



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0425KY-1 for Lewis County Board of Education

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Louis County School District's reform vision lacks comprehension and coherency. The vision addresses 2 of the 4 core educational assurance areas.</p> <p>a. The district adopted MAP assessment to analyze student performance K-12 which speaks to assurance #1. Assessments will be administered 3 times throughout school year from preschool to high school. Teachers will use these data to facilitate personalized student support.</p> <p>b. There is partial implementation of assurance #2 referenced through conducting grade level meetings to review lesson plans, instructional strategies, and assessment to increase student achievement. However, there was no mention of building data systems that measure student growth.</p> <p>c. The reform vision omitted assurance #3 that addresses strategies to recruit, develop, reward and retain effective teachers and principals and strategies for turning around low performing schools.</p> <p>d. The reform vision does not mention assurance #4 of processes to turn around low performing schools.</p> <p>The Louis County School District reform vision is unclear and fails to articulate a clear and credible approach to accelerating student achievement, deepen student learning, and increase student equity.</p> <p>a. The methods to accelerate student achievement were obscure. There was mention of utilizing of MAP assessment results and the utilization of team meeting to increase student performance. Parent Portal will afford an opportunity for parents to be informed of student progress</p> <p>b. Personalized student support was mentioned however the extent to which this will occur was vague.</p> <p>Overall, these omissions place Louis County School District in the low range. The applicant lacks evidence to support most of the core educational assurances and goal articulation requires clarity and credibility.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Louise County School District approach to implementing its reform proposal will support high quality LEA and school level implementation.</p> <p>a) This reform encompasses 4 elementary schools, 1 middle school, and 1 high school. A total of 2,465 students in the Louis County School district are included in this plan.</p> <p>b) It is reports 71% of students receive free/reduced lunch which qualifies the district for RTT District competition.</p> <p>c) Data chart list all participating schools, total number of participants, low income identification, high need students and educators. All schools in the district are classified as Title I schools which supports the high need status of the district</p> <p>d) Reports a homeless population of 228 in 2011-12. This is vital information that should be considered throughout the grant cycle.</p>		

Louis County School District evidence warrants a score in the top of the medium range. The written narrative and the data chart were incompatible. For example the narrative states Garrison free/reduced lunch was 84.3% yet the chart states 79.7%. The graph that depicts school enrollment and free/reduced lunch status lacked all school listings. Graph only list Garrison and Tollesboro.

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

10

7

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Louis County School District application includes a high quality plan that will be scaled up to support district wide change and assist applicant to reach its outcome goals.

- At the preschool level, Kindermusik will be used to assist with phonemic awareness and application. In the 2013-2014 school term, the Brigance K will be utilized to assess Kindergarten readiness.
- At the elementary level, MAP assessments will be administered along with adopting the Reading Street Language Art Curriculum. Additional interventions and supplemental activities will be integrated. New math, science, and social studies textbooks will be adopted to align with the new Kentucky Core Content Standards. There is no evidence of instructional changes,
- The adoption of new textbooks and the integration of new technology in the form of iPads and ereader will be implemented at the middle school level.
- At the high school level, there will be an expansion of dual credit enrollment opportunities. Career Tech courses at high school level are transferred to college which will enhance future careers goals.
- Partnering with the Boys and Girls Club for afterschool tutoring will increase student internet access and optimize additional educational support.

Overall, this places Louis County School District in the top medium range.

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

10

5

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The Louis County School District vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrating ambitious yet slightly unachievable goals.

a) The performance on the summative assessment reflects a gradual yearly increase in ACT scores across all assessed content areas. Based on growth chart, all 11 grade students will met or exceed ACT benchmarks by 2017. Proficiency rates in Reading and Math show positive, ambitious trends across all grade spans. Fourth grade student's performance trajectory is extremely high. Reading proficiency for 4th grade is 97.2% and 98.58 in Math. This goal is unrealistic.

b) Decreasing achievement gaps goals indicate 90% will be proficient/distinguish in Reading and 83% in Math. Chart reflects 10% will achieve apprentice medium/high in Reading and 17% medium/high in Math. Special education population may have difficulty achieving this rapid level of proficiency and growth.

c) Overall Graduation rate for 2010-2011 was 82.9%, 75.6% in 2011-2012, to 100% in 2016-2017. Aspiring to achieve 100% graduation rate in 2016-2017 is an unrealistic goal.

d) College enrollment rate is reported at 84% in 2017. This percentage may serve as an ambitious yet achievable goal.

e) The plan does not address post-secondary degree attainment.

Louis County School district's ACT scores, student proficiency and growth, graduation rate goals are slightly unrealistic. This section shows evidence of a mid medium score. The goals to improve student outcomes were unrealistic and should reflect a true trajectory of success.

## 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	6

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The extent to which Lewis County School District describes their records of success in the past 4 years in student learning

and achievement is limited. There is some improvement in learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps.

- The progress in Math reflects a steady increase over the past 4 years across all grade spans. However, that does not hold true for Reading, Science, and Social Studies. Chart reflects 2 years of data instead of 4.
- A High School graduation rates is 82.9% in 2011 which exceeds Kentucky's state average.
- College enrollment is significantly lower than states average. No data was shared to indicate percent of college enrollment in previous years.

Louis County School District demonstrates the ability to achieve ambitious and significant reform in persistently low performing schools.

- The adoption of the Common Core Standards in Mathematical process yielded high achievement and growth in that content area across all schools.
- Reviewing and upgrading curricular materials, ongoing observation, review of pacing guides, and expanding dual credit had a direct impact on Math gains.
- The utilization of Operation Preparation and Workkeys afforded the district the opportunity to group students based on these results.

Louis County briefly mentioned the availability of student performance data.

Although there is evidence that data will be made available the district and building level staff, there is no mention of making these data available to parents.

Based on the evidence presented in this criteria, Louis County ranks in the low medium range. The district displays limited evidence of demonstrating a clear track record of success.

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

5

3

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Louis County School District maintains a moderate level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments.

- Salaries for school-level instructional and support staff, instructional staff, teachers, and non-personnel expenditures are transparent.
- Provides local newspaper a list of individual salaries and posts every salary schedule on district website annually with URL provided.
- The district provides financial information to local newspaper and on website.
- The district complete budget summary is available online and in the newspaper. It does not specify if the URL of website, whether the newspaper is local, and the frequency of this publication.

Based on the evidence provided, Louis County's level of transparency is in the bottom high range. There should be consistency in the manner in which that processes, practices, and investment are disseminated.

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

10

5

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Louis County School District shows evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy to implement personalized learning environment.

- Screening of preschool students at 3 years of age which assist in the identification of special needs student. All Kindergarten students will be screened with the Brigance K assessment to detect any speech, language, motor skills, and developmental deficits.
- The administration of the MAP assessment results are used by teachers, instructional supervisor, and coach to develop personalized learning plans. Assessments administered 3 times per year to determine level of progress.
- Eight graders are administered the PLAN assessment as a precursor to the ACT and eleventh grades are administered the ACT to identify academic progress and future career choices. Students that fail to meet ACT benchmark are offered developmental Math courses. If Math course proves to be a success, students may count course as a college credit. This strategy supports the development of college and career ready students.
- Implementation plan requires specification of what grade span MAP assessments are utilized and what additional assessments are administered at high school level specifically at the 9th and 12th grade level.

- All assessments referenced were state mandated and there was no reference to local benchmark assessments.

Overall, this places Louis County score in the mid medium range. Plan would be strengthened through the use of other local and varied formative assessments. Proposed elements of the plan would be a challenge to implement under State legal, statutory, or regulatory requirements. In addition, implementation spans most grade spans, it appears 9th and 12th grade students were omitted from this criteria.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	6
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Louis County School District has obtained stakeholder engagement in the development and support of this proposal.

- Student engagement was limited to an annual student survey. Parental involvement included a family needs survey and serving on the Councils to define the project scope and direction. Teacher and administrator representatives of each school developed plans for advancing students. There is evidence ideas and support was offered by teachers during the development of the plan through the site based Councils.
- Plan does not refer to any revisions based on student, family, teacher or administrator engagement and feedback.
- Key stakeholders that offered support to plan include the Boys and Girls Club, Health Department, local LEA, math department, local library, and the city of Vanceburg.
- There is no evidence of support from student organizations, civil rights organizations, and institutions of higher learning.

The applicant has some evidence of stakeholder engagement and support. This places Louis County School District in the mid medium range. The inclusion of higher institutions, civil rights organization, and student organization would strengthen stakeholder engagement.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Louis County School District has demonstrated sparse evidence of a high quality plan current implementation of personal learning environment and the logic behind the reform proposal.

- Analysis of initial test results were mentioned but failed to provide specific proficiency rates.
- The support systems in place includes implementation Kentucky Education Reform Act, development of a Comprehension Improvement Plan by school instructional staff, administrators, and district staff, and the utilization of Measure Academic Performance (MAP) assessments data.
- Plan compares past performance, current performance, and goal setting to increase student proficiency.
- Limited details were mentioned in the plan that address goals, timelines, and specific activities needed to address personalized learning environments.
- Adequate support and resources were not embedded in the plan.

The district plan on this criterion places them in the low range due to a lack of specifications in the area of needs and gaps.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Louis County School District has an extensive, high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready.

- Students are assessed using Measure of Academic Progress (MAP), Kentucky Content Testing, and ACT. Individualized Learning Plans are development based on these data. Students meet with administrators every nine weeks to set academic goals. Career choice classes are offered at the technical high schools that allow students to receive career certification. Technology is heavily embedded in the plan to ensure competency of college and career

standards. Evidence is vague in the area of access and exposure to diverse cultures, context, and perspectives. The plan references art classes, social studies, history, and co-curricular settings meeting however these options should be expanded. The plan states clubs and organization will foster skills and traits of goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communications, creativity, and problem solving. Effective instructional strategies will foster these skills and traits more effectively in conjunction with clubs and organizations.

- Plan includes a variety of high quality in approaches that include instructional support to Gifted and Talented students, setting clear learning targets embedded in Common Core Academic Standards, extended school services, online personalized learning curricula, and strong professional development in technology. Digital learning is heavily embedded through the use of Manga High, Prezis, iPads, Whiteboards, and web-based instruction with the ultimate of transitioning to "bring you own device" concepts. Plan acknowledges the need to upgrade technology infrastructures. Parents may access Infinite Campus to receive weekly updates on student progress. Accommodations and high quality strategies for high-need students lack specificity.
- Applicant failed to mention mechanism to provide training and support to students to understand how to use the tools and resources to track and manage their learning.

Overall, this places Louis County School District in the medium range. The district details college- and career-ready strategies but should elaborate on student training on tools and resources and seek to embed diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives. To make plan credible, include timelines for implementation and name responsible parties.

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

20

10

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Louis County School District has a plan to engage educators in training and work in professional teams and communities.

- Professional Learning Communities meet weekly to monitor student progress. Project- based learning, white boards, manipulative are used to increase student engagement. Formative and summative assessment results are reviewed to personalize learning. Interventions are implemented in the form of teacher-student discussions of individual student goals referenced as Contact Time.
- Teacher and principal evaluation data are used to maximize instructional growth and effectiveness. Teacher and Principal Evaluation are evaluated semi-annually to provide feedback to improve level of effectiveness.
- Student progress is measured annually to the use of ACT, Explore, and End of Course Assessments. Plan stated that MAP assessments are administered 3 times a year.
- Louis County School District Professional development plan in math and technology will be conducted by specialist regularly to accelerate student progress.
- This training details on how to access, use data to accelerate student progress. Plan lacks detail on how timeline and specifics of training. Plan does not mention a high-quality learning resources.
- Teachers are trained according to their professional needs and students. Career/Technical instructors receive certification is their specific vocation. Plan mentions process and tools to match student needs but failed to provide details around these resources. There is no evidence of digital resources to align to college and career-ready standards.
- Minimal details were provided around increasing the number of students that receive instruction from effective or highly effective teachers and principals. Principals are afforded to opportunity to attend professional development training to improve instructional staff at each school.

Overall, this places Louis County School District in the mid medium range. The plan would be strengthen by clarifying set goals, detailing activities, and defining timelines.

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

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Louis County School District has s sound high quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructures.

- The district's central office has an extensive support staff that provides services to all schools. The plan includes but is

not limited to an Instructional Supervisor, Director of Special Services, and Director of Pupil Services.

- School leadership teams exist in all schools which have complete autonomy over school schedules, calendars, personnel and school level budgets. Site Based Decision Making Councils exist in all schools in the district. No reference was made to autonomy in roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators.
- Students may progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery in college algebra or English composition, COMPASS, and during extended school. Students demonstrate mastery in multiple comparable ways through attending summer school and Boy's and Girl's summer camp just to name a few.
- There is no mention of providing learning resources and instructional practices for students with disabilities and English learners.

Overall, this places Louis County School District in the high medium range. The inclusion of special subgroups and increased autonomy would be beneficial.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Louis County School District and school infrastructures strongly support personalized learning.

- All participating students, parents, educators and other stakeholders have access to necessary content, tools, and learning resources both in and out of school. COMPASS is accessible from any computer. The plan does state some educational resources provided by Boy's and Girl's club are fee accessible which can prevent student participation.
- Appropriate technical support will be provided to schools by offering training on setting up passwords, technical support, and assist with the use of Infinite Campus. Plan lack specifies about the frequency of these meetings and if this training will be held before, during, or after school to accommodate parent work schedules.
- The plan does not state if Infinite Campus has an export function or whether you can use these data in other electronic learning systems.
- The district's data system does use interoperable data systems.

Overall, Louis County School District scores is in mid medium range. Incorporating an export function to data system, specifying data access training times, and ensure that all students have access to free educational resources will strengthen the plan.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Louis County School District strategy for continuous improvement processes of timely and regular feedback on progress toward goals, corrections, and improvement during and after the grant are vague.

- The plan mentions trainings and Professional development workshops will be provided. However it fails to mention methods of monitoring success, mechanisms for measuring effectiveness, or how the quality of professional development will be shared with the public.
- There is undocumented evidence of timely and regular feedback on monitoring, measuring, and sharing information on the quality of investment in technology. Simply adopting grade 3-6 new reading series and Math Innovation for grades 6-8 both does not meet the expectation required to measure continuous improvement.
- Evidence of tools are in place to measure and monitor continuous improvement in the area of staff. Observations reveal classrooms were teacher centered with low student involvement. Reviews revealed teachers not using the Trailblazers program that would provide to positively impact math scores. Applicant fails to mention publicly sharing the quality of investment in staff.

Overall, the district continuous improvement process for correction score in the bottom medium range. Plan would be strengthened by putting tools in place to consistently monitor, measure, and share quality of investment.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Louis County School District's plan details their approach to continuous improvement through modes of ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.

- External communications include posts on district website, local radio, local newspaper ads, and maintains an open door policy. There is no evidence of community engagement.
- The most common internal communications are email and telephone. Again, the plan fails to mention any internal face-to-face communication or engagement.
- Boy's and Girl's Club director communications include phone, email, and conferences. Club is available daily which allow access to student data and interest.
- Communication and engagement strategies should include support of grant partners i.e. the local library and health department

Overall, this places the district in the bottom medium range. There is evidence of continuous internal and external communication but not mention of stakeholder engagement.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Louis County School District performance measures are ambitious yet achievable based on the goals, measures, and targets set.

- Baseline and annual targets were reasonable however only 3rd grade performance targets were selected for the elementary subgroup. Plan should include grades 3-5 for the elementary school subgroup.
- All goals are ambitious as reflected in the timeline and trajectory set forth in the plan. Goals are achievable as said target can be achieved within a reasonable timeframe.
- These performance measures tables meet the threshold of ambitious yet achievement with most populations and some subgroup. Performance measures for grades 4-8 data actually only reported 6-8 grades. Grade 4 and 5 were omitted. There is no evidenced of subgroup reporting of Performance Measure for grades 9-12 a. Developmental math enrollment targets are unrealistic. Developmental math enrollment should reflect a more gradual decline as years progress
- The plan does state a specific rationale for addressing K-8 but the rationale for grades 9-12 lacks specifics. There are rigorous, timely, and formative leading information detailed in the form a various formative, summative, and diagnostic assessments. There are little specifications on reviewing and improving performance measures over time.

Overall, this places Louis County School District in the high medium range. An explanation as to how the district will review and improve performance measures will strengthen plan.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The Louis County School District shared it plan to evaluate the effective use of Race to Top funding activities.

- Plan shows evidence of professional development offered to administrators and teachers by an experienced educator in Math across all grade spans. No reference to future plans to monitor the effective of this activity.
- Purchasing additional technological infrastructures will expose students to the latest technology as they prepare to enter the workforce. There is no evidence to evaluate the effectiveness of implementing technology.
- Collaborative efforts between the Boys and Girls Club and schools will offer additional time to access technology and extended school services.
- Plan fails to mention compensation reform or modification of schools schedules and structures

Overall, this places Louis County School District in the bottom medium range. While there is mention of some evaluative measures, the evidence provided fails to evaluate the effective of funding activities.

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

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Louis County School District shows evidence of a sound budget for the project funds identified, are reasonable and sufficient, and provide a rationale for all investments and priorities.

- District plan specifies various funding sources that include Federal, State and Local funding sources that serve to complement Race to the Top funds. Title I was specifically identified as the previous funding source for Math and Technology Consultants.
- Applicant's budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal.
- Years 1-3 in the supplies column on the Overall Budget Summary table depict a gradual reduction in supplies however, year 4th shows an increase. Justification of this increase would prove beneficial.
- Budget reflects a one-time investment in equipment compared to other budget categories that will be used throughout the budgeted funding period.
- Plan provides thoughtful rationale for all investments and priorities
- Anticipated travel expenses for Grant Coordinator are estimated to be \$12,000 per year. A decrease in this amount may be a more effective use of funds.

Overall, this places Louis County School in the lower high range. The applicant has strong evidence of a sound budget for the project; however, portions of the budget were incomplete.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Louis County School District demonstrates a sound plan for sustainability of project goals after the term of the grant.

- The plan dictates high school counselor, teacher training, mathematics facilitator, individual assessment/instruction/intervention, and extended school services will be sustained by General Funds.
- Perkins funds will be used to sustain College/Career student coach. Technology consultant will be maintained by Title II.
- All other projects will not require additional funding or will be discontinued.
- Plan does not include a budget for 3 years after the term of the grant however funding sources were identified to sustain project goals.
- District plan mentions financial support but there is no evidence of support of efforts in this project.

Overall, this places Louis County School District in the upper medium range. Although the plan fails to mention other means of support, there is strong evidence of financial support from State and local government.

### Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	6

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Louis County School District has given priority to integrate public and private resources that address social, emotional, and behavioral needs of participating students.

- A description of a coherent and sustainable partnership with various private and public organizations that include the local library, the sheriff's office, Resource Youth Services, Lewis County Extension. There is no documented evidence of partnering with any postsecondary institutions which would strengthen the plan
- Louis County listed 10 population-level desired results that aligned with the broader Race to the Top proposal. The Head Start Program partnership addresses both educational results and other educational outcomes by offering skills to successfully enter K-12 programs. Six out of 10 partnership work to assist to facilitate family and community support. i.e. First Steps, Lewis County Education Foundation
- Methods to track selected indicators were not specified. Plan fails to detail how data will be used to track resources in order to improve results for participating students. The Family Resource Center and Boys and Girls Club offer services to students in poverty as well as those families facing with welfare issues. Student with disabilities and English language learners were two subgroups that were not mentioned in the competitive preference priority. A strategy to scale this model beyond the participating students was not documented. The district recognizes how these partnerships will improve results over time by ultimately preparing students for future success in college and careers.

- This partnership integrates education and other services by addressing social-emotional needs of students through agencies such as Boys and Girls Club and the Lewis County Comprehend Office. There is no evidence of address behavioral needs, acculturation of immigrants, refugees.
- Louis County Schools District lacks ability to build capacity of staff in participating schools through this partnership. Plan does not address assessing, identifying, and inventorying needs and assets of students. It also does not speak to creating decision-making process to address needs of participating students. Parent and family engagement occurs through partnering with Lewis County Public Library. There is no mention of routinely accessing the applicant's progress in implementing its plan.
- The plan fails to identify annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures nor its desired results for students. There were no goals, measures, or targets mentioned in this priority.

Overall, the Louis County District evidence reflects a score in the medium range. While the overall plan defines formative partnerships, it lack some attributes that address behavioral needs of students.

### Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

#### Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Louis County School District share its plan to coherently and comprehensively address how it will build on the 4 core educational assurance areas designed to significantly improve learning and teaching.

1. The district showed evidence of plans to adopt new Kentucky State Standards and assessments that prepares students for college and career readiness. Data systems used to measure student growth and success include but are not limited to Brigance, MAP, ACT, and Explore. Plan states that teachers and administrators are informed and have access to all data reports and grade level meetings are held to personalize student learning. District inadequately addresses recruiting, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals. Professional development for administrators and teachers is embedded throughout the plan. Strategies used to turning around lowest achieving schools were omitted from the plan.
2. District plan addresses creating learning environments that will improve learning and teaching strategies through the development of personalize learning, assessment systems, staff development, and community partnerships. Said plan are aligned to college and career-ready standards. Plan fails to sufficiently address college and career-ready graduation requirements.
3. Accelerated student achievement and depth of student learning was addressed in the plan through formative and summative assessments, the inclusion of the Boys and Girls club, embedded teacher and administrator professional development, and significant upgrade in technological infrastructures.
4. Math and Technology consultants led professional development workshop to increases teacher and administrator effectiveness. The district plan mentions expanding student access to effective educators by ensuring that all students have access to highly qualified teachers.
5. Data charts depicts a plan to decrease achievement gaps across subgroups particularly low income and high needs students. There is inadequate evidence to address students with disabilities and English Language Learners subgroups.
6. Plan describes an ambitious yet achievable goal to increase graduation rates and prepare for college.

Overall, Louis County School District has no met Absolute Priority 1. Although there is evidence of personalized learning environment, the plan fails to address 2 of 4 core educational assurances. The plan fails to address teacher recruitment, rewards and specific strategies to address turnaround of lowest performing school in LEA.

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



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0425KY-2 for Lewis County Board of Education

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	0
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>While the 10 "capacities" the applicant lists are excellent goals for any school or system, the proposal does not provide a vision in this section that shows how they will achieve this. While students will be screened for early childhood and elementary readiness, but there is little in this proposal that addresses the personalized learning environment that would lead the reader to believe that the goals of accelerating student achievement and deepening student learning will take place. The purchase of next textbooks, iPads or improving upon the infrastructure may have a positive effect on student access to up-to-date hardware and software, but ultimately it is what happens with texts and hardware by teachers that leads toward accelerating student achievement. There is little of that in this presentation.</p> <p>This proposal lacks a high-quality plan that would increase student achievement and deepen student learning through a personalized learning environment. Missing is a thoughtful perspective provided by key goals and the means to achieve them. This is a major fault. As a result, the proposal lacks direction. The reader is constantly looking for the direction that the plan will take but feels lost as the proposal dwells on supplies, materials, texts, technology and an improved infrastructure. While such purchases together with professional development would be welcomed in any school, the use of these within the classroom must be presented coherently and comprehensively to the reader. The proposal must provide the reader with key goals, activities and a rationale for the activities, a timeline, deliverables, the parties responsible for implementation and a plan that is credible. This unfortunately is not the case with this proposal.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The schools listed include 4 elementary schools, 1 middle school and 1 high school/vocational school. Each of these schools surpasses the criteria requiring 40% of the participating students to be from low income families. These are Title I schools and as such the students are identified as high-needs students. A total of 2465 students will participate in the proposed project. Although the proposal does include a list of resumes, near the beginning of the proposal, the participating educators have not been identified within this section except for an Instructional Teacher Coach and a Teacher Coach split between the four elementary schools. This is a very needy school district, extremely poverty stricken, with texts being used by the students dating back some 15 years.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal lists a number of activities/purchases (e.g., Reading Street; the hiring of a Teacher Coach and Principal Coach, infrastructure upgrades; and the purchase of iPads and e-readers.), but lacks a high-quality plan that includes <i>key goals, rationale, timeline</i> and the <i>parties responsible for the implementation of the plan</i>. There are some excellent ideas within this section dealing with developmental readiness for elementary students and testing students to understand student needs that must be addressed to personalize education for each student. Likewise, providing digital technology to the students would be helpful, but the proposal does not demonstrate how it would be used. The lack of targeted goals does not draw the plan together and move the district toward meaningful systemic reform for its educational program. Aside from listing a number of priority purchases, it does not clearly describe how all students, and more importantly their education, will be effected by these purchases. The LEA-wide reform and change demanded by this section has not been address sufficiently.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

In (A) (3), it was noted that the proposal lacks key goals, activities to meet those goals, a rationale, timeline and parties responsible. (A) (4) and its credibility lies in the evidence put forth in (A) (3). Based upon the lack of a High-Quality Plan, the goals set for Performance on Summative Tests, Decreasing Achieving Gaps, Increasing Graduation Rates or College Enrollment seems unlikely. A clear case as to how the current plan would lead to improvement in each of the areas above is needed. At present, the reader has to take on faith the changes that are anticipated in ACT, reading or mathematics proficiency. Likewise, a high school graduation rate by 2015-16 of 95.6% when it is currently at 82.9% seems unlikely without substantial evidence to support actions that will accomplish this.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	3

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section provides a number of bar charts to indicate progress from 2008-2011. This is expected to cover four years of data to demonstrate a clear record of success. A number of these (e.g. science) show a decline rather than success. The bar charts themselves are small and difficult to read. None of these charts indicate the number of students that are being described, only the percentages for 2008 and 2011. The charts are not comprehensive since data has been omitted for the intervening years. While there is some positive information for graduation rates (82.9%) as compared to the state and for vocational training this is for one year alone, not the four years requested. The positioning of the charts is confusing, since they are not titled nor do some appear where we are informed they should appear. It is difficult to see the usefulness of the data since subgroups have been omitted from the graphs. We are left with no knowledge of how effective their program has been on these subgroups over time. There is little evidence to go on here regarding the district's success over four years in advancing learning and achievement.

This section is the applicants opportunity to illustrate/describe a clear record of success and yet we find just the opposite.

There is actually a decline in science in high school and social studies assessments show a decline in social studies in the elementary and high school grades. Student's attending college is actually lower than the state numbers presented. This does not appear to be a clear record of success. There is no evidence that they have addressed (b) in this section that asks for ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools.

The district is to be commended for their attempts to improve education by purchasing new texts, the observation of teachers, providing professional development and coaching. These are all positive attempts at education reform. Performance data is being made available to students, educators and parents, but nothing is said in this section about how this will inform and improve participation, instruction and services.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The peer reviewer is limited to the actual grant proposal and may not access any outside information such as the district website. Evidence relating to actual personnel and non-personnel salaries has not been presented in the proposal outside of the internet address provided by the applicant. This information/description is not verifiable by the peer reviewer. The applicant does describe the extent to which it makes information regarding these expenditures available to the public.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	0
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes the conditions/status of the district in being able to administer the program and describes a number of intake programs, and other programs that are beneficial in assessing students. Testing students with MAP is not implementing a personalized learning environment. Taking this information and using it to establish goals for each student is vague at best and goes no further. The specifics of developing a personalized learning environment are missing and dismissed in four or five sentences. These do not seem to be successful conditions that would lead to a personalized learning environment.

The State legal, statutory or regulatory requirements under which they currently operate are not described. While the reviewer understands that the administration of tests and screening children is an important function in a school district's operation and may indicate that they are autonomous, this is not always the case. More information would be helpful here to indicate that the state legal, statutory and regulatory requirements are in place to allow them to implement a personalized learning

environment. This section does not provide information about the personalized learning environment itself and how the conditions in this district favor their plan.

The applicant has not described successful conditions and autonomy under State legal, statutory and regulatory requirements to implement the personal learning environment.

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

10

2

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal was reportedly developed in concert with parents, teachers and the principal at each school. Those individuals on these School Councils are chosen by their peers. This section (B) (4) offers only one stakeholder (Boys and Girls Club of Lewis County) as evidence of stakeholder engagement. Evidence of this group and their contribution to the proposal is not contained in this letter. There are other letters of support found at the beginning of the proposal (e.g., district schools, including the Foster Meade Career and Technical Center and Lewis County Kentucky Education Association.) No information was provided concerning how students, families, teachers and principals were directly engaged and the proposal revised.

*There is no evidence of direct engagement and support for the proposal from collective bargaining or non-collective bargaining teachers in the participating schools.* The applicant has not demonstrated meaningful stakeholder engagement.

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

5

0

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not provide evidence of a high-quality plan (key goals, activities and rational for activities, timeline, deliverables, parties responsible for implementation and credibility of the plan) for the analysis of the applicant's current status. There do not appear to be any key goals in the information they have presented and most important is the lack of a timeline and persons responsible for carrying out a plan. Gaps and needs are not identified.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	3

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section lacks the high-quality plan mentioned throughout. In reviewing this section, there is some mention of English and math college ready courses, but the description only generally covers the topics referred to above. Exposure to diverse cultures seems to occur through course content already undertaken, and no description is presented regarding the responsibility to bring students to an understanding that learning is the key to success in meeting their individual goals.

Missing is the mastery of skills such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking communication, creativity and problem-solving. The reader never arrives an an understanding as to how this will be presented as part of the personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development. This is only mentioned in a vague, general way.

We are not led to an understanding that students will understand that what they are learning is a key to their success. We are presented only with a statement that "they will be able to set goals." We learn that the gifted and talented students receive additional educational opportunities and that all students are presented with daily learning goals in the classroom. Middle and high school students participate in college and career planning with their guidance counselors and principals. These opportunities are fine and have been practiced in schools for generations. There is not anything in this section that relates to an understanding of learning as a key to their success nor does the information here lead to an understanding of how to structure their learning to achieve their goals and measure progress toward those goals. This proposal seeks answers to these questions in a non-traditional and innovative way.

We are told that these students are given various opportunities for academic success through classroom instruction approaches (technology, small group, whole group, clinical labs, landscaping) and are offered extended school services two days per week. The opportunities are not mentioned, only how this will be delivered to students; we are not informed about the opportunities themselves. While it is fine that two days a week students may take advantage of "extended school services," it would be helpful to know of what those services consist and how many students take advantage of this. Great emphasis is placed on technology and the professional development that will bring teachers up to 21st century standards. Students too need to know how to utilize the technology although no mention is made of this. The proposal does not tell us how students will be able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest.

Section (b) asks for a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals. While there is some mention of testing and using test results to develop a plan for each student, the discussion goes no further than this, and we are left with questions about the process of moving from testing, planning to ultimately course selection. Likewise a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments has not been presented. Nothing has been added regarding ongoing and regular feedback or the accommodations and high quality strategies for high-need students.

This section fails to address the major questions here and lacks direction. This is not a high-quality plan.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	10
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has not provided a high-quality plan to explain their approach toward implementing instructional strategies for all participating students. They provide a number of items (i.e., professional learning communities, math and technology professional development, analyzing data) but never describe exactly what they will do to improve instruction and produce college- and career-ready students. While they have responded to the list of items in (a) it is in a general and vague manner and lacks the depth of a full blown plan. For instance, the applicant indicates that they attend professional development and have enlisted the services of persons knowledgeable in the fields of technology and math to bring the staff up to speed. But that is as far as this information goes. They say they have professional learning communities, but nothing about what the discussions involve or how often they meet. Information about whether they meet as grade levels or subject matter would be helpful. Many times they refer to the opportunities that students have in this section, but what those opportunities consist of is not clarified. The proposal indicates that they use MAP to assess students, but how that gets translated into an actual personalized learning plan is not stated. This testing and ACT are the primary resources used to evaluate students and seem insufficient for the task of accelerating student academic progress. This should involve multiple means and cover all students in all grades.

Principal and teacher evaluations take place semi-annually. There is no plan in place that would deal with improving teacher and principal effectiveness. The use of interactive White Boards, videos, project based learning, classroom projects and 4H are fine. But question (ii) looks for the adaptation of content and instruction and providing opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks. It would be helpful to develop this further. In the same way, the proposal says: "All participating teachers will have access to, and know how to use tools, data and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college and career ready goals." There is no explanation of what resources they will use to do this. Aside from talking about the people they intend to hire for the grant, there is little to satisfy the reviewer that they have meet the criteria for this section. Here is a partial list of information that is missing from the section:

- Frequent measure of student progress;
- Improvement of teacher and principal effectiveness;
- Information that would allow improvement of an educator's effectiveness;
- Training, systems and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps.
- A plan for increasing the number of students receiving instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals;
- Actionable information that allows educators to identify optimal learning approaches for students;
- High quality learning resources; and
- Processes and tools to match student needs with specific resources and approaches.

There is so much left out here that It is difficult to see much of a plan that leads to providing the support and resources to accelerate student growth. Credit is assigned only for the general content that has been provided, but this section completely ignores providing a high-quality plan that would be useful in meeting the missing pieces above.

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

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides persons and policies associated with the organization of the central office that is consistent with that of

other school districts. Essential duties have been supplied for the Instructional Supervisor, the Director of Special Services, the Director of Federal Programs and, the Director of District Services and the Director of Pupil Personnel. The Lewis County School District have a Teacher Coach who serves as a support and instruction advisor for the teaching staff. They will seek two additional Teacher Coaches--one for the elementary schools and one for the middle and high school.

The school leadership teams have the appropriate flexibility and autonomy to form such things as school calendars, schedules and budgets. Mastery of subject matter is provided to students who are allowed several opportunities to achieve mastery.

Learning resources are made available to students who can gain credit recovery. A principal player in assisting students after school is the Boys and Girls Club of Lewis County who provide students with credit recovery, college prep content and small group educational assistance two evenings a week.

While the district has laid out several pieces that address this section, missing is a high-quality plan which brings this together and provides greater depth.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

While stakeholder parents, students, educators have access to some instructional learning resources, the district provides other resources through the Boys and Girls Club for a fee. Given the high poverty level of this district, this would seem to have the effect of denying them what may be important resources. Support is provided at the school for setting up access to technology driven data for their son or daughter in a open data format. The framework for the data system is interoperable and parents and guardians are provided access to grades, attendance and student credit progress through the Parent Portal.

The narrative indicates that annual instructional data for individual schools is located on the Lewis County school District website as a countywide educational improvement plan and individual assessment that it is located in the school report card. This includes academic progress, attendance, and other educational factors that are pertinent for a successful educational experience. This information is available to the public for review and feedback.

Credit has been deducted due to the limitation of access (charging a fee for access) to some instructional resources. It is not clear if parents or students can use the data in other electronic learning systems (e.g. Electronic tutors, tools that make recommendations for additional learning support, or software that securely stores personal records).

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The lack of a high-quality plan is a major roadblock to developing a rigorous education experience for Lewis County students. While the current section indicates reading, math and language arts initiatives that they have taken, the lack of a solid educational plan with specific key goals, activities and timelines means that it is impossible to define the outcomes in other than general ways. Without these outcomes in mind it is difficult to provide corrections as the plan progresses. In (C) (1) and (C) (2) both assessing students and professional development are introduced. Outside of the fact that the staff would be trained in the use of technology and math in this section, there was no elaboration that training would continue after the grant funding was gone.

In this section, they talk about expanding Kindermusic and the Reading Street series. The discussion indicates that "students will be continually monitored and tracked to ensure steady progress toward the goal that all students enter school prepared for successful transitioning into the educational setting." The actual plan behind this is not clarified. The same may be said for the Language Arts/Reading curriculum (Reading Series) and math series (Trailblazers). As with other sections in this proposal, the information regarding assessment seems to rely principally on MAP rather than multiple measures to provide a picture of a students progress toward college and career readiness. But even when the assessment results are present, there is little evidence regarding the use of this information or how it will inform the school curriculum or student progress. While this section does talk about assessing students, it does not define what would be an acceptable outcome except in the same general way that has taken place from the beginning of the proposal. While there is a short discussion of professional development in math, reading and language arts this never seems to be placed in the context of improving the delivery of educational services with convincing depth.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant lists a number of communication techniques. This list includes:

1. Postings on the website;
2. Announcements on the local radio station;
3. Ads placed in the local newspaper;
4. E-mail; and
5. Telephone communication.

Most of these techniques are limited in nature. It would have been helpful to understand how ongoing communication regarding the plan would be specifically addressed regarding to whom, when or its nature and the stakeholders actual engagement. The applicant has limited their response to this section to nine sentences. With this limited response, there is insufficient information for keeping up a dialog between parents, students, staff and community. The communication here is one-way, not two-way. Parents need to be part of the loop regarding the personalized learning environment and the status of their child's college and career readiness. This has not been addressed through the proposed plan.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
--	---	---

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The performance measures in some cases do not define performance. For instance, giving diagnostic screenings to students is something that is done to them, not what they have done. The performance measures totally ignore subgroups and as a result have no benchmarks to gauge the success or failure of performance measures. It is difficult to see how ASVB is connected to this proposal. Since the number of students in these benchmarks is not specified, it appears that any number of students will suffice as a measure of success. The timeframe in many of these measures is missing which leaves the measure open-ended. No rationale is attached to these measures and the measures do not provide the rigorous, timely formative leading information required by this section. There is no indication how the applicant will review and improve the measure over time.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

A well-crafted continuous improvement plan is not evident throughout the entire application. This section in particular evades the question of showing plans to evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top - District. It says nothing about how they plan to more productively use time, staff, money and other resources to improve results. The application does briefly mention professional development, but only in the context of using it to update personnel on technology and math. Nothing is said about strategies dealing with the improved use of technology, compensation reform and modification of school schedules and structures. It spends considerable time talking about out-of-date and aged equipment, materials, and proposes to remedy this by making new and up-to-date purchases while improving the infrastructure. It intends to offer instruction/school services (not clearly defined here) and transportation for after school activities and tutoring at the Boys and Girls Club which seems to be the only community partner working with this district. This information lacks the depth expected of a high-quality plan. An actual plan for evaluating the effectiveness of investments has not been presented in this section.

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

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	3

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has not completed Table 2.1 involving primary or additional associated criterion blanks on this table. The only funds listed are those to be received from the federal government for the purpose of the grant. No evidence of federal, state or local monies is associated with this budget. These funds are only referred to as a "variety of funds."

The narrative here is an explanation of the assets that will be purchased with RTTT-D funding. Only 15% of the funds listed are for staffing. For the most part, the expenditures appear rational given the extensive financial and educational problems the district faces. Rather than a thoughtful plan, the district appears to upgrade technology, the infrastructure, professional development and texts through this grant. This does not appear to be a high-quality plan that could be scaled up in the future. A description of all of the funds (district grant; external foundation support, LEA, State and other Federal funds) needs

to be provided to understand if this budget is both reasonable and sufficient. The short-term and long-term use of funds has not been provided.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant indicated that Title II funds will be used for technology and principal/teacher support and that the College-Career Coach will be carried over to the Perkins Grant. Other items such as the teacher training fund, a high school counselor, math facilitator, individual assessment program and extended school services are slated to be taken over through the general fund. No other state or federal sources are mentioned. As with other sections of the grant proposal, a high-quality plan has not been presented. A number of the activities that have been proposed will be sunseted once the equipment and materials have been purchased and training is completed. The low number of personnel employed at the conclusion of the grant adds to its sustainability.

### Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

This section does identify partnerships (e.g., Boys and Girls Club of Lewis County, Lewis County Extension Service, Lewis County Public Library, Lewis County Head Start) and provides a list of performance measures in relation to each partnership. The partnerships do not have any effect on building the capacity of staff in the schools. The information in this section covers the partners and what kind of relationships is desired (e.g., educational, family, social, health) and the desired result. To this extent, they have integrated education with other services.

There is an additional series of tables that provide targets for the performance measures and schools. It is difficult to tell how the increase in percentages are arrived at since they do not appear to be tied into any specific program. This is then followed by a series of budgets relating to future purchases should the grant funds be approved. Much of this is a repetition from earlier budget projections. Budget Table 1.1, 2.1 and Budget Subpart 3 are confusing and seem misplaced. The budgets themselves do not identify specific purchases, only general categories such as materials, supplies, equipment, etc. that are applied to each project. Much of the information in this section is not relevant to numbers 3, 4 and 5.

### Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

This proposal lacks a high-quality plan that would increase student achievement and deepen student learning through a personalized learning environment. Throughout, the proposal asks for supplies, materials, texts, technology and an improved infrastructure. While such purchases together with professional development would be welcomed in any school, the use of these within the classroom must be presented coherently and comprehensively to the reader. The proposal must provide the reader with key goals, activities and a rationale for the activities, a timeline, deliverables, the parties responsible for implementation and a plan that is credible. This is not the case with this proposal.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>68</b>
--------------	------------	-----------



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0425KY-3 for Lewis County Board of Education

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	2

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In addressing the four core educational assurance areas, the Lewis County Board of Education does not address each one sufficiently:

1. The Lewis County Board of Education provides documentation for adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy:

- Adopted Common Core Standards
- Multiple benchmark assessments for each grade level K-12
- Personalized instruction on current levels of performance as well as anticipated targeted goals for mastery of skills
- Personalized student learning is part of the goal and the plan is ambitious by accommodating every student in grades K-12 but is not realistic based on the gains needed to reach the goal

2. Insufficient documentation exists on how Lewis County will build a data system that measures student growth and success and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction.

- Results from MAP assessments provide information to teachers, but no explanation on how teacher modifies instruction for each student
- No explanation on how data is captured, reported, and maintained and shared with students, parents, and other stakeholders
- Data tables do not reflect benchmark scores indicating growth in student achievement

3. Vision does not include a plan for recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals.

- Teachers and principals are "supported" by an Instructional Teacher Coach but there is no data supporting how this develops effective teachers and principals
- No explanation of how effective teachers are retained or rewarded or how ineffective teachers are given opportunities for development

4. Lewis County provides a comprehensive list of capacities for students to acquire to turn around their low achieving schools.

- Specific documentation on how each of these capacities will be addressed is not clear

Overall, this places the Lewis County Board of Education in the top of the low range for their reform vision due to the lack of a comprehensive plan.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	5
---	----	---

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Lewis County Board of Education meets the eligibility requirement for all participating schools and clearly lists the schools participating in grant activities. Data is provided for 2,465 participating students in the district with 72.5% qualifying for free-reduced lunch. Data is also provided for the number of students from low-income families.

By implementing reform at a district level with all schools in the district participating, there is consistency for the students as they progress through each grade level. Having data available to teachers through benchmark testing, classroom or individual instruction can be modified to help students succeed. Instructional Coaches, MAP assessment results, and partnering with Career and Technical Center are strong factors for successful implementation.

Overall, the elements in the implementation plan are supportive of the goals and are positive attributes in high-quality LEAs. However, the score is in the middle range because there is no timeline for activities and identification of responsibility for key roles in the project for insuring activities are completed in a timely manner.

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

10

2

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The Lewis County Board of Education's plan for reform includes all students in grades K-12 and expectations are for district-wide change as the plan is implemented. No logic model or theory of change was presented in the application. No language in the application explained how the reforms would be scaled up. No timeline was provided to indicated progression on interim or long term goals. A low score is given to the applicant for failing to include a logic model or theory of change. It is difficult to understand how the proposal supports meaningful reform without documentation of how the applicant plans to reach its goals.

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

10

2

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The proposed vision builds on existing programs already being utilized in the district. Multiple approaches to increasing or expanding services for pre-K and K screenings, continuing MAP assessments, increasing the use of afterschool, Technical and Career, and dual college credit classes, and extending use of instructional and principal coaches, will likely result in improved student learning. Data tables indicate scores on state tests have increased from 2008 to 2011.

The State of Kentucky's targets for student performance on assessments is 100% scoring at the Proficient or Distinguished level by the end of the 2014 school year. Applicant's goals are equal to the State targets and includes all grades K-12.

As to the applicant's vision resulting in improved student learning and performance, there is no evidence supporting the effectiveness of these initiatives already being utilized in the district. There is no data to support student growth from MAP assessments being given multiple times, evidence of student's who attended after school programs increased their learning, teachers or principals effectiveness was increased due to professional development provided by consultants, or students were more successful in college when taking dual credit courses.

The low score reflects the lack of sufficient documentation supporting the success of these programs and lack of data to support proposed project.

Examples:

- Applicant's vision regarding technology has no evidence supporting student's use of iPads and e-readers will increase college/career readiness.
- Data tables were provided for 2008 and 2011 but no documentation indicating increases were in response to initiatives listed included in proposal
- Dual college credit is already being offered but there's no documentation on how this has improved student performance

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	3

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Working with a consultant in 2010 for improvement in K-12 Mathematics programs resulted in a plan of action which improved student involvement in classroom settings and identified resources teachers were under utilizing. New programs were purchased, but data is not available for the 2011-2012 or the 2012-2013 school years to determine the effectiveness. "Teachers are much better at implementing content standards" does not provided evidence of student improvement.

There was also no evidence provided to support how the consultants, after school programs, and other initiatives increased high school graduation rates and college enrollment.

Operation Preparation and WorkKeys are great programs but no evidence was presented to support student learning outcomes, high school graduation rates, or college enrollment were directly related to these programs. Social Studies scores dropped at the high school from 2008 to 2011 and no explanation was given for the decrease in scores.

Applicant is making student performance data available to students, educators, and parents through an online portal. Data is for student grades and attendance but no evidence was provided on if students and parents have access to results from MAP assessments or other information which would assist them in reaching their goals.

The score for is low because the applicant did not provide sufficient evidence of how it has improved it's low performing schools and it's ability to improve student learning and close achievement gaps.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:  
 The Lewis County School District provided evidence that it demonstrates a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments and actual school-level expenditures by posting all financial information on their website. It also publishes annual personnel salaries in a local newspaper.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	5
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:  
 The Lewis County School System is implementing personalized learning environments by administering assessments and establishing individual goals for students based on the results. State requirements are being adhered to by adopting Common Core Standards and plans have been developed to create conditions where students are 100% successful by 2014 on state assessments. There is no evidence the district has sufficient autonomy on implementation of personalized learning environments. Lewis County was proactive in hiring a consultant in 2010 to assist them in meeting the requirements. The district is flexible in providing personalized learning environments based on students' performance on the MAP assessments and state tests. The score in the middle area reflects lack of sufficient evidence of autonomy in meeting regulatory requirements even though they have taken a proactive approach.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	2
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:  
 Stakeholders were involved in the development of the proposal by parents participating in surveys, teachers providing input on educational materials to be purchased, and partners submitting letters of support. It is unclear how students participated, other than possibly completing surveys with their parents. No evidence exists on how any of the input gathered was incorporated into the plan.  
 Applicant did not specify if the LEA has collective bargaining representation or not and so evidence can not be determined on the support from teachers.  
 The low score reflects this lack of evidence on how stakeholders were involved in developing the plan.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:  
 The Lewis County School District began with the Kentucky Education Reform Act and evolved into the personalized learning environments which compares past and current performance levels and develops goals to meet 100% proficiency by 2014. Applicant failed to identify gaps that will be addressed with this proposal and therefore, received a low score. The plan proposed is to continue with existing activities and initiatives and is based on needs identified in 2010 with no documentation of reassessing needs over the past few years.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	10

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:  
 The CHEER project has components that will provide students with a personalized learning environment that will prepare them for college and career opportunities.

- Implementing Common Core Standards
- Offering Technical/Career and College level courses
- MAP assessments that provide personal goals to improve learning
- Offering career planning services
- Participation in Fine arts
- Extended school services for intervention
- Varying instructional methods with technology and new instructional materials
- Involving consultants and teacher/principal coaches

Applicant's proposal provides a portal for students and parents to access data for classwork, assignments, grades, and attendance. Does not provide through the portal:

- Access to MAP assessments or state test results
- Career planning results
- Goals developed by the student

Students have access to:

- Individual goal setting opportunities
- Individual Learning Plans
- MAP assessments to determine academic needs with ongoing feedback throughout the year
- Variety of instructional approaches with technology and traditional classroom environments

Applicant does not provide sufficient explanation of how students are trained to evaluate their assessment data and develop goals to improve learning. It is also unclear how students are involved in the process of understanding if they are on track toward meeting college and career ready standards. There is no indication parents are trained on how to interpret and evaluate their child's data and assist them in improving their learning experiences.

Applicant states that "accommodations and high quality strategies for high need students are provided." No documentation exists to define high need students. Accommodations and strategies are not explained.

Overall score is in the middle range which reflects the positive aspects of the proposal and incorporates the missing components as well.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	10
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Teachers in the Lewis County School District participate in professional development for:

- Common Core Standards
- Content areas for grades K-12
- Technology and mathematics from consultants

No evidence in the proposal exists to describe how professional development will focus on personalized learning and environments or adapting content and instruction for individual and group tasks.

Applicant does not provide documentation on why only technology and math areas require consultants. There are no measures to determine the effectiveness of the professional development and no track record of how student learning has improved based on past and current teacher trainings. No timeline was provided on when professional development opportunities are offered to teachers.

Participating educators have access to student data to personalize instruction for each student and they meet with other teachers in their content area to discuss intervention strategies and goal setting. Teachers then meet with students to discuss their individual goals and growth needs. There is no evidence to support whether this approach is improving student learning. Applicant states that students' needs are met but detailed documentation of how teachers accomplish this for each student is not available. No evidence in the proposal supports processes being put in place to provide feedback on the feedback of student resources.

Applicant does not indicate how school leaders provide training, policies, tools, data, and resources to enable them to structure an effective learning environment. District's teacher evaluation system includes formal and informal observations but the applicant does provide data to support the effectiveness of the evaluations based on these observations. Applicant states that Kentucky is upgrading the requirements for teacher evaluation but no specific information on the new evaluation system was provided. No evidence in the proposal exists where feedback is provided to teachers and principals to improve effectiveness.

There is not a clear correlation on how the proposed plan will increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals. Applicant does not specify how effectiveness is determined for teachers or principals.

Overall, the score for this area is in the middle due to the lack of a high-quality plan for increasing student learning by receiving instruction from effective or highly effective teachers. The activities proposed in this plan do not have sufficient evidence to support the improvement of instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards and graduation requirements.

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

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	9
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Lewis County School District's proposal includes identification of key roles and the associated responsibilities of personnel in the district. These key roles support the LEA central office and provide services to all participating schools. It is unclear in the proposal how these roles directly relate to the implementation of the proposal.</p> <p>Leadership teams within the district work with district staff to develop school schedules and calendars, personnel decisions, and school level budgets. There is no supporting evidence on what specific staff participate on these teams and how they relate to the goals in this proposal.</p> <p>Students are given multiple opportunities to demonstrate mastery of standards with the MAP assessments given three times a year. Applicant does not provide information on multiple opportunities to take the state or other assessments. Proposal states students are given opportunities for credit recovery, college credits while still in high school, summer school, and extended school services during the week.</p> <p>Applicant provides information on various methods of instruction through computer programs, online courses, and technology in classroom instruction. No specific evidence was provided on how the proposal will develop instructional practices that are adaptable for all students, including students with disabilities and English learners.</p> <p>The overall score is in the middle range due to the lack of supporting evidence stated above.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	2
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Lewis County School District has the following infrastructures in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infinite Campus (not fully defined) which provides access for parents</li> <li>• Annual instructional data (not clearly defined)</li> <li>• School report card</li> </ul> <p>There is no evidence on how these infrastructures support the goals in this proposal. Parents have access to data on grades, attendance, and credit progress but it is unclear how parents access other data pertinent to their child's success in school. Technical support is available for the parental portal but no indication that technical support is available for parents in other areas. No evidence of electronic tutors or the ability for parents to export data.</p> <p>Applicant does not provided evidence that the district has or will develop an interoperable data system that uses a common, established structure such that data can easily flow from one system to another. Lewis County School District does provide student data on their website in forms of school report card on their website. This is not sufficient evidence to support requirements for this application.</p> <p>Overall score is low because applicant does not provide the above information and there is no explanation on the student data information system being used in Lewis County.</p>		

#### 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 Lewis County School District has been implementing initiatives identified through a needs assessment in 2010. This proposal builds on areas identified in 2010 and expands current services. Applicant's score is low in this area because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No evidence was provided on how these initiatives directly improved student learning</li> <li>• Timelines were not provided on proposal implementation</li> <li>• Key roles/responsibilities were not identified to support a timeline of implementation</li> <li>• Adding textbooks, iPads, electronic materials, etc. in the proposal is not supported by evidence of how these will improve student learning</li> <li>• Goals do not have measurable outcomes to determine effectiveness of activities</li> <li>• Plan does not build in opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during implementation</li> <li>• Documentation of how applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information was not provided</li> </ul> <p>Applicant's ability to improve student learning is not substantiated based on lack of evidence to support success in implementing previous initiatives. Their strategy is incomplete as described in bullet points above and is not likely to build on current services without addressing the missing components.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Lewis County will measure the success of the CHEER project by assessment data collected and annual surveys completed by stakeholders. No evidence was provided on how assessment data is measured and evaluated. Annual surveys were not defined as to what information will be requested from stakeholders or how the data will be used to adjust implementation of the proposal. Therefore, the applicant's score is low in this area.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant provides information in the tables on increasing the percentage of each of the performance measures. The narrative does not specifically address these performance measures in detail as outlined in the application guidelines. The score is low because the applicant does not address 12 to 14 specific performance measures in the narrative, the proposal is lacking key elements, and fails to identify how it will continuously improve its plan.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant does not provide a plan to evaluate the activities in the proposed plan. Activities are discussed but the proposal lacks evidence of established measures and a means to identify areas needing adjustments and how the plan will show continuous improvement. Based on the data provided in the performance measure tables for E (3), 100% of the teachers in the district are effective. Therefore, no improvement can be measured and narrative does not support maintaining or retaining effective teachers at a 100% rate. There is no measure to evaluate effectiveness of kindergarten screening. Applicant's score is low in this area because there is no supporting evidence of how the plan will be evaluated for effectiveness.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The budget proposed by Lewis County School District identifies all funds that will support the project. The budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the proposal. Supporting tables are not complete and therefore, sufficient documentation is not provided. Applicant has identified one-time investments and ongoing operational costs. Score is in high range but reflects the omission of data in tables.</p>		

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant does not have a high-quality plan for sustainability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purchase of content materials - applicant states no need for further funding. Materials will need to be replaced at some point in the future.</li> <li>• Technology - applicant states no need for further funding. Maintaining infrastructures will require additional funding.</li> <li>• Equipment/supplies - applicant states no additional funding needed. Maintenance on equipment and replacement of materials will need funding in the future.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the score is low in this area because sustainability for this proposal is based on funding from this grant to pay personnel, extended school services, and consultant services will be sustained with programs that are funded currently in the district. There is no evidence as to why these programs need grant funds if the district has existing funding sources to pay for these services.</p>		

### Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	2
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Lewis County School District has partnered with the Boys and Girls Club after school program, the Lewis County Public Library, and the Lewis County Health Department and has secured letters of support. Other partners are mentioned along with services they currently provide to the district for a total number of 10 partners listed. No partnership letter of support were secured for these other partners. It is unclear in the narrative how these partners will provide additional services to support the goals of the project. One exception is the Boys and Girls Club which will offer additional days of after school activities but there is no evidence to support the effectiveness of increasing the number of days students have access to after school activities.</p> <p>Lewis County School district has identified targeted populations in pre-K and Kindergarten screenings, all students grade K-12 in MAP assessments, and high school students for college and career opportunities. These three areas of concentration were not expanded upon in this section of the application. There are organizations described in this section which provide community support but these organizations are not mentioned in other areas of the application. The applicant does not provide evidence that any of these programs have significant impacts on student learning outcomes.</p> <p>Applicant does not provide documentation on how these measures will be tracked over time or use data to target resources to improve results for participating students. No strategy was provided to scale the model beyond participating students.</p> <p>Partnerships described in the application do not provide sufficient evidence of how education will be integrated in their services.</p> <p>Applicant did not provide sufficient evidence of how partnerships and Lewis County School District will build capacity of staff. No documentation was provided to support how needs and assets were evaluated in included in the decision-making process about effective solutions, engaging parents, or resolving challenges and problems.</p> <p>Overall, the score is low in this area because applicant failed to identify achievable performance measures and supply evidence for the information stated above.</p>		

### Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p>		

As stated in other sections, the Lewis County School District failed to comprehensively address how it builds on the core educational assurance areas to create personalized learning environments to improve learning. Applicant has areas that will support some of the areas by adopting Common Core Standards, professional development for teachers in content areas, multiple MAP assessments, intervention and goal setting for each student based on results from assessments, and adding additional screenings for pre-K and Kindergarten students. The proposal will increase high school student's opportunities to take dual college credit and career/technical classes. However, the applicant fails to provide sufficient evidence that these areas of concentration will positively effect student learning and insure goals under this proposal are met. The applicant does not meet Priority 1.

Total	210	75
-------	-----	----