyed and 40% agreed. No information was provided on the other consortium districts related to their support. RTT-D guidelines required 70% of the teachers to support the RTT-D proposal.

Though there are sample letters from teachers and principals, a weakness was noted because of the lack of documentation of the overall support by teachers from the consortium schools.

(i) Signatures were provided of the teacher union leaders. A strength was noted for this subcriterion.

(b) A broad range of support from educators and community leaders was provided through letters attached in the appendix. No weakness was noted for this subcriterion.

The response to this criterion was determined to be in the medium range.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The schools participating in the applicant consortium have implemented both differentiated instruction and RTI to advance the personalization of student learning. The applicant cited that schools also use data to identify areas in our educational programs that need improvement at the level of student, grade, building, and district. Individually and in teams, teachers and principals review efforts to personalize learning and they use data to identify barriers, whether personal or institutional, to the expansion of personalized learning. The two districts described as having high-needs, have focused recent attention on analyzing needs and gaps and designing strategies to address them. The use of differentiated instruction and other appropriate strategies for personalizing instruction was seen as a strength.

Although the above information was provided, the applicant does not include key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and the parties responsible for the activities which are a requirement to have a "high-quality plan". This was determined to be a significant weakness for this section which was rated in the medium range.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	12

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

C1(a) The applicant does not provide a high-quality plan with key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and the parties responsible for the activities which is a requirement. The applicant states that the project's management team and the principals will work together to identify areas of strength and areas needing improvement in each area in each school. The applicant proposes that this analysis will inform the project's initial focus of resources within each school and also will inform the schedule of implementation of the various areas by school and district.

The applicant does not provide sufficient information to address C1(a) (i) through (v). Very limited and generic statements are provided under each of these subcriteria that indicate an overall understanding of the criteria and how the RTI, PLCs, and personal learning plans are appropriate. This is inadequate to fully address the requirements.

C1(b) The applicant provides a few statements supporting early learning and project-based learning, but does not include key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and the parties responsible for the activities which is a requirement to have a “high-quality plan”.

The applicant does not provide sufficient information to address C1(b) (i) through (v). As with the previous subcriteria, very limited and generic statements are provided under each of these subcriteria that indicate an overall understanding of the criteria and how the RTI, PLCs, and personal learning plans are appropriate. This is inadequate to fully address the requirements.

(C)(1)(c) The applicant provides limited information supporting the strategies they propose but does not include key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and the parties responsible for the activities which is a requirement to have a “high-quality plan”.

This C1 section was rated in the low range because of the absence of a high-quality plan and the failure to address the subcriteria.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	15
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides narrative descriptions addressing each subcriteria but does not provided a plan with key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and the parties responsible for the activities. The credibility of the plan is addressed in the specific criterion below:

C2(a) In this section the applicant proposed all educators will participate in PLCs which is a primary focus of the proposal.

(i) Six strategies are proposed with a brief explanation provided. This is inadequate to address this subcriteria.

(ii) Four strategies are proposed which primarily restate the intent to utilize CCSS, project-based learning and RTI. This is inadequate to address this subcriteria.

(iii) Four strategies are proposed, one of which is to use the state recommendations for use of summative assessments. Statements are provided indicating they will create personal learning plans and individualize assessment using data and informal assessments. The applicant stated they will tailor instructional strategies to accelerate learning, but this is inadequate to address this subcriteria.

(iv) The applicant states they are now developing teacher and principal evaluations and anticipate these to be available by 2015. No other information is provided which was noted as a weakness.

(C)(2)(b)(i) The applicant provides four statements related to the proposed PLC strategies then states that a combination of summative and qualitative assessments of student projects and portfolios and CCSS-aligned assessments will provide actionable information to the PLCs. In addition, progress data gathered in each student's personal learning plan will be key in informing personalization and optimization. Actionable information is not provided but rather a minimal description of how the PLCs will occur to support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments.

(ii) The applicant stated that the districts' implementation of CCSS and related assessment tools is the foundation of the initiative to achieve this objective. All participating districts are stated to be embracing place-based, experiential, and project-based learning, which will be enhanced by the increased use of technology under our proposed project. The use of technology, including interactive whiteboards connected to the World Wide Web, is expected to prepare our students to meet career-ready standards. This description highlights the expectations of the funded projects, but does not provide sufficient detail to address the subcriteria.

(iii) Minimal information is provided which primarily summarizes the statements made in the previous sections.

(iv) This subcriteria is not addressed.

Because the applicant does not provide a high quality plan with key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and the parties responsible for the activities, this criterion was rated in the medium range. Credit was given for choosing PLCs as a major strategy of the project.

(C)(2)(c) Training is addressed in generic terms with no specific details. The information is primarily a restatement of the intent to use CCSS, RTI, and PLCs. This was noted as a weakness.

(C)(2)(d) The applicant has a strong relationship with a local college who provides support for teacher recruitment and training. This was noted as a strength though a thorough description meeting the criteria for hard-to-staff schools and other aspects in this criterion were not addressed.

Because of the weaknesses cited throughout this section and the absence of a high quality plan with the required elements, this section is rated in the medium range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	6

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not provide a high quality plan with key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and the parties responsible for the activities.

(a) The applicant proposed that the project will be overseen collaboratively by the three superintendents of the three participating school districts. They or their designees will meet monthly with a grant manager who will be hired as a full-time employee to oversee the funded project. The grant manager will serve as the liaison between the components of our reform project and the superintendents' leadership team; and will report progress, data, issues, and concerns within each component of the project, including those at individual participating schools. This leadership team will work to personalize program implementation to the needs and objectives of each participating school and to provide necessary supports and services.

This limited structure does not address the criterion sufficiently. It is doubtful that three superintendents would be directing the project on a discrete enough level for effective implementation and other central office resources are not described. This was seen as a weakness.

(b) The applicant states that within the framework of state statutes and regulations, and districts' policies, each school's leadership team now has the power to determine its own calendar and schedules, school-level budgets, and negotiate and adjust the roles and responsibilities of educators and non-educators within the job descriptions determined by an individual district. Based on this information and a previous section which did not indicate autonomy, this subcriterion was not addressed adequately.

(c) and (d) Addressing both of these subcriteria, the applicant states that if a student demonstrates mastery over a standard sooner than classmates, the teacher and student design a project that can engage the student and lead to mastery of the subject in greater depth or breadth. This does not address the nature of personalized learning systems where students have the flexibility to master standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways. This was seen as a weakness.

(e) The applicant states that students with disabilities are accommodated through the use of tutors and paraprofessional educators in addition to participating in mainstream classrooms. They anticipate that increasing the uses of technology will also be a support to students with diverse learning needs. This meets the minimum standard for this criterion.

Because of the lack of a high quality plan and the weaknesses cited above, this criterion was rated in the medium range.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not present a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure though they did provide somewhat generic statements describing how they provide every student, educator, at every level of the education system with support and resources. They did not elaborate with sufficient detail to fully address the criterion.

(a) The applicant stated that the SAU and each of its districts and schools have individual web sites, most of which list content, homework assignments by class, teacher contact information, and include a password-protected portal through which parents and students can access grades and other private information. The Claremont School District has upgraded its website by incorporating a revised, upgraded, commercially available webpage system called Edline, a communications platform for school districts. No information was provided for the third consortium member, Winchester. Overall, this description was lacking in content to fully address access to content and tools by stakeholders. This was cited as a weakness.

(b) The applicant stated that stakeholders and constituents are "welcome to call our school districts' central offices to ask for technical support" which is insufficient to address the provision of technical support for a personalized system of learning.

(c) Very limited information is provided other than to state that SAU is now using the cloud and Claremont is using Edline, Winchester uses PowerSchool which recognizes flexible formats. This is minimal amount of information to address this criterion.

(d) The applicant stated that the three districts have interoperable data systems that can share data related to the proposed program within strict observance of all FERPA regulations and district policies protecting privacy and confidentiality. This is minimal amount of information to address this criterion and does not address human resources data or budget data. Because they cited FERPA, it is assumed the one statement they did provided related to student performance data.

Because of the lack of a high quality plan and the weaknesses cited, this was rated in the medium range.

### E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide a high quality plan nor is there a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve the project. This criterion was rated in the low scoring range.</p> <p>(E)(1) The applicant states that the grant manager, project administration team, and implementation teams will design a data-driven evaluation plan for each funded activity. Each team will gather quantitative and qualitative data, analyze short-term and longitudinal results as reflected in student outcomes, and will maintain, replace, or adjust the implementation or administration of each activity as the data indicates. This is insufficient to determine that an evaluation design has already been created to ensure that there is a rigorous continuous improvement process.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide a high quality plan nor is there a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve the project. This criterion was rated in the low scoring range.</p> <p>(E)(2) The proposed strategy for ongoing communication and engagement were presented at a minimal level. The applicant proposed that upon receipt of the grant award, superintendents will make presentations about our reform program to local civic groups, such as meetings of Rotary and Kiwanis clubs and chambers of commerce. Extensive media coverage will promote the new program.</p> <p>Each participating school in the consortium will report progress of the project at weekly faculty meetings and reports will be made to the Boards of Education. Additionally, reports will be posted on participating school districts' websites with links to the report posted on individual schools' websites. The reports also will be distributed to local media. This description does provide for the flow of information out to stakeholders but does not address engagement. This was noted as a weakness.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve the project. This criterion was rated in the medium scoring range with one primary strength and numerous weaknesses.</p> <p>(E)(3) The applicant provides a chart with a performance measure and a rationale in the narrative (a). The rationale appears to be appropriate for each of the measures which are not stated in quantitative terms.</p> <p>(b) and (c) The applicant provides information in tables in the appendices. A strength was noted on the table regarding behavioral referral reduction which seemed to be ambitious and achievable. The applicant presented data earlier in the proposal which supports behavioral issues as a problem and appropriate performance measures are presented.</p> <p>A weaker area was in the measures focused on students' access to effective and highly effective teachers. The applicant currently reports 50 % of teachers and 75% of principals are considered effective. The projected percentages for 2016-17 are the same- to have 50% of teachers and 75% of principals who are effective. This data is similar across the board for all subgroups.</p>		

On the chart which reflects access to “highly effective” teachers and principals, the applicant states that 15% of teachers and only 7.5% of principals are highly effective currently, and the goal during the 2016-17 year will be 50% of teachers and 25% of principals. This seems extremely low and does not meet the standard as ambitious to truly improve schools.

Regarding students who are on track to college and career readiness, the applicant presents data in the tables that currently 94% of students are on track and that after four years they will have increased that to 98.5%. This is problematic in that the baseline data does not appear to support the range of problems that were briefly addressed throughout the narrative. Virtually the same data is provided regarding attendance with 94.6% attendance rate currently to be increased over four years to 98.5%.

Because of the weaknesses cited this criterion was rated in the low scoring range.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that the ultimate measure of each activity's success will be improvements in student outcomes as measured both within each course and school as well as by standardized assessments such as the state's Smarter Balance assessment system. They provided a caveat that it was important to note that data may not show distinct, sustained successes in these areas until near or after the end of the grant period.

The applicant failed to provide a high quality plan nor a credible approach to continuously improving the strategies they have proposed. This criterion was rated in the low scoring range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The applicant reports that RTT-D funds will provide the total support for the project except for \$792,000 paid by consortium to cover staff time and \$25,000 for use of space. (Source of funding is not provided.)

(b) Costs seem reasonable to support the project, including salaries, travel and other expenditures.

(c) (i) costs for professional development are described to be paid by RTT-D. These costs seem to be reasonable as does the expenditure for the PLP. Technology costs are \$1,576,370 to cover purchase of iPads and to complete cabling for wireless access at Winchester and Claremont. Funds are also requested for READY! for Kindergarten and Parents are Teachers.

The FOCUS program for students with disabilities is estimated at \$3,934,656 and covers specially certified teachers and aides for students with disabilities. This is described as a pilot to show boards of education the value of this special education model. While the focus on special education is commendable this seems like a large expense which does not impact the overall school population in an inclusive manner. This was cited as a weakness. Separate costs are broken out for Winchester which seem appropriate and reasonable.

Overall, the quality of the response to this criterion was in the high range based on the information provided.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	4
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes three strategies for sustainability. First, they are building a technological infrastructure as a one time investment to be maintained through each district's annual budget. Second, they are establishing a train-the-trainer model that will provide sustainable training into the future. The last strategy is to sustain the main aspects of their model, Parents are Teachers and READY! For Kindergarten by showing boards of education positive results and hoping they will continue to fund these. They also hope to get donations for this.

This does not represent a high quality plan with key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and the parties responsible for the activities which is a requirement for sustainability and is rated in the low range.

### Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: Not addressed.		

### Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The absolute priority mandates that applicants significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards, accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student; increase the effectiveness of educators; expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.</p> <p>Several criteria were rated in the low to medium range and have a direct impact of the capacity of the applicant to meet the mandate of the absolute priority. This includes (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments, (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support, (B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps, (C)(1) Learning, (D) LEA Policy and Infrastructure, (E) Continuous Improvement, and (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals.</p>		

Total	210	111
-------	-----	-----



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #1288NH-2 for Keene School District

### 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 Keene School District Consortium application presents a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that addresses core educational assurance areas and presents a reasonable approach to implementation of a system that is centered on personalized educational planning for all students. The plan addresses critical aspects including evaluation of teachers and principals, focused learning, student support systems, technology, Common Core State Standards (CCSS), and professional development efforts. The program goals include a reduction in the need for student remediation indicating that the emphasis should shift to college- and career-ready goals. The proposed reform program addresses many aspects that will support personalized student learning plans but some detail as to the actual development of the student learning plans are vague. It was stated that educators will talk informally with students regarding their career aspirations but this was not</p>		

developed as a part of the plan structure.

Among the positive elements presented in the vision, several important elements have been identified. All districts in the consortium have developed data teams to analyze data. Performance Pathway has been identified as the system that the consortium intends to adopt. Some student support programs are already in place and there are plans for expansion of support systems to parents and kindergartners, among others. Community support programs are described as a part of the plan. Teachers will work in professional learning communities (PLCs) to provide the structure for program review and growth.

This criterion is clearly organized and comprehensive with only slight detail omissions for a score in the high range of 9 out of 10.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided the requested information on participating schools and demographics as well as a description of the invitation to participate. A summary of how each participating school district will implement the program elements such as personal learning plans (PLPs), professional learning communities, and other programs is a good synopsis of what needs to be accomplished and the initial plans that have been developed to begin the reform effort but there was little description on how these elements will support the high quality plan and implementation.

The applicant has earned a high score of 8 out of 10 because of the appropriate information but a lesser amount of elaboration.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has effectively identified common goals that are key to student success in college- and career-ready skills and knowledge. The applicant's logic model and command of the research that supports early student success is an important foundation for student learning.

The proposed model for teacher professional development and peer support is a strong model for building capacity and utilizing existing resources at the school and district level. The effect of this model to scale up meaningful reform efforts will be an important part of the final project and useful as a common frame of reference for collaboration. Other elements that will support the high quality plan include the Parents As Teachers program and the READY! for Kindergarten program. Extensive use of data analysis is also mentioned as a part of the personalized learning plan development.

This criterion has been outlined in a clear and sufficient manner for a maximum score of 10.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	9
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The charts in the appendix that show the targets for improved student learning and performance support the applicant's goals on academic achievement in math and English language arts. A target for decreasing achievement gaps is listed in the application narrative as a 50% reduction. Graduation rates that have been increased over the last four years are impressive and it is important to note that this is, in large part, attributed to programs in credit recovery and flexible curriculum delivery systems. Decreasing achievement gaps at the kindergarten level are explained to be an important factor in continued student success.

The applicant has set ambitious yet achievable annual goals but the linkages to the proposed new programs and the setting of higher-level targets has not been clearly presented in the narrative or charts. This criterion has been addressed with the required information for a high-end score of 9 out of 10.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has reported success in graduation rates, discipline control, and college entrance exam testing but there is no presentation of evidence as to the causes for improvement.

Teachers across the district are reported to have a successful data tracking system to inform instruction for each student. Student performance data is also addressed in other sections of the application.

Effective institution of a positive behavior system supports the suggestion that reform efforts will be able to be implemented.

The charts in the appendix are helpful to envision the final goals but the clear record of success over the past four years is not clearly presented. There is little specific information on the lowest performing schools.

This criterion is short on actual information that directly addresses a record of success and the descriptions are vague for a mid-range score of 10 out of 15.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Actual personnel salary information was not made available for this application but information on how to obtain the financial data has been described. The applicant has met the minimum criteria for this section of the application for a lower-end score in the mid-range of 2 out of 5.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

New Hampshire policy has set parameters for closing achievement gaps, a teacher and principal evaluation system as well as encouragement to implement systems that develop professional learning communities, data analysis, Common Core State Standards, and technology. The applicant reports that state policy allows for flexibility and autonomy in the implementation and development of school improvement efforts such as is presented in this application. There does not appear to be undue barriers to implementation and development of this project from state regulatory and statutory requirements.

This criterion scored a maximum score of 10 out of 10 for fully meeting this element.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

This criterion requires a description of how students, families, teachers and principals in participating schools were engaged in the development of this proposal. It does not appear that an intentional gathering of stakeholders was assembled in the development of this proposal although it is important to note that issues identified from other stakeholder meetings have been incorporated into this plan.

No evidence is presented that the local teacher bargaining unit provided official support but the president of the local teachers union did provide a signature on this application. It was reported that 40% of the teachers replied favorably to a survey on this project but the criterion asks for a minimum of 70% in lieu of bargaining unit approval.

An impressive set of letters of support are provided by a wide range of community organizations and school principals.

Due to the lack of some of the evidence as stated in the criterion, this section is scored at the lower-end of the medium range at 4 out of 10.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

This criterion calls for a plan for analysis of the current status of the programs and the consideration of what gaps and needs exist in order to address those in the plan. Although the application indicates, in various sections, that meetings have taken place and many stakeholders have been involved to various extents, there is no discussion of a systematic plan to review the status, identify needs and gaps, and plan from that perspective.

Although there is a lack of intentionality in bringing together stakeholders to use an organized process of review, plan, organize, implement, monitor, and evaluate, there appears to still be access for stakeholders to continue to review the project and address the needs and gaps through collaborative planning and organizing sessions. Some principals have conducted

their own needs and gaps analyses. This criterion has been scored in the middle range of 3 out of 5 due to the lack of intentional evaluation of needs and gaps by stakeholder groups.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided a wide variety of learning goals that will be addressed in the adopted programs and plans. Students will be involved in deeper learning experiences that include project-based instruction and personalized academic subjects. High need students will have the advantage of a Response to Intervention (Rtl) program that will target specific learning gaps and needs and provide targeted remediation.</p> <p>The personal learning plans that are proposed for all students in all schools include academic goals as well as personal and career goals. These learning plans are purported to address personal skill development such as goal-setting, communication skills, and responsibility. Technology will be a part of the learning plan and student engagement through meaningful educational experiences will be supported by interactive white boards and iPads. Student achievement data will be available to students for feedback on personal learning plan goals and progress toward reaching those goals.</p> <p>The plan is missing some of the critical elements of a high-quality plan that includes timeframes, deliverables, activities, and persons responsible. The plan did not clearly address how students will develop some of the skills that they will need to help them understand that what they are learning will be key to their success in accomplishing goals. There was little discussion of how students will understand the intent and outcomes of the college- and career-ready standards. Although some of the project-based learning will address the development of traits such as collaboration, teamwork, perseverance, and problem-solving, the proposal did not elaborate on how these activities will be encouraged, planned, and organized.</p> <p>This criterion addressed a majority of the elements for preparing students for college and careers but failed to offer a coherent plan that would help students to understand the connections between standards, assessments, assessment data analysis, personalized plans, and progress toward goals. In sum of the elements addressed and those that were not fully developed in this section, this criterion was scored in the middle range for a score of 14 out of 20.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	16
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Personal learning plans are proposed to be implemented at all grade levels but it is unclear how the implementation will occur. The teachers participation in professional learning communities will focus on student achievement data and identification of needs for personalized learning plans but the coordination of the plans for common elements has not been discussed.</p> <p>The proposal provides a variety of assessment source information including state standardized testing. Data will be collected and available for teacher use in personalizing student learning goals.</p> <p>A teacher and a principal effectiveness evaluation process is in place. The application did not explain a high quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals.</p> <p>High quality learning resources are not discussed at length in this proposal but technology is mentioned as an important resource for the development of 21st century skills.</p> <p>This criterion is scored at the upper range of middle for 16 out of 20 due to some omissions in the discussion of resources and how the learning plans will be coordinated across all grade levels over the course of the first year of grant funding.</p>		

### D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	11
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

Policy and practice for effective implementation of this proposed plan is presented through the school administration as the superintendents will work with a grant administrator but building level teams will have flexibility in implementation of these program components.

Student mastery of standards and skills will remain at the discretion of the teacher who will have summative and formative assessments as well as project-based learning and activities that measure student performance but there is no proposal to have collaboration between teachers on developing the parameters for a common set of grading standards, skills, or program structures for consistency across grades and schools. The proposal states that multiple opportunities and ways to assess will be provided to the students.

The plan presents program goals and objectives that outline a clear set of policy guidelines such as "We will implement personal learning plans for all students" and "We will continue to expand our use of place-based, project-oriented, experiential learning to engage students and keep their learning personally meaningful." As a guiding principle, it is unclear how much of a policy this may be in actual practice as there is no discussion of how policy will be implemented. There is no plan for flexibility in delivering instruction in or outside of the classroom.

This section of the proposal has earned a higher-end score of 11 out of 15 for the overall considerations but slightly limited due to the lack of discussion on how policies, practices, and guidelines of the consortium will be implemented.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has described the on-line resources that are currently available but has not indicated how grant funding will support increased access to learning tools, resources, and educational opportunities for personalized student learning. The proposal does not address how technology might increase the flexibility and adaptability of teaching and learning outside of the regular classroom.

Although one of the districts in the consortium has staff assigned for technical support, there is no indication that other schools and districts are providing the same. Open data format and interoperable systems are in place.

This criterion was not fully addressed as to the accessibility of tools and resources for personalized student learning for a mid-range score of 7 out of 10.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	5

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This criterion was insufficiently addressed as to how a rigorous continuous improvement process will be implemented and how the public will access information on the investments in all aspects of the proposal. The plan indicates that data will be made available through the websites of the various schools and districts but the plan does not indicate the type(s) of data nor does it indicate how the data will be collected, monitored, and measured.

This criterion is scored in the lower range for 5 out of 15 due to insufficient consideration of the systemic implications of the continuous improvement processes.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Communication of the goals and progress of the project is reported to use public meetings, websites, digital communications, newspaper, and civic groups for a well-rounded public relations outreach effort. It is not clear how much engagement and interpersonal discussion will be solicited at the various meetings but the opportunity appears to be present.

This criterion is scored at 3 out of 5 due to the lack of discussion on interactive dialogue and engagement among internal and external stakeholders.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The performance measures for teachers and principals that are highly effective and effective are appropriate. The teacher evaluation is based on the New Hampshire teacher evaluation described in the appendix.

Performance measures for students in K-2 are appropriate for reading and on-track progress. Performance measures for students in grades 4-8 are appropriate for referrals, skills, math, and reading. The performance measures for students in grades 9-12 are appropriate and cover critical areas of reading, math, FAFSA completion, and youth risk behavior.

The applicant has provided the rationale for measurement selection and information on how the measure will be reviewed and used for improvement.

For this criterion, the applicant has scored the maximum score of 5 out of 5 for completeness.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Indicators of progress and quality have been identified as measurable objectives including reading levels, math levels, remediation needs, and graduation rates, among others. The grants manager will be collecting the data and will share the information through the website and at meetings. It is not clear if this information will be strictly quantitative or if qualitative information will also be collected. The data does not address all proposed funding expenditures including professional development efforts and some of the support programs.

This criterion scored at 3 out of 5 due to incomplete measures of the full proposed program.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The proposed budget clearly identifies Race to the Top funding priorities and provides a rationale for the many aspects of the project and the associated costs. The budget amounts appear to be reasonable and carefully thought out for all expenditure implications. The funding appears to be sufficient to meet all proposed aspects of the program including development and implementation. One-time expenditures have been identified.

This criterion has earned a maximum score of 10 thorough presentation.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	7
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The criterion has been addressed with thoughtful consideration of the on-going nature of some of the expenditures and how those programs may continue to be funded but an actual plan has not been presented that outlines each component for sustainability of project goals. The program has potential for sustainability due to the programs that will be able to be built and garner community support. The narrative discussed budget assumptions and potential sources for future funding.

This criterion is scored in the medium range of 7 of 10 due to the identified components but without a comprehensive plan.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	3

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The Competitive Preference Priority for the Keene district consortium is scored at a level of 3 out of 10 based on the following:

- There is no description of a public or private partnership but elements of community programs are mentioned such as the after-school program and post-secondary supporters. There are letters of support from civic and community groups

and agencies.

- There are no desired results for specific population subgroups provided.
- Measurable objectives have been identified that include some social-emotional factors.
- The use of data for all students, including high-need students is a part of the project.
- The continuous improvement nature of the proposal should see improved results over time.
- There is no description of partnerships for integration of services.

### Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has sufficiently provided evidence of a coherent and comprehensive plan that address core educational assurances and is invested in a personalized learning environment. The plan is developed to effectively utilize data systems, technology, college- and career-ready standards, effective teacher development, academic support and interventions, and parent support systems. This plan has met the absolute priority #1 .

Total	210	149
-------	-----	-----



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #1288NH-3 for Keene School District

#### A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section meets the criteria for a comprehensive and coherent reform vision in the high range because of its clearly stated expectation for success for all students who are members of the consortium . This is demonstrated by high learning expectations beginning at kindergarten and ending at graduation with students expected to demonstrate personal learning and pursue success on meeting the standards. The success will depend upon Parents as Teachers and READY for kindergarten in all participating district. PLC's will be implemented in schools using a train the trainer model and will be used to track student learning, implement Response to Intervention (RTI), and plan implementation of the CCSS. There will be personal learning plans for all students that will focus on closing achievement gaps. Plans to increase Focus classrooms (for the most severe emotional and behavioral identified students). The vision will be implemented with the use of extensive data examination about student learning and needs.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The description of the process used to identify participating school districts participating in this RTTT consortium is clearly stated with each district meeting separately and then together to discuss the RTTT participation plans and to ensure that all meet the eligibility requirements. Documentation verifying the legal aspects of the consortium partnership and division of responsibilities is included with the proposal.</p> <p>There is a list of all schools participating in the proposal including the home district for each school.</p> <p>The number of participating students is provided in total with no breakdown by district/school. The information supplied meets the requirements of A(2)(c), with numbers of total students, low income students, high needs students, and participating educators.</p> <p>The information supplied meets the criteria for a high rating in this category.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The first level of reform to be implemented is Parents as teachers, READY for Kindergarten (school readiness) and Focus classrooms (special classrooms for the high need students with severe behavioral and/or emotional disabilities). There is a clearly stated plan describing how each will be implemented. The use of a train the teacher model will transfer learning among all schools and teachers in an organized tiered approach where each tier builds upon the other. The focus on preparing students for kindergarten through the parent training programs will ensure students enter school ready to learn.</p> <p>This section meets the high category as it provides a focused plan and description for implementation and includes all students.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section clearly describes the approach to monitor student learning through the use of data, RTI approaches, and personal learning plans. The use of data by students and teachers is designed to decrease achievement gaps as all are aware of what individual learning needs should be addressed more fully. Graduation rates will raise as all students enter school ready to learn and master reading and math standards. College enrollment numbers are included in the growth because the use of CCSS aligned curriculum ensures students graduate with the knowledge and are college and career ready.</p> <p>This section scores in the high range because it clearly has a plan in place to meet all four priorities required under RTTT.</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	15
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Consortium has made plans to mirror success of one district participating district across all districts. An example is the manner in which students are prepared for graduation through the use of innovative work-study plans, evening courses, and on-line study to raise graduation rates and college enrollment rates. Schools are implementing Positive Behavior Interventions Supports (PBIS) to reduce disciplinary issues at the schools which increases the time everyone can spend on learning activities. The use of data is expected at all schools to plan individual student learning and to drive instructional practice. The data is available to teachers in a variety of user friendly formats. Parents are also included in those who receive timely information about the child's progress. This section is scored in the high range because it addresses each item in this section in a thoughtful manner that supports increased student success.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Keene District does not publish data in any of the above categories, but will supply this information as part of public record requests. All other participating school districts publish the data as listed above at the school level.

This section scores in the middle range because the data listed above is available to anyone who may request it which does not exactly meet the requirement for transparency.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The state provides the necessary autonomy to implement personalized learning environments and is encouraging districts to implement CCSS, PLC's, to increase the use of data to drive instruction and integrate technology into teaching.

The score for this section is in the high range because of the scope of support that the state encourages as districts move toward personal learning for students.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

All stakeholders were included in focus groups discussing the goals to be selected and implemented in the RTTT. The superintendent met with college partners and community partners to discuss shared goals and their needs and ideas pursuant to the proposal. Staff was surveyed in October with more that 40%of teachers responding positively to the RTTT proposal. The signature of the President of the Local Teacher's Union is on the Assurances page indicating teacher support for RTTT. There are letters of support from state and local government officials, business leaders, parents, and other stakeholder groups included in the appendix.

This section scores in the high range. However, without the total point allocation because it is unclear if all teachers had a voice other than the opportunity to fill out a survey and limited participation in focus groups, for this reason not all of the available points were awarded in this section.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

This section scores in the high range because schools and districts are already implementing strategies that will enhance and encourage student success (RTI and differentiated instruction). Teachers individually and in teams review efforts to personalize instruction and implement appropriate interventions as needed. This information is shared with superintendents offices. Administrators in the districts will survey the use of data teams, PLCs, other leaders to identify areas that each school should prioritize. District leaders can then utilize resources to address the identified priorities.

This section scores in the high range because of the focus on using data to identify and prioritize learning needs across district and then allocate resources based upon the data.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

There is a clearly outlined comprehensive plan that provides structure to the learning experience of students from the time they enter kindergarten. Personal learning will be implemented for all students, based upon data available about individual student learning needs. Student learning goals will be monitored for success through the use of formative assessments (projects, performances, portfolios) and summative data based upon standardized assessments aligned with CCSS. PLCs will have a role in keeping curriculum aligned to high standards for graduation and college and career ready. Student learning needs will be addressed with RTI and implementation of project-oriented, experiential learning. C(1)(a)(iv) does not appear to address a rich access to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives because the plan describes only a Chinese language program implemented at 1 high school and French and Spanish language classes at the middle school. While speaking another language is a positive to encourage for students, merely learning the language does not ensure a broadening of understanding of diverse people and cultures. The plan to align curriculum with assessments supports student learning,

because students are assessed on what they learn. RTI will be implemented with differentiation in instructional practice to address the learning needs of all students and increase student success. Instruction is delivered in a manner supporting the concept of high quality, CCSS is continually expanded in the classrooms in a manner that supports individual student learning, implementation of a variety of technology (SmartBoards and the internet), and providing support to students needing additional assistance in meeting goals.

There is a comprehensive plan to monitor learning regularly (monthly or bi-monthly) by checking progress of plans with success on aligned assessments. The District has high expectations for all students. Accomodations are provided as required and documented through RTI processes and individual student learning plans. The schools use interventions, including tutor and para educators to provide academic support for the students. The implementation of the Focus classrooms will strengthen RTI in support of all students and is designed to improve academic success of students who's learning needs are met in a structured environment designed to meet their learning needs.

Students and parents may receive trainig in the use of data systems in place in all districts. This provides them with current information/data about the success of their individual learning plan goals.

This section scores in the high range because as described above it is focused on providing access to academic success for all students. Not all points were given because of the weak implementation of programs designed to increase understanding of diverse populations.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	18
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The plan supports growth in the implementation of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) with a train the trainer model to increase the number of teachers who understand the PLC's and the ways they support student learning plans. The decision to strengthen the use of RTI in each school will also go forward in a train the trainer model. This will increase the sustainability of each, as there will be teachers in the building who understand each process and its support of student learning.

Teachers will be trained in how to design and plan individual student learning plans in a series of workshops over a 2 year time period. Teachers will mentor each other as the process becomes fully implemented in all schools.

Technology and its use in teaching enables students to learn in new ways and provides support in implementation of individual student learning. Technology use allows for the personalization of learning in ways that have not been possible in the past. Students can demonstrate learning through projects, portfolios, and presentations using technology to enhance their work.

There is sustained focus on implementation of CCSS and RTI to increase student learning and raise graduation and college and career ready achievement by all students.

PLCs will enhance learning of students because of the focused attention to the success of each student as the CCSS and college and career standards are implemented. This progress will be assessed in both formative and summative manners with assessments aligned to the standards being taught.

The teacher evaluation system is aligned with the New Hampshire Department of Education Standards. The system is in the process of being phased into all districts by 2015. The data will provide principals with information about effective teaching practices in the classrooms, as well as provide indications where additional assistance for the teacher may be needed.

Professional Development will focus on alignment and implementation of the CCSS, using RTI effectively, creating time for teachers to work in PLCs and integrating technology into the classroom. This focus has been determined by examination of the data and the goals for student learning in the RTTT proposal.

The plan to increase the number of highly effective teachers will be addressed through the Professional Development plan which is focused on increasing teacher instructional practice. The use of the train the trainer model will ensure that there should always be someone near the teacher who needs assistance. The relationship with Keene State College to host student teachers and interns, especially in identified critical areas, such as special education.

This section scores in the high range because it states clearly and comprehensively its plan to increase learning for all students, to increase access to information to parents and teachers, and to provide a structured Professional Development plan based upon data. The total points were not awarded because there not clear information about when/how the learning plans would be discussed with the students and parents.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
--	-----------	-------

(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	15
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section scores in the high range because it provides an organized structure to monitor progress of the RTTT plan from the District office to the schools and student/parent levels. There are appropriate performance measures identified to measure success overall and by subgroups. Data will be reviewed on a quarterly basis to determine success. If success of a strategy is not evident the Project Management Group will meet to address the concerns and determine how to proceed. The grants manager will prepare and publish quarterly activity and expense reports related to the grants goal achievement. The report will be distributed to school leaders, the public, and the media.</p> <p>This section meets the middle range in scoring because even though it places emphasis on regular and continuing examination of student achievement, school achievement, and teacher effectiveness, the total points were not awarded because the structure in place is very top down. The assurances of access to data by all stakeholders is a positive procedure in the plan's implementation process.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section scores in the high range because it provides access to data to all stakeholders in a variety of methods both online and web based and also through print reports and public media reports (newspaper). Parents and students are an important piece of this reporting as they have the ability to have an active role in student success on Common Core and college and career ready standards.</p>		

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 structure designed by the district implementing a continuous improvement process and to provide timely feedback is clear and inclusive. District staff monitor the implementation at school sites. Data is shared with stakeholders to increase success in meeting to goals of the program. There are processes in place to ensure continual communications with all stakeholders. School Leaders attend public meetings, information is shared with the media and an interactive website is in the process of being designed. This section scores in the high range because it demonstrates commitment to sharing data across platforms and with all stakeholders. The total available points were not awarded because the procedures for sharing data is all top-down.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The District has implemented a wide variety of procedures to provide communication and engagement of all stakeholders. This is accomplished through technology, conferences, public meetings attended by school leaders, and the district newsletter.</p> <p>This section scores in the high range because of the commitment to provide access to information in a variety of formats to all stakeholders.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section scores in the high range because the district demonstrates its concern for student achievement at all grade levels. There is a planned system to use the data gathered from formative, summative, and other qualitative measures (ie., behavior referrals) and use this data to demonstrate the success of the plan.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	4

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The project effectiveness will be evaluated first of all by measuring the increase in student achievement. These measures are thorough and provide a balanced view across the school at all grade levels of student learning. There is a focus on examining data from formative and summative assessments aligned to CCSS and college and career standards.

The grants manager will prepare and publish a quarterly report detailing activity and expense reports. Annually, the grants manager will publish an annual report detailing the success in meeting the plans goals. The district has made provisions to provide this information to all stakeholders in a variety of formats, including public reports at Board meetings.

This section scores in the high range because it provides regular and timely reports about the effectiveness of the the plans implementation/goals.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section clearly describes how the funds allocated for the district RTTT plan will be utilized. The information provided details how each core priority will be addressed because of the expenditures from the plan. The budget clearly supports the implementation of the plan. There is concise description describing the use of all funds that will be used, including any funds that do not come directly from the grant. Funds that will be used for one-time investments are identified and their use explained as to how the expenditure will support the goals of the RTTT plan. This section scores in the high range because it provides clear information about how the funds will be used to increase success of students at all levels in all schools.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district has designed a 3-pronged strategy to ensure sustainability of the RTTT plan beyond the grant period. The technology infrastructure will be complete and supports data driven instruction and personalized learning for all students. Each student will have access as well as families. Equipment replacement will become the responsibility of each district annual budget costs. The second prong has created a 2 tiered system of in-house experts and trainers in each district to continue the professional development in CCSS adoption and implementation, RTI, use of technology to support personalized learning, and PLCs. The final prong includes on going expenses which include the Parents as Teachers and READY for Kindergarten. The districts are prepared to become responsible for financing these projects.

This section is in the high range because it clearly and comprehensively describes an organized plan to continue the implementation of the RTTT beyond the grant period.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The plan presented by Keene School District and consortium school districts clearly supports the achievement of all students through the implementation of personal learning plans, provides professional development for teachers in the methods that will enhance the learning of all students in on organized plan supported by data for inclusion into the process. The

Professional Development will be sustained through teacher trainer methods at each school site. There is a strong expectation for the use of data by all stakeholders in monitoring their academic success, with avenues for training and use of technology as part of each districts Technology department. The emphasis on implementing the Common Core and college and career standards is evident from the kindergarten preparation programs all the way through the high school level. The Professional Development program is also set to provide teacher training in these areas as needed, including how to use data to drive instruction to meet the standards. The teacher evaluation system will be in place by 2015 and is designed to increase the number of highly effective teachers as individual learning needs of the teacher is identified. The districts have also gone to local higher education resources to involve them in growing teachers for the districts through involvement with student teachers and interns. This plan meet the personalized Learnig Environments priority.

Total	210	187
-------	-----	-----