



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #1310PA-1 for Lebanon School District

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Lebanon School District described their vision of expanding their hybrid learning initiative, the district's context and student population. However, this section did not explicitly identify the following core educational assurances would be incorporated and built upon: (i) personnel evaluation system and (iii) data system. There was one sentence referencing that several of their principals had been involved in the pilot of the new teacher evaluation system. Their description appeared to represent a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that would accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning, and increase equity. More information about the hybrid model and its current implementation would have made this section stronger. Therefore, this section was rated in the medium range.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) Lebanon School District proposal did not describe the process for the participating schools. However, the (A)(2) Applicant's approach to Implementation table with the list of participating schools met the eligibility requirements.</p> <p>(b) The proposal included a list of participating schools, including 5 elementary schools, 1 middle school, and 1 high school.</p> <p>(c) This section included a table on demographics of grade 5-12 students, including: the total numbers and percentages of participating students who are from low income families and high-needs students. The total numbers of educators were also identified for these grades.</p> <p>Therefore, given comments above, this section was rated in the Medium range.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In the appendix, Lebanon School District included an action plan. The plan, identified as Race to the Top-District action plan, had goals, commitments, action steps, and baseline data/achievement data. The plan did not include timelines and persons responsible. The plan included general areas: professional collaboration, supporting students, and teaching and learning. The goals addressing teaching and learning focused on: increased student academic achievement and students fully prepared to pursue chosen options after graduation. However, the plan in the appendix did not have specific references to the implementation of the hybrid learning model, specific student groups, and specific academic content areas.. Neither a logic model nor a clear theory of change was presented on how their proposal would specifically improve student learning outcomes for all students. Therefore, this section was given a rating in the low medium range.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) Lebanon School District presented completed tables for performance on summative assessments in reading, writing, math, and science for grades 3-11 for the following subgroups: overall, IEP subgroup, Hispanic subgroup, ELL subgroup, and economically disadvantaged. The baseline data for 2010-11 and 2011-12 indicated decreases for all student groups in grades 3-11 reading (ranging from 3% to 6%), and writing (ranging from 7% to 23%) and erratic performance in math and science. The yearly goals increased from 5% to 30%. The annual goals appeared ambitious; but it is not clear if they are achievable since the system did not provide any additional data on student performance for the last four years.</p>		

(b) Decreasing achievement gaps: The section included completed tables of baseline and goals with achievement gaps identified between: IEP students and all students in reading, math, science, and writing; Hispanic students and all students in reading, science, and writing; ELL students and all students in reading, math, science, and writing; and economically disadvantaged students and all students in science and writing. The yearly targets were reported as the decreases in the percentage points according to a eMetric data system; but this needed more explanation before it could be determined that the yearly targets were achievable and ambitious.

(c) Graduation Rates: High school graduation rates baseline and goals were reported for overall students, IEP students, Hispanics, and economically disadvantaged. Graduation rates declined for every group ranging from 1% to 5% between 2010-11 and 2011-12. The yearly targets increased from 1% to 10% with 100% rates for all student groups by 2015-16. Certainly, the goals with yearly increases of 10% represented ambitious goals. However, without additional data, the reviewer was not able to determine if these goals were achievable.

(d) College Enrollment: Baseline and yearly goals for overall college enrollment rate were identified for overall, IEP students, Hispanic students, ELL students, and economically disadvantaged students. However, no baseline was identified for IEP and ELL students and there was no explanation. For overall students, the yearly targets increased from 5% to 10%. The goals for 5% appeared achievable while the goals for 10% increases represented ambitious targets.

Given the above comments, this section was given a medium rating.

## 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
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Lebanon School District did not demonstrate evidence of their clear record of success in the last four years but only inadequately described their reform efforts.</p> <p>(1) Lebanon School District described its recent reform efforts, including the pilot of the state's new teacher and principal evaluation system, the study of effective math and science instruction, the implementation of a hybrid learning model, and the use of student achievement data in a more timely manner. The proposal did not provide any evidence of advancing student learning and achievement over the last four years through graphs, charts, or other descriptions that would demonstrate their ability to: (a) Improve student learning outcomes and close achievement gaps. (b) achieve ambitious and significant reform in its lowest achieving schools.</p> <p>(c) Student performance data available to inform and improve participation, instruction, and services: The proposal stated that the current student information system provides opportunities for teachers and administrators to review the data on a frequent, regular basis, and connect the information in the classroom. However, they did not describe how data informs and improves participation, instruction, and services.</p> <p>Overall, this section received a rating of low.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	0
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Lebanon School District proposal provided a brief financial history, briefly described their budget and reporting system, and that they post the district's budget on its website. The appendix included a board summary report dated 6/30/12 that included account description, current budget, un-liquidated encumbrances, expend/received, balance, and percent used. This section could have been improved by explicitly providing evidence that addressed each sub-criterion. (a) The description did not include a breakdown at the school level for all school level instructional and support staff at the school level. (b) The description did not include a breakdown at the school level for actual personnel salaries instructional staff. (c) The description did not include a breakdown at the school level for teachers only. (d) The proposal did not include actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level. Given the above, this section was rated in the low range.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	0
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The Lebanon School District proposal described how their hybrid learning model generally operates, but it did not specifically identify what conditions and autonomy they have under State, legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement personalized learning environments. Therefore this section, was given a low rating.

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

10

1

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(a) Lebanon School District did not describe how students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools were involved in the development of the proposal (other than the statement on collective bargaining representation). They did not discuss how the proposal was revised based on their engagement. (i) The proposal referenced that instructional staff are represented by a collective bargaining agent in the state's association. There was a statement that the leadership of the association was engaged in the planning of the project and signed the cover page.

(b) The proposal contained the following: email statement from the mayor that referenced the application. Another email statement from a college representative referred to a pilot program in reading but not specifically this application. The proposal also included a letter from the state education agency which acknowledged receipt of the application but no comments. The proposal would have been strengthened by including letters of support from parents or parent organizations, local businesses, and community-based organizations. The proposal also identified their current partnerships. This section was rated in the low range.

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

5

1

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The Lebanon School District referenced the need to improve performance of economically disadvantaged and Hispanic students. They described the overall timelines for implementation of the Hybrid learning model to all schools. (Note: a previous section had also identified gaps with IEP and ELL students).

In the appendix, Lebanon School District included a an action plan, identified as Race to the Top-District, action plan with goals, commitments, action steps, and baseline data/achievement data. The plan did not include timelines and persons responsible. The plan included general areas: professional collaboration, supporting students, and teaching and learning. The goals addressing teaching and learning focused on: increased student academic achievement and students fully prepared to pursue chosen options after graduation.

However, the plan in the appendix did not have specific references to analyze their current implementation of the hybrid learning model, specific student groups, specific academic content areas, and any details about the identified needs and gaps that the plan will address. Nor were the action steps directly correlated with the budget.

Therefore, this section received a low rating.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	2

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Lebanon School District proposal did not delineate the sub-criterion and submitted one paragraph that identified the district's overall goal. There was a reference to the current piloting of the hybrid model in the high school which is able to determine students' current level of function and tailor an education program to meet student needs. This needed much more details.

The applicant did not address the following criteria: (a) With the support of parents and educators, all students: (i) Understand what they are learning as key to success. (ii) Identify and pursue learning and development goals. (iii) Are able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest. (iv) Have access to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives. (v) Master critical content and develop skills. (b) Strategies to ensure that each student has access to: (i) Personalized sequence; (ii) Variety of instructional approaches and environments; (iii) High quality and digital content;

(iv)(A) The applicant generally identified the use of a hybrid learning management system by teachers that is also accessed by parents and students. But it did not identify how frequently the system is used to determine progress toward mastery of standards and graduation requirements. The applicant did not identify how the system addressed (B) except to say that an educational program can be tailored to meet student needs.

The applicant did not address: (v) Accommodations and strategies for high-need students.

The applicant did not address: (c) Training and support to students so they would manage their own learning.

Overall, this section received a rating in the low range.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) Lebanon School District proposal included one paragraph that addressed how the district requires the access and review of individual student data by teachers for instructional planning. They also referred to the goal of developing an individual learning plan for each student that would include: level of functioning, career and education aspirations, and relevant programming to support needs and goals.

(a) Engaging educators in training, professional teams, or communities that support: (i) Support effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies; (ii) Adapt content and instruction; (iii) Frequently measure student progress and inform acceleration; and (iv) Improve practice and effectiveness by using feedback from evaluation systems: Not addressed.

(b) Educators access to and use of tools, data, and resources: The resources must include: (i) Actionable information to accelerate student progress and respond to individual student needs and interests; (ii) Provide high-quality learning resources (including digital instructional content and assessments); (iii) Provide processes and tools to match student needs with specific resources and approaches: Not addressed.

(c) Participating leaders and leadership teams have training, policies include: (i) Using evaluation system for continuous school improvement; (ii) Training, systems, and practices for school progress toward goals and closing achievement gaps: Not addressed.

(d) Plan for increasing numbers of highly effective teachers: Not addressed.

Overall, this section received a rating in the low range.

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

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	0

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Lebanon School District proposal, addressing D.1. and D.2 together., included one paragraph that only identified their technology system for collecting and analyzing student data and how it is used by educators to determine system needs and plan for student learning. This paragraph was aimed at D.2.

(a) The proposal did not address this section.

(b) The proposal did not address this section.

(c) Students earn credit based on mastery and not time: This sub-criterion was not addressed.

(d) Opportunities for student mastery at multiple times/ways: This sub-criterion was not addressed.

(e) Learning resources and instructional practices adaptable accessible to SWD and ELL: This sub-criterion was not addressed.

Based on the comments above, this section is rated in the low range.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	1
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Lebanon School District Proposal, addressing D.1. and D.2., included one paragraph that identified their technology systems for collecting and analyzing student data and how it is used by educators to determine system needs and plan for student learning.

- (a) Stakeholders access to content, tools, and resources for implementation: Not addressed.
- (b) Stakeholders appropriate levels of technical support: Not addressed.
- (c) The use by parents and students of the information technology systems, the proposal did not address.
- (d) Use of interoperable data systems, the proposal did not address.

Based on comments above, this section received a low rating.

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

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	1
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Lebanon School District proposal presented one paragraph for Section E. that stated they would monitor and evaluate activities, conduct evaluation exercises, and that annual progress toward goals would be measured and adjustments made. The proposal did not provide sufficient details to ensure that the process would be rigorous, and provide timely and regular feedback. There were no specific references to how they would publicly share the information on the quality of investments. Therefore, this section was given a low rating.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Lebanon School District proposal presented one paragraph for Section E. that stated they would employ a committee structure to monitor and evaluate activities, conduct evaluation exercises, and the measurement of annual progress toward goals with adjustments. This only implied internal stakeholders and not external stakeholders. Therefore, this section was given a low rating.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Lebanon School District proposal submitted complete performance measure tables that included: for all students: a, b, and c; for Prek-3<sup>rd</sup> grade: a, b; for grades 4-8: a, b, and c; and for grades 9-12: a through e. Tables were submitted for 13 performance measures; however, the performance measure for all students for c included grades 3-8 and 11 while the performance measure for grades 4-8 included the same measure (increasing proficiency in reading and math in 8<sup>th</sup> grade). Therefore, there were actually 12 measures which met the required total range of approximately 12 to 14 performance measures.</p> <p>The performance measure c for all students, student proficiency in grades 3-8 and 11 in reading, mathematics, algebra I, biology, and literature, for all students and student groups had yearly targets representing 10% to 15% increases. This performance measure combined too many grades, included 5 different subjects, and different types of state assessments. This complicates the ability to track the progress on this performance measure. Since the district did not provide any data for the past four years but only the baseline data for 2011-12, it was difficult to determine if the measures were achievable and ambitious.</p> <p>For performance measures for grades 9-12, baseline data was not available for the following: submission of FAFSA form, students on track to college- and career-readiness, completion of individualized career plan, students at beginning of grade 11 on track to graduate with their class, and increasing student perceptions of school effectiveness. There was one note that they system currently did not track the 11<sup>th</sup> grade students who are track to graduate with their class. There were no other explanations of why the baseline data was not available for the other measures. Without baseline data, it is difficult to determine if these measures were achievable and measurable.</p> <p>(a) The proposal did not include rationales for the selection of major performance measures.</p>		

(b) The proposal did not identify how measures will provide rigorous, timely, and formative information.

(c) The proposal generally identified that they would measure annual progress toward the goals and adjustments made as necessary. More information was needed.

Therefore, this section received a rating of low.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Lebanon School District proposal presented one paragraph for Section E. that described how they would generally monitor and evaluate activities, conduct evaluation exercises, and that annual progress toward goals would be measured and adjustments made. The section referred to the plan in the appendix which only included baseline data and achievement data and not evaluative activities and evaluation exercises. Therefore, this section was rated low.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) Lebanon School District proposal included the following completed budget tables: 1-1 Overall budget summary, 2-1; overall budget summary project list; 3-1 Project-level budget summaries for professional development, student computing devices, course content and management software, and oversight and management; and table 4-1 project level itemized costs.

(b) Reasonable and sufficient. Forty-seven percent of the 1<sup>st</sup> year budget is for equipment (4800 iPads for teachers and students). Other significant costs included content subscriptions and the hybrid learning system management software licenses which needed more details to determine if these were reasonable. While there were no personnel costs identified, personnel fringe benefits were identified for teachers receiving training stipends.

(c) Rationale for investments and priorities including: The proposal included one paragraph that generally described the request for funds and some additional information on Table 4-1. The proposal needed much more detail on the rationale for equipment and other significant costs.

(i) Description of all funds to support project: The overall budget summary and in table 3-1 for student computing devices and for overall management, the tables indicated dollar amounts from other sources. The amounts in the 3-1 tables did not match the amount in the overall budget summary. In addition, the district did not identify the sources of these funds.

(ii) The proposal did not specifically identify funds that would be used for one-time investments versus those that would be used for ongoing operational costs. There was only one reference to a recurring cost associated with the hybrid learning system management software.

Overall, this section received a rating in the low range.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	1
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Lebanon School District proposal included one sentence that with the reassignment of teacher loads and fewer purchases, the district would be able to maintain the necessary funding level. No other information was provided on the sustainability of the project to meet this criterion.

Therefore, this section received a rating in the low range.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Lebanon School District proposal submitted one sentence stating that they have partnerships with two colleges, a library, and foundation that would support the integration of RTT-D initiatives. The competitive preference priority table: population-level desired results for all students had one type of result: increasing student awareness of post-secondary opportunities and sense of readiness.

- (1) The Lebanon School district identified that they had current partnerships with two colleges, a library, and foundation.
- (2) The proposal presented a completed table for population-level desired results that included for all students, under type of results: increase student awareness of post-secondary opportunities and sense of readiness. Under the desired results, there was reference that the district data would support academic and interpersonal readiness and that students would self-report awareness and sense of aspirations. These need more specific details.
- (3) The proposal provided a completed Competitive Preference Priority: Performance Measures table with the identification of performance measures, applicable population, baseline, and targets. The section did not describe how the partnership would: (a) track the selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all children; (b) use the data to target its resources to improve results for participating students; or (c) develop a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating schools; and (d) improve results over time.
- (4) The proposal did not describe how the partnership within participating schools would integrate services.
- (5) The proposal did not address any of the sub-criterion for how the partnership would build the capacity of staff in participating schools.
- (6) The annual performance measures included: college and career readiness: perceived effectiveness of school programs for all students, IEP subgroup, ELL subgroup, economically disadvantaged subgroup, and Hispanic subgroup. But baseline data was not available with any explanation. Yearly targets, based on baseline, were set for yearly increases ranging from 5% to 20%. Without clearer definition of the performance measure and baseline data, it is not possible to determine if the performance measures were achievable and ambitious.

Given the comments above, this section received a low rating.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Lebanon School District submitted a proposal for the expansion of their hybrid learning initiative to all schools. However, in the majority of the proposal sections, critical information was missing. Given the comments and low ratings for a number of sections, particularly: (B)(1)(2)(3)(4)(5), (C)(1)(2), (D)(1)(2), (E)(1)(2), (F)(1)(2), the proposal did not meet the Absolute Priority 1.

Total	210	34
-------	-----	----



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #1310PA-2 for Lebanon School District

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>(A)(1) was not specifically addressed in this application. The applicant shared the vision of the school district, not a reform vision for this grant. This vision did not address the four core educational assurances defined by this grant. The applicant provided a reference to goals that address the four core areas through the development of a more personalized learning environment however, this reference did not detail a comprehensive or coherent approach. The applicant did not include a plan for deepening student learning or increasing equity through personalized student support.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	1
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation of that proposal was not adequately described by the applicant. The applicant did not include a description of the process that the applicant used or will use to select schools to participate in the RttT Grant.</p> <p>Chart (A)(2) included data and the names of seven participating schools and detailed the number of participating students from low income families and high need students. However the applicant stated that the district was seeking the grant only to expand a hybrid learning pilot in their high school, thus the students effected would be limited. The applicant included information for all schools in the district. It is not clear how all students would receive services. In section (B)(5) the applicant indicates the at the hybrid pilot would expand from high school to middle school. The applicant intends to provide internet services to elementary studnets by 2015-1016.</p> <p>The total number of students who would receive reforms outside of access to free internet was not defined. The applicant included data for all students in the LEA, however they indicated that the project was intended to serve only secondary students.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><b>Strengths</b></p> <p>The applicant proposes to expand their hybrid learning model through this grant. They will use the grant to scale up the project throughout the district.</p> <p><b>Weaknesses</b></p> <p>The applicant did not include a narrative that addressed scaling up or translating reforms into district wide changes beyond participating schools. A logic model or theory of changes was not included in the application. The application did not include information regarding how the project will support meaningful reform to support district wide change beyond the participating schools. The applicant did not address how expanding a hybrid learning model would increase academic proficiency, decrease drop out rates, eliminate achievement gaps, or enroll more students in college.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant states that they will expand the hybrid program at the high school. This program is in its first year and details on how it would be expanded or who would be served was not included. No details are shared on what this will look like for elementary or middle school students or if the program will be expanded to included them.</p> <p>There is no data to support that the applicant's vision of becoming the district that parents choose to send there children to is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals.</p> <p>Goals are ambitious however the applicant does not address specific grant activities that will be implemented to reach goals. It</p>		

is unclear if the goals set in (A)(4)(a) are achievable. The baseline data provided indicated significant declines from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012. The project did not address how such ambitious achievement goals would be reached. The information shared did not indicate that it is likely that by the year after the project, 100% of students in all subgroups and grade levels would achieve pass proficient or above scores on state assessments and all achievement gaps would be eliminated (A)(4)(b).

(A)(4)(c) Graduation rates appear to be on a decline based on the two years of data shared. It is not likely, based on the vision and limited goal details that all students in all subgroups will graduate by the last year of this grant through the expansion hybrid model of instruction. This model is one year old and last year, graduation rates declined. This decline does not support an expansion of the effort.

(A)(4)(d) College enrollment rates goals are ambitious, however the applicant did not address a plan to raise enrollment rates for all students to 85%. For example, Hispanic students had a 28% college enrollment rate last year, however equity issues were not addressed and plan to address the needs of this population was not specifically addressed.

The applicant was awarded a low level of points for providing ambitious goals but not including a plan to indicate that the goals were achievable.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	0
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant did not include data that indicated a four year history of success in advancing student learning and achievement.</p> <p>The applicant did not include data that indicated a four year history of success closing achievement gaps.</p> <p>The applicant did not address a four your history of ambitious or significant reforms in persistently lowest achieving schools.</p> <p>The applicant did not address how data has been or would be available to students, educators, and parents to inform or improve participation, instruction, and services.</p> <p>The applicant did not address required criteria, thus no points can be awarded.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	0
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant indicated that they post financial information on their website and that they provide hard copies to those without internet. The applicant did not detail what financial information was shared and did not specifically address the criteria referenced in a-d.</p> <p>(B)(2) (a) Not addressed by the applicant.</p> <p>(B)(2) (b) Not addressed by the applicant.</p> <p>(B)(2) (c) Not addressed by the applicant.</p> <p>(B)(2) (d) Not addressed by the applicant.</p> <p>Applicant did not address the minimum criteria in this section or in the application thus no points can be awarded.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	0
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The information provided in this section was unrelated to the criteria. The applicant discussed rotations for students. The applicant did not address successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments. State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements were not addressed in any section of the application. No points can be awarded as the applicant did not demonstrate evidence for</p>		

(B)(3).

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	0
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal and meaningful stakeholder support for the proposal was not provided.

A description of how students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools were engaged in the development of the proposal and, as appropriate, how the proposal was revised based on their engagement and feedback was not included.

The applicant indicated that a signature of the president of the PSEA/LEA indicated that the leadership was engaged in the planning. No other evidence was shared to support this statement. The applicant indicated that there was a "history of collegial relations" but did not detail that history or how it related to this project.

Letters of support from such key stakeholders as parents and parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, tribes, the business community, civil rights organizations, advocacy groups, local civic and community-based organizations, and institutions of higher education were not included.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

**Strength**

The applicant proposes to give all students iPads and subsidize internet services in each students home in an effort to expand their hybrid learning environment.

**Weakness**

The applicant does not identify the academic needs providing iPads will offer or how this proposal demonstrates evidence of a personalized learning environment. The logic behind a reform proposal is not provided. The applicant suggested that low income and Hispanic schools have the "least best" access to technology, however they provided no evident to support this statement. No evidence demonstrating that expanding the hybrid model would personalize the learning environment for all students was included.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	0

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not include a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready.

The applicant did not include an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students that demonstrates that all participating students would pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards, college- and career-ready graduation requirements, or accelerate his or her learning through support of his or her needs.

The applicant did not provide support for how there approach giving students iPads and expanding a hybrid learning model would engage and empower all learners, in particular high-need students, in an age-appropriate manner.

There is no indication in the application that parents and educators would support the plan proposed or support student learning through the plan.

Not addressed: (i) A personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable

the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals and ensure he or she can graduate on time and college- and career-ready;

Not addressed:(ii) A variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments;

Not Addressed:(iii) High-quality content, including digital learning content (as defined in this notice) as appropriate, aligned with college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice);

Not Addressed: (iv) Ongoing and regular feedback, including, at a minimum—

(A) Frequently updated individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice), or college- and career-ready graduation requirements; and

(B) Personalized learning recommendations based on the student’s current knowledge and skills, college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice), and available content, instructional approaches, and supports; and

Not Addressed: (v) Accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students (as defined in this notice) to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice); and

The applicant stated the teachers would receive training, however did not include information detailing what Mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning. The applicant stated that a hybrid learning management system was in place, however they did not describe what this system was or how it supports student learning.

The applicant provided no information that supported the criteria in this section, thus no points can be awarded.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	0
---	----	---

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant shared two sentences to address this section. They indicated that the district was currently implementing a data review structure that will require teacher to access and use data in their planning. They plan to reference students present level of functioning (not defined), career and education aspirations and programming that would support needs and goals. The information shared did not support a high quality plan. This district appears to not currently use data for instructional planning. The applicant did not reference the criteria for this section of the application or the rest of the application. No references to the type of training teachers would support or how the plan would address personalized learning was included.

The applicant did not address how participating educators would have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

The applicant did not address how participating school leaders and school leadership teams would have training, policies, tools, data, and resources to enable them to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and accelerates student progress through common and individual tasks toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

The applicant did not 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.

Since the applicant did not address the required criteria in this section or in the rest of this grant, no points were awarded.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	0

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not address this criteria. There was no reference to LEA policies, practices, or rules in the application, thus no points can be provided. None of the criteria in (D)(1) a-e were referenced in the application or in the two sentences provided for this section. The information provided did not relate to the criteria for (D)(1).

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

10

0

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant shared that they have a data system. This fact does not adequately address section (D)(2) criteria. The applicant did not address the extent to which they have a plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed. There is no indication from the application that state or LEA policy would allow the expansion of the hybrid model. Providing subsidized internet during the grant period does not demonstrate LEA and school infrastructure to support personalized learning. No points were awarded since the applicant did not address the criteria.

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

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant will have a committee structure to monitor and evaluate grant activities and annual progress will be measured and adjusted. The committee structure was not defined and no details were provided on who they would be or how often they would meet. The criteria requests a continuous improvement plan however the applicant will only look at evaluation annually. The action plan referenced did not address timely and regular feedback for ongoing corrections and improvements in grant activities. There is no indication if or how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information. The applicant addressed evaluation, thus one point was awarded.

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

5

0

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided insufficient information to address strategies for ongoing communication with internal and external stakeholders thus no points can be awarded. No strategies were provided for ongoing communication and engagement of stakeholders. A committee will meet, however communication and engagement were not discussed in the four sentences provided to address the all of the criteria for section E.

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

5

0

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Continual improvement was not addressed in the narrative through ambitiously yet achievable performance measures.

(E)(3) charts are included, however they are inconsistent with the application. Goals are included for elementary grade students by subgroup, with annual targets for years they would not be served under the grant.

- (a) The applicant did not include its rationale for selecting measures;
- (b) The applicant did not address how the measures would provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern; and
- (c) The applicant did not address how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

The applicant did not have a total 12 to 14 performance measures. Seven performance measures were included and many did not have the required baseline data.

The applicant did not address the minimal requirements of this criteria, thus no points are awarded.

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

5

0

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Section (E)(4) was not addressed anywhere in the application by the applicant thus no points could be awarded.

Not addressed: Plans to evaluate the effectiveness of 1) professional development, 2) activities that employ technology, 3) to more productively use time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results.

Not addressed: strategies as 1) improved use of technology, 2) working with community partners, 3) compensation reform, and 4) modification of school schedules and structures. The applicant would provide students with iPads and move to an undefined hybrid model, however these references lacks sufficient details on how they would be a high quality investment.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	0

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not identify all funds that will support the project (e.g., Race to the Top – District grant; external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds); in one budget chart, other funds were listed, however they were not identified elsewhere.

It is unclear if the expenses are reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal. The applicant did not share sufficient details to make this determination. A budget narrative was not included and table 4-1 is not complete. Personnel costs, descriptions and assumptions were left blank.

A clearly and thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities was not included in the application. Professional development costs are not defined and some costs are unrelated to the rest of the application. For example, nearly 3 million dollars would be spent for teachers to develop hybrid classes. This does not seem reasonable or feasible given the past academic performance of students in this school division.

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

10

0

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's plan for sustainability seems to involve saving money by not staffing teachers and reducing the purchase of textbooks. This plan does not seem feasible or sustainable. The applicant did not offset the cost for the increased use of technology. Internet subsidies would end with the grant. No plan is in place to ensure families would be able to have continued access. No points were awarded for this section as the applicant did not provide sufficient data to show that the hybrid model should or could be sustained.

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant addressed that they had partnerships with several colleges, a library, and the Dixon foundation. It is unclear how these partnerships would support this application. The information was insufficient to address any of the criteria for this competitive preference priority.

- Not addressed (1)
- Not addressed (2)
- Not addressed (3)
- Not addressed (4)
- Not addressed (5)
- Not addressed (6)

### Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant did not meet the absolute priority:</p> <p>The applicant did not provide a consistent or realistic plan to address how it will build on the core educational assurance areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No data supported that implementing a district wide hybrid learning model would create a learning environments that would significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies. The data shared indicates this plan may further erode student learning and teaching. There is no evidence that sending students home with an i-Pad will improve student learning and the applicant did not document support from parents or teachers. It is unclear who would supervise these students should they have parents who work outside of the home or if their parents do not want to enroll them in a hybrid model.</li> <li>2. There was no evidence to support that this grant would provide tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements. Performance measures did not address college and career ready graduation requirements.</li> <li>3. No evidence from this proposal indicates that the project would accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student; No data was provided that indicated that the applicant would meet the minimal student learning needs through the proposal.</li> <li>4. No evidence was provided through this proposal that indicated the effectiveness of educators would increase; students would have access to the most effective educators; achievement gaps would decrease across student groups; or the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers would increase. Students would have access to fewer teachers and few details were provided on the hybrid model. This model was piloted for one year with secondary students and tier scores went down. This is no indication how or why this model should be implemented in elementary or middle schools.</li> </ol>		

Total	210	10
-------	-----	----

# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #1310PA-3 for Lebanon School District



A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant does state a vision statement for the RTT-D funds relative to expanding their 'hybrid' learning initiative in their high school but fails to demonstrate clearly how the vision statement is linked to the four education assurance areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lebanon plans to begin implementation of the common core standards, but how this implementation will support this RTT-D initiative is not addressed.</li> <li>Applicant doesn't describe how data systems that reflect students' growth and success will be included or is currently included, or how teachers/principals can access data on individualized students that would provide an understanding of instructional strengths and weaknesses.</li> <li>Lebanon states that there is not a large turnover of teachers within the district, but fails to identify if the teachers are considered effective and what measurement is used to determine effectiveness. Applicant reported a change of school principals, but also fail to report the determination of effective principals.</li> <li>The fourth assurance addresses "turning around lowest-achieving schools." How Lebanon has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision to turn around their lowest-achieving school(s) is not clearly stated. The applicant states that the "hybrid" model (combination of in school classroom instruction and on-line coursework) has had success, but not enough detail was provided to get a clear vision of how Lebanon will expand this program using RTT-D funds to support more students having success.</li> </ul>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) Applicant indicates in (A)(1) that the LEA-level has committed to serving <u>all</u> students "to establish a more personalized learning environment that will encourage all students to greater aspirations and provide the education and experiences that will allow for maximum opportunities to achieve their personal objectives." Applicant refers to a plan of expanding a hybrid learning initiative, which is currently being piloted in the high school, to all students at other school-levels based on students' successes from the pilot year. Although the applicant indicates that all students and all schools in the LEA will participate in this grant, the process of how they determined this is unclear. The applicant also fails to provide evidence of the students' successes from the pilot program, or state why the LEA feels that by replicating the initiative at other school levels would likely result in a successful reform initiative.</p> <p>(b) Applicant provided the names of the schools that were included in the reform proposal (pgs. 15 &amp; 16). There is one high school, one middle school and five elementary schools.</p> <p>(c) Raw data required for this criteria was provided in the "School Demographic" tables (pgs. 15 &amp; 16) for each of seven schools. The raw data indicates that each school identified as part of this grant application has a high percentage of high needs' students.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Although the applicant identifies that they want to use the RTT-D grant to expand and replicate a hybrid learning initiative that is currently being piloted in their high school by implementing the initiative in other grade levels, it is unclear of how this reform will look when implementing it with younger students. A more detailed description is needed to understand how this "infused technology" will be translated into meaningful reform for all participating schools.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(a) Outlined in the Action Plan is a Goal for "students to demonstrate increased academic achievement in classes and standardized tests." How individual student growth will be determined is a value added component, which is not clearly defined, as well as performance increases. Applicant has provided data in the tables related to this criteria (pgs. 18-19). Baseline data and annual targets reflect an increase in proficiency is expected.

(b) District has defined how achievement gaps are determined, but a clear reasoning for comparison of subgroups to 'all' groups versus a comparison to state or national criteria is not provided.

(c) High school graduation rates are not very high in this district (overall 73%). Although 100% target is ambitious, it unclear based on the information written into this narrative or the detailed in the action plan that this target will likely be achievable.

(d) It is confusing to understand that only 73% of student graduated last year, and of those, 60% enrolled in college (based on data interpretation from the table on pg. 21). Applicant fails to provide rationale for data or expected targets.

Based on the information provided in this narrative and the data charts, it is unlikely that the applicant's vision will result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity.

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: (a & b) Applicant lists several initiatives that Lebanon has been involved with over the past four years (i.e. State's new teacher and principal evaluation system, study of Intermediate Unit #13 study on math and science instruction, instilled a hybrid learning program) but no data was provided that would support that the initiatives have improved learning outcomes, closing the achievement data, increasing high school graduation rates, and increasing college enrollment, other than one elementary school was awarded Title I recognition. based on performance.  (c) A student information system and a data warehousing software provides data to districts' teachers, but narrative does not explain how parents have access to this sort of data.		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	0
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: Although applicant refers to having a "tight standards of accountability" and posts all financial information on its website, this proposal did not address specific expenditures required by this selection criteria (e.g. actual personnel salaries at school level for support and certified teachers).		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	1
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: Applicant provides sufficient evidence that a 'hybrid' learning program, including the scheduling of students, has been established. The applicant fails to align any of these existing conditions with state/federal statute concerning this type of scheduling or course scheduling.		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	1
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments: Little evidence is provided as a means of stakeholder support. The application is signed by the local union school board president, but no supporting documentation of how the staff support this initiative via the collective bargaining unit or the administration. There was no support documentation from parent organizations, students, business community, etc.		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1
(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:		

Applicant has identified areas of focus for reducing performance gaps among their economically disadvantaged population and their Hispanic students. The plan to analyze the implementation is unclear. There is no rationale given to why if the area of focus is for Hispanic students and economically disadvantaged students, the timeline to implement the proposed reform for this populations of students in the lower elementary schools would not be offered for at least two years after the program begins.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Lebanon's Action Plan, located in the Appendix, describes two goals related to Professional Collaboration, two goals for Supporting Students, and two goals for Teaching and Learning. The goals contain a vision, commitments, action steps, baseline/achievement data.</p> <p>(a) Applicant addresses most of the criteria from this selection. The applicant's Action Plan has goals that support student engagement in learning and establishing a college- and career- ready standards. The Plan also includes a process to create individualized learning environments, and there is evidence of establishing a collaborative culture. Although the action plan gives an overarching vision and states its goals, the applicant doesn't address specific criteria such as how the activities described will develop skills and traits such as goal setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity and problem solving.</p> <p>(b) Action plan supports a commitment from Lebanon to provide a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development (e.g. identification of skills that student needs to function as citizens, promote and implement curriculum and standard). Teachers will support this commitment by improvement in instructional approaches (Teaching and Learning, Action Step #7). The plan promotes ongoing and regular feedback by an action that supports revising as necessary (Step #8). Although the applicant refers to the hybrid learning management system as a way for students to digitally able to access how they are performing, it was unclear if the students were receiving high quality content in a digital format that was linked to college and career standards, or if accommodations were being made for high need students to ensure that they were on track to graduate.</p> <p>(c) Action plan does not provide strong evidence that there are mechanisms in place to provide training and support to students that will help them track and manage their learning.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	9
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) Action Plan supports evidence that teachers will be provided support by access to professional development opportunities, curriculum mapping, access to students' data, curriculum content, and instructional teaching practices/differentiating instruction. Lebanon has piloted state's new teacher evaluation process. Supporting evidence was not provided of how this criteria had been implemented with the high school pilot initiative.</p> <p>(b) Applicant discusses professional development for teachers in their plan learning resources such as using digital resources, but a clear vision of how this related to the program proposed in not evident.</p> <p>(c) District plans to participate in the State's new teacher/principal evaluation process. Applicant states that there is a plan to require teachers to access and utilize individual student data to develop "individual learning plans," but details about how these two steps will ensure continuous school improvement and increase student performance and close achievement gaps are not provided.</p> <p>(d) Design for effective teachers and principals to increase number of students is not clearly identified. Applicant does not provide how the district plans to improve in specialty areas such as math and science areas.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	0
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant only identifies that districts has a technology system that will allow for collection and analyzing of student data. There is no discussion of how the district is organizing itself to provide support to all participating schools. There is no discussion about factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school-level budgets. There is no discussion about how LEA plans to give students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, nor was it mentioned in the application that students would have the opportunity to master standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways. The application also did not discuss ways that the learning resources and instructional practices would be adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	0
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) The applicant does not discuss how all participating students (as defined in this notice), parents, educators (as defined in this notice), and other stakeholders (as appropriate and relevant to student learning), regardless of income, have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation of the applicant's proposal.</p> <p>(b) The applicant does not discuss how students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders (as appropriate and relevant to student learning) have appropriate levels of technical support, which may be provided through a range of strategies (e.g., peer support, online support, or local support).</p> <p>(c) The applicant does not provide details of how LEAs information technology system will allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format (as defined in this notice) and to use the data in other electronic learning systems (e.g., electronic tutors, tools that make recommendations for additional learning supports, or software that securely stores personal records).</p> <p>(d) The applicant provides no evidence that the LEA and the schools will use interoperable data systems (as defined in this notice) (e.g., systems that include human resources data, student information data, budget data, and instructional improvement system data).</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	4
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Action Plan fails to address a timeline of implementation or responsible persons in charge of the implementation. Although the strategies included in the Action Plan does identify an approach to reach overarching goals (e.g. establish school-wide PLCs), it lacks a system of monitoring (other than a statement that says that a committee will meet and discuss), measuring, and plans for publicly sharing the information.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative states that it will have ongoing communication and engagement, but with the exception of a goal being that there will be discussions about the progress of the grant within the PLCs, and the outside stakeholder's e-mail communication, there is not evidence of stakeholders participation in this grant implementation nor is it clear what the specific strategies are for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders after the initial grant implementation.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant identifies targets for performance increase and specific measurement instrument. There was not rationale provided on why applicant chose their instrument tools (e.g. It is unclear how students completing individualized career plans will ensure</p>		

college- and career- readiness).

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

5

0

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The data tables provided in the application provided performance measures for each of their goals, but there was no discussion of how the Applicant plans to formally evaluate the RTT-D activities. There was no discussion made in this section of the application specific to to more productively use time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results, through such strategies as improved use of technology, working with community partners, compensation reform, and modification of school schedules and structures (e.g., service delivery, school leadership teams (as defined in this notice), and decision-making structures).

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	0
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: In review of the budget, several items listed were not supported within the narrative or Action Plan (e.g. eBased text, home internet). Rationale for professional development training was not adequately defined. It's confusing to tell what expenses would be considered supplanting versus supplementing. With a program already in place, it's not clear on what budget expenses are related to the expansion of the program versus just doing more of the same. There is not supportive evidence for several items in the budget or relative rationale for an estimate (i.e. \$300,000 for Internet subsidies (based on what information/quote?).		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	1
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant refers to local funds coninuing program once the RTT-D funds end, but this does not appear to be a reasonable method to ensure sustainability. There was no evidence of support other than what was required by the selection criteria.		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: Applicants idea to expand on an existing initiative of hybrid learning was a feasible means to promote individualized learning plans for students. The Action Plan provided overarching goals that would support this sort of program, but other areas of this proposal were weak in supporting evidence to ensure success (i.e. lacks family and community engagement, doesn't clearly articulate infrastructure that support improved results, and has no evidence of evaluation.		

## Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: The Action Plan has not clearly defined its timeline for activities. There was no evidence of the quality of the personnel to be hired to manage the grant. The application lacks an adequate evaluation plan that would monitor how the strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators are being implemented and aligned with the college- and career-ready standards and graduation requirements.		

---

Total	210	50
-------	-----	----