



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1161OK-1 for Mountain View-Gotebo Public School

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>In the section that is presumably A-1 (there is no label or header to the section), there is limited provision of a comprehensive and coherent reform vision. While the proposal presents the districts' realization of the importance of more personalized learning approaches to enhance student performance and the need for more data-driven instruction, there is insufficient articulation of the ways in which student learning would be deepened or personalized, or how students' common and individual tasks would be based on students' academic interests.</p> <p>Technology, a major focus of the proposed project, was briefly discussed almost exclusively in terms of remediation strategies, rather than also considering how technology might be used to enrich, deepen and personalize students' learning experiences.</p> <p>This section would have also been considerably strengthened by a definition and description of the consortium applicant as part of the introduction to this proposal. In this section, as well as throughout the proposal, there appears to be little description or discussion of how many schools or districts are part of this consortium, the names of the schools and districts, where they are located, or the qualities and characteristics which make these LEAs an important or compelling set of districts to consider for this federal funding initiative.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In the body of the proposal, the applicant provides no description of how participating schools were selected, nor a list of schools that would participate. The only information provided is a table that lists the consortium, and a total number of participating educators (1470), students (25,000), and number of participating high-need students (20,000). The appendix features a list from whom MOU's were obtained, but the accompanying set of signed MOU's do not fully match the list, and some signed MOU forms failed to indicate the name of the district, or the town in which the district was located.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	0
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant appears to provide no information pertaining to section A-3, regarding LEA-wide reform and change.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>a) While the applicant's table presents a number of areas for summative assessment (e.g., 3rd grade reading), it seems to feature overly ambitious goals for the consortium, such as 95% - 100% of students should be achieving proficiency in both Reading/English and Math, across all grade levels, starting even in the first year of the program.</p> <p>b) Regarding decreasing achievement gaps, the applicant has not listed subgroups or comparison groups in the featured table (e.g., different groups by ethnicity, etc.), but simply the different grades and subject areas. Thus there is no evidence of how the applicant could successfully decrease achievement gaps.</p> <p>c and d) The applicant has listed extremely ambitious target goals for graduation rates (of 94% -100%), college enrollment (e.g., 75% and 80% in later years) and post-secondary degree attainment (65% and 70% in later years.) There is insufficient evidence that the applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student performance at these levels.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	0
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant does not seem to have entered a response in the section pertaining to 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 applicant indicates that financial materials and salaries for administrators are published and posted on the district website. It indicates that each individual salary is by law, a matter of public record, but does not indicate how transparent or easily accessible such information is. The applicant does not clearly indicate that salary information is made available at the school level.		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	1
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: There is little evidence that is presented that the consortium possesses the successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State, legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal. The applicant primarily describes a general process that the LEA is using regarding benchmarks and looking at students' test score data.		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	2
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments: The prose that is inserted under this heading is simply a repeat of the prose featured for B-3. Thus, little information in the main body of the proposal is provided regarding stakeholder engagement and support, and how students, families, teachers and principals in participating schools were engaged in the development of the proposal. There is a list of MOU's from 38 different districts in the appendix, but the series of signed MOU forms include about a third that neither specify the name of the district, nor the town/city of the mailing address for the contact person. The majority of these signed forms did not include a name or signature from someone who was the president of the local teacher's union. The appendix does include letters of support from 14 different agencies and organizations. Most of these letters, however, feature only the same two standard paragraphs, with no additional information, perspectives, or special indication of their organization's involvement or expressed enthusiasm for the proposed project.		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1
(B)(5) Reviewer Comments: There is little evidence of a high quality plan for an analysis of the applicant's status in implementing personalized learning environments, and of the logic behind the reform proposal. The applicant's discussion of needs and gaps mainly references the Oklahoma Data Pipeline Project (and how its instruments will take several years to develop to be fully functional and of use to the project), and a general discussion of using test data, grading systems, teacher evaluation systems, and the need to improve students' timed test-taking skills.		

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

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

(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	4
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not present a coherent, high quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment. There is no clear presentation of key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, or responsible parties, as is required for a high quality plan.</p> <p>Overall, there is a general lack of specificity or breadth that provides evidence for the provision of a proposed intervention that would enable students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college and career-ready standards. The applicant presents a model that emphasizes the uses of test data to “drive” the curriculum and student learning experience, without sufficient discussion or description of what the nature of those learning experiences would be like.</p> <p>The only approach described in some detail was one that focuses on the development of reading fluency and comprehension skills. While this is an important area, any discussion of other elements of students' learning K-12 was absent. Similarly, the majority of the issues that needed to be addressed in a high quality plan of personalized learning (e.g., students being involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest; mastering critical academic content and developing skills and traits such as goal-setting, critical thinking; variety of high quality instructional approaches and environments) were lacking in the applicant's discussion.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	4
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not present a high quality plan for teaching and leading that helps educators to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards and graduation requirements, by enabling the full implementation of personalized learning and teaching for all students. There is no clear presentation of key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, nor responsible parties, as is necessary for a high quality plan.</p> <p>The discussion of professional development primarily outlines the focus of study being in the area of reading interventions, and a general description of the kind of assessment experiences that are envisioned for students. Other than listing the names of some teacher evaluation models, it does not discuss the ways in which educators will engage in training or in professional teams or communities, will use tools, data and resources, or how the districts will have training and policies to accelerate student progress, promote student achievement, or support personalized learning. The applicant does not provide a high quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	3
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide a high quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provides every students, educator, and level of the education system with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed. There is no clear presentation of key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, nor responsible parties, as is necessary for a high quality plan.</p> <p>While the applicant describes a number of the functions of the Executive Committee, and various policies of the LEA (e.g., being able to determine the learning calendars in each individual school), the applicant provides inadequate discussion addressing how the Consortium and its LEAs has practices, policies and rules that facilitate personalized learning by the nature of the LEA consortium governance structure, school leadership teams or student roles, or through its learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	2
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide a high quality plan to support project implementation through the LEA and school infrastructure. There is no clear presentation of key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, nor responsible parties, as is necessary for a high quality plan.</p>		

While the applicant describes plans for a web platform to disseminate data, and that districts in the consortium will have access to the Oklahoma Data Pipeline Project which provides a link to disaggregated data, there was insufficient detail addressing how the LEA and school infrastructure would support personalized learning, or provide technical support to students, parents, educators and other stakeholders. Similarly, there was no information on whether the consortium would have available information in an open data format, or through the use of interoperable data systems.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides insufficient information on a strategy for implementing rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant.</p> <p>Much of the section on continuous improvement only appears to describe the evolution of the working notions of participating districts to date, in order to arrive at some of its current conceptualizations of their desired plans. There is some reference to use of data snapshots of students, a benchmarking system, and conversations with the Career Centers regarding Work Keys.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is insufficient information provided regarding strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.</p> <p>There is mainly general reference to different kinds of groups working together, such as with the Career Centers, and the Oklahoma State Department of Education.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not present ambitious yet achievable performance measures overall and by subgroup, or its rationale for selecting that measure. They also do not describe how the measure will provide rigorous, timely and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicants' implementation success or areas of concern, or how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.</p> <p>The table of performance measures does feature 12 different performance measures. . All of the tables for performance measures, however, fail to indicate subgroups, with "all participating students" being substituted instead.</p> <p>One of the measures indicates that "at this time" 100% of the students in the lead LEA are served by highly effective teachers and administrators. This surprising statement is not backed up by any background information as to what criteria were used to assess highly effective teachers or administrators, nor the type of data that was gathered that yielded such a finding.</p> <p>Several performance measures cite the use of the Zone of Proximal Development, with no further information on how this Vygotskian notion is defined, determined, applied, and assessed. It is somewhat surprising that penmanship should be listed as one of the two performance measures deemed important for the PreK-3 grade span.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There does not appear to be a section devoted to evaluating effectiveness of investments, as required.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score

(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided insufficient information on the project's budget, and does not adequately identify all funds that will support the project, nor provide evidence that the budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal. Nor does it clearly present a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities.</p> <p>An early check-off box presented in the application indicates that the consortium has requested \$30 - \$40 million, given that it has 25,001+ participating students. The applicant has not provided any information as to how many schools or districts would be participating in the consortia, nor the names of the schools or districts and how many educators, administrators, and students are located in each school or district. Thus, for example, their budget request for \$100,000 a year for travel, as including "5 a year per school" and \$1,000/trip for professional development, is difficult to justify, with limited information in the proposal as to what kind of professional development activities would be encouraged, how many schools or teachers would be involved, and where these training sessions would be held.</p> <p>Of the requested \$40 million for the grant funds, the bulk of the money (\$20 million) is going towards computer equipment, and an additional \$16.5 million going towards supplies, largely to purchase individualized learning software. Neither of these areas has been adequately defined in the proposal, nor in the budget. A \$20+ million line item for equipment simply indicates "laptop computers, Tablets, etc." at "\$400 a student." No funds are going towards personnel, which seems professionally and fiscally unwise, with no new roles, tasks or personnel identified to handle a significant and sizeable reform grant from the federal government. The budget indicates no funds from other sources used to support the project, which significantly raises the issue of the feasibility of the sustainability of the proposed initiative.</p>		

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is no provision of a high quality plan for sustainability of the project's goal after the term of the grant. There is no clear presentation of key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, or responsible parties, as is required for a high quality plan. As noted above, the four-year budget includes no funds from other sources used to support the project, which raises the question of the sustainability of the proposed initiative.</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>There is no provision of a description of a coherent and sustainable partnership that has formed with specific public or private organizations to augment the schools' resources to support Absolute Priority 1. There are only a few sentences that feature a very general list of the kinds of services considered, such as counselling, child welfare services, tribal services and other services that help families, and groups such as faith communities and other philanthropic organizations.</p> <p>The applicant indicates three population groups, Native American Students, At-Risk Students, and Developmentally Disadvantaged Students, in a table of population-level desired results, but provides no information in the narrative about what specific approaches, strategies or interventions would be used for these groups. No information is provided regarding tracking selected indicators, developing a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students, describing how the partnership would integrate education and other services, or assessing the needs and assets of the schools and communities, or building the capacity of staff from participating schools.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

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

The applicant has failed to coherently and comprehensively address how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create personalized learning environments for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready graduation requirements, expand student access to the most effective educators, and other required elements that make up Absolute Priority 1.

Total	210	35
-------	-----	----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1161OK-2 for Mountain View-Gotebo Public School

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	2
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium proposes a vision of reform that involves aligning the curriculum with common standards. However, it is not clear if the articulated vision includes a comprehensive reform model that encompasses the four core academic areas. Instead, the consortium proposes a transformation of the curriculum. This vision is articulated in the consortium's study trend. For example, ORSC identified trends in assessment data by examining weaknesses and strengths on state assessments, aligning the curriculum, developing remedial methods, and providing professional development. Likewise, the consortium's emphasis on curriculum redesign, personalized learning, technology, and online learning opportunities suggests that the focus is limited relating to the four educational core areas. Overall, this places ORSC in the upper low range.		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	1
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium's approach to implementation includes both the LEA and the school level as evidenced by the involvement of all schools in the consortium. However, the process for selection of schools is not described in detail. Likewise, there is no list of all participating schools in this section. Therefore, the chart included does not identify specific student groups by high needs and low-income populations at each school. Overall, this places ORSC in the lower low range.		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	1
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium's reform proposal will support consortium wide change. This is suggested since the proposal focuses on all students in the rural consortium. However, it is not clear what specific goals and activities ORSC has established as part of its high quality plan to improve student outcomes. In fact, the consortium does not include a response to this section. The proposal includes responses from A2 then A4. Overall, this places ORSC in the lower low range.		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	4
(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:		

Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium reports a target of student learning by incremental growth. There is no evidence that goals are ambitious or achievable for all students and subgroups as noted by the included charts, performance on end of course test, and statewide assessments. Likewise, there is no observable focus on growth annually nor by the end of the grant period. Based on the charts included, zeroes are listed for each year beginning with the 2013-2014 school year and beyond. Furthermore, there is no expectation to decrease gaps neither in student achievement levels annually nor by the end of the grant period. Given the size of the population the consortium anticipates serving; it is highly unlikely that there are no gaps in any grade or subject.

However, goals for increasing the graduation rate are noted from 89% to 100% after the grant period ends and an increase from 56% to 80% is projected for college enrollment rates. Likewise, the consortium hopes to increase the rate of postsecondary degree attainment from 50% to 70% by the end of the grant period. ORSC should be commended for such a goal.

Overall, this places ORSC in the lower middle range.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	0
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium reports no clear record of success over the past few years. Moreover, the consortium did not respond to this section. Overall, this places ORSC in the bottom of the low range.		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium provides evidence that it currently practices transparency in processes, practices and investments. For example, in accordance with the state's School Transparency Act, personnel salaries and other expenditures are made available to the public through consortium, state, and governmental websites and in a format for public review. Overall, this places ORSC in the upper high range.		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	1
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium reports conditions that have resulted in autonomy under state guidelines to implement its approved grant proposal. For example, ORSC states that the LEA has been given the autonomy to develop plans based on efforts over the past 5 years. However, there is no evidence to suggest a policy or document from the State allowing autonomy to the consortium in executing the plan described in the proposal. Overall, this places ORSC in the lower low range.		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	4
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments: Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium reports limited stakeholder involvement in the proposed plan. For example, there are MOUs from consortium members located in the proposal. However, the response for this section does not address this indicator in the proposal. Additionally, letters of support were included from many external stakeholders such as governmental officials, business owners, postsecondary organizations, and politicians. Obviously, it is clear from the letters that ORSC has support from stakeholders, but the consortium description of the support is not included in this section. In fact, the proposal responses in section B3 and B4 are identical.		

Overall, this places ORSC in the lower middle range.

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

5

3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium identifies the needs and gaps that exist in the consortium. The consortium acknowledges that needs do exist in districts. The proposal explicitly describes the plan for identification of needs as well as current gaps that must be addressed. The consortium articulates the need to audit classroom learning, add value to teacher evaluation instruments, prepare students for college and career examinations and test taking skills. However, it is uncertain that a high quality plan including goals and activities for implementing a personalized learning environment is articulated clearly in this proposal.

Overall, this places ORSC in the upper middle range.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	7

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium proposes a plan designed to promote College and Career Readiness skills in students. According to the proposal, the consortium will participate in an alignment process to help students become career ready. If the aligned curriculum allows a clear path to a proposed career, students will have a greater opportunity for future success.

ORSC proposes to establish a data system that will be used throughout the consortium to address individual student needs. If analyzing data with fidelity, the data can be used to revise instruction so that individual student needs can be addressed.

Likewise, professional development approaches are listed as adding to a high quality reading instructional environment. This model when used appropriately will provide staff with instructional strategies that target specific interventions designed to build reading skills.

The consortium proposes the use of mobile devices as part of the approach to further student's education. The use of technology in the classroom will enhance the student's ability to become college and career ready and provide portals for parents to obtain information on their child's academic progress.

ORSC notes the availability of student data both in local and statewide databases. A data instrument will be used to develop a College and Career Readiness Indicator Index. When used correctly, the College and Career Readiness Indicator Index should drive instruction on the school, classroom and student levels.

Although, the consortium addressed some areas in this section of the proposal, little evidence of training and support for students could be identified. Similarly, it is not clear if opportunities will exist for exposure to diverse groups or will a variety of high-quality instruction occur. Furthermore, the consortium's commitment to personalized learning for all students is unclear.

Overall, the consortium scores in the lower middle range for this area.

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

20

8

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium identifies a plan for improving teaching and learning through a focus on reading instruction and professional development for all grade levels. For example, the consortium reports that school-based educators will receive adequate and ongoing professional development to implement the reading intervention model. As teachers incorporate these strategies into their classrooms with fidelity these intervention strategies should build the necessary reading skills in students.

Additionally, students will have opportunities for use of a variety of technology learning resources. For example, students will experience digital learning resources such as mobile devices. The use of technology in the classroom will enhance the student's ability to become college and career ready.

Although ORSC provides some evidence in most cases; however, there is no evidence of educator training to provide frequent feedback to students.

The consortium will use the teacher and administrator value added evaluation system of effectiveness currently in use by the state. By using this model, the consortium will have additional data to include in the data instrument and therefore improve the depth of its proposed plan.

Although professional development will be provided to teachers using the reading intervention model, it is unclear how the training will result in matching student needs with available resources.

Therefore, this places ORSC in the lower middle range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium infrastructure and policy are aligned to support implementation of this project. The consortium executive committee's makeup provides the necessary structure to adequately support its schools. For instance, the executive committee staff members represent all schools including LEA representatives and serve as overall responsible parties for ensuring implementation of the activities involved in this reform effort.</p> <p>Additionally, consortium schools have the autonomy to plan for improved student achievement based on the implementation of the proposed transformed school curriculum. Schools are given the flexibility to develop calendars, hire personnel, and organize instruction. Likewise, students benefit from similarly flexible options such as advance classes to support learning.</p> <p>Finally, it is not clear how the consortium will ensure that standards-based instruction is accessible to all students.</p> <p>Overall, this places ORSC in the lower high range.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	3
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium demonstrates its record of support for an instructional learning environment throughout the consortium member schools as part of the proposed high quality plan. However, it is not clear if all students, regardless of income, have access to a classroom equipped with 21st Century technology.</p> <p>ORSC does not provide evidence of a wide range of technical support to ensure that all stakeholders have appropriate deliverables and support with technology instruction.</p> <p>Additionally, the consortium plans on transitioning to an electronic parent portal. However, it is unclear in this section of the proposal if or how data will be used with other electronic learning systems.</p> <p>Finally, ORSC has a software based data warehouse system that integrates multiple data sources for consortium use. However, it is not clear if plans include additional components to be integrated in the future.</p> <p>Overall, this places ORSC in the lower middle range.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	4
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium will utilize its data driven instructional model to ensure continuous improvement. This process developed as a result of consortium consensus will ensure that all schools operate under a systematic approach that involves data driven instruction and the Oklahoma Data Pipeline Project. Although the consortium indicates that it will report to the public it is not clear in this section, how the consortium will publicly share information on the quality of investments under the grant.</p> <p>Overall, this places ORSC in the low middle range.</p>		

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	0
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium provides unclear evidence in this section of strategies that will be used for communication among all stakeholders. In fact, this section addresses an analysis of needs, data systems models, community issues, and research to support the models.</p> <p>Overall, this places ORSC in the lower low range.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium attempts to show a commitment to implementing a personalized learning environment with performance measures that reflect this commitment. However, there is no clear rationale for the selection of the performance measures nor is there a correlation to a personalized learning environment. For example, one performance measure states that students will demonstrate financial literacy prior to leaving school. Although this is an important concept, it is unclear of the connection to the vision, plan, or personalized learning environment.</p> <p>The consortium included only seven performance measures instead of the approximately 12-14 expected. In addition, it is not clear how the stated performance measures will result in student success. Finally, there is no evidence of how the performance measures will be reviewed or improved upon in the future.</p> <p>Overall, ORSC scores in the lower low range.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium does not include evidence of a plan to evaluate the grant funded program. In fact, evidence of research on models used to determine the effectiveness of data driven instruction and professional development is provided but no specific plan for evaluating the proposed program is included.</p> <p>Overall, ORSC scores in the lower low range.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium provides a budget that identifies all funds available and sufficient to implement the grant. ORSC articulates in a narrative format, all funds available to support the grant project. However, there is no indication of the availability of local school funds for project implementation. Equipment and other resources are listed in the narrative; however, the plan does not include a clear description of how these resources will align with the consortium's vision.</p> <p>Overall, this places ORSC in the upper low range.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium does show a commitment for sustainability beyond the grant period. For example, the current grant request will supplement existing funds provided to districts by the consortium. As part of the proposed plan, a sustainable program will be implemented and this model will benefit students in the future over the long term.</p> <p>However, ORSC does not mention any other entities such as the school board, collaborative partners, advisory boards, and local businesses as potential providers of financial resources in the future. Likewise, no potential supporters were identified to provide support currently or beyond the grant period. Therefore, sustainability based on support from outside supporters beyond the grant period is unclear.</p>		

Overall, this places ORSC in the mid middle range.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	1
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium provides little evidence of specific and sustainable partnerships with both private and public organizations.</p> <p>The consortium has identified three population groups in grades PreK-12. These described results include both educational outcomes and results.</p> <p>Likewise, the consortium does not clearly state how partnerships will address particular student needs and services.</p> <p>ORSC proposes no evidence relating to building capacity for staff. Similarly, no evidence is included to ensure that parents, students, and families have input into the decision making process.</p> <p>However, the consortium does include only one performance measure and two desired outcomes for students. For example, ORSC proposes to serve Native American at risk and developmentally disadvantaged students targeting between 95%-97% preparation for College and Career Readiness Standards.</p> <p>Overall, this places ORSC in the lower low range.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Oklahoma Rural Schools Consortium proposes a vision of reform that involves aligning the curriculum with common standards. However, it is not clear if the articulated vision includes a comprehensive reform model that encompasses the four core academic areas. Instead, the consortium proposes a transformation of the curriculum. This vision is articulated in the consortium's study trend. For example, ORSC identified trends in assessment data by examining weaknesses and strengths on state assessments, aligning the curriculum, developing remedial methods, and providing professional development. Likewise, the consortium's emphasis on curriculum redesign, personalized learning, technology, and online learning opportunities suggests that the focus is limited as it relates to the four educational core areas.</p> <p>The consortium demonstration of its commitment to personalized learning is limited though out the proposal. The proposal is grounded in research that is stated and repeated throughout the proposal thus limiting the ability of the consortium to clearly address the vision and plan for reform. Likewise, professional development, and family engagement approaches are listed but the correlation to a high quality instructional environment is unclear.</p> <p>Similarly, the consortium proposes the use of mobile devices as part of the high quality content proposed for students. However, it is unclear of how these resources will create a personalized learning environment for students.</p> <p>The consortium does not propose a clear teacher and administrator evaluator system of effectiveness to be used in this plan.</p> <p>Finally, there were several sections of the proposal that were unanswered. Several questions were consolidated into one response thus making it cumbersome to review the proper response.</p> <p>Overall, this places ORSC in the upper low range.</p>		



Total	210	61
-------	-----	----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1161OK-3 for Mountain View-Gotebo Public School

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Oklahoma Consortium of 44 rural school districts has compiled a Race to The Top grant that is compliant with the four core educational assurance areas. They have established an effective, realistic vision built on data and foundations for improving curriculum, delivering rigorous individualized instruction and implementing and scheduling assessment rubrics and tools to raise and track student achievement working towards career and college readiness for all students. Goals are ambitious, but achievable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The needs assessment was based on data available from the Oklahoma State Department of Education looking at a previous five year study trend of student achievement in individual schools as well as in the consortium as a whole. • Trends will be evaluated to determine curriculum and instructional weaknesses and needs. • Rubrics will be developed to utilize all available data from the Oklahoma Data Pipeline. • Student data will be studied and disaggregated to determine present levels and where early intervention is needed. • Intensive Professional development will be given to teachers and administrators to train them to analyze and disaggregate data to improve and drive instruction. 		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicants are a consortium of 44 rural school districts throughout the State of Oklahoma that share similar demographics and profound needs to improve student achievement. These districts have come together to apply for the Race to The Top funding to establish a common ground of trends and needs assessment to build a 21st century educational delivery and accountability system that will prepare all students for career and college readiness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 44 Rural School Districts Statewide Pre K-12. • 1470 participating educators • 25,000 participating students • 20,000 low income students <p>The proposal is clear and concise in listing all stakeholders and participants.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Oklahoma Consortium of Rural Public Schools RTT proposal outlines a plan for comprehensive systematic reform to improve individual student achievement through high quality curriculum, instruction, assessments and evaluation systems for all participants including the following components of a Highly Qualified Plan;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Studying state testing data to establish the strengths and weaknesses in each curriculum area. • Development of a statewide rubric for each subject area using methods from the CORE Curriculum as the guideline. 		

- Rubrics will be based from curriculum models that prove to have efficiency and efficacy rates above 80%.
- Requirements that districts work together to build a rigorous statewide curriculum delivery systems.
- This rubric rigor will be based on the EPASS curriculum that is used by the Oklahoma Regents for Higher Education.
- Curriculum will be aligned to the Oklahoma Criterion Reference test and a nationally normed test such as the ACT.
- Remediation and individualization of curriculum and delivery will be achieved by teacher interventions and the use of technology.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The program plan of the 44 rural school districts working together establishes a powerful foundation for student success. By developing effective statewide reform best practices and resources can be developed, implemented, evaluated and improved upon to result in systematic reform across the consortium. This reform will improve instructional methods, decrease gaps in low income sub group population and lower drop out rates as a result of individualizing student learning.

- Grant funds will be used to purchase programs and technology to improve curriculum, establish benchmarks and track student level and areas of need and growth.
- Improving curriculum and instructional methods will be a focus.
- Data will be gathered continuously to track individual student instructional needs
- Technology will be used to gather, track and share information that will drive high quality instruction and disaggregate student data and drive individualized instruction.
- State test data, curriculum crosswalks, development of curriculum maps, improving instruction methods through professional development to establish appropriate benchmarks to guide instruction will all be implemented across the 44 districts.
- Staff, students and parents will follow individual student achievement and implement what the consortium refers to as remediation strategies to improve student learning.

The proposal goals are ambitious yet achievable with the above bulleted points followed with fidelity.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

It is clear the that root cause for this RTT application is stemming from this consortium of 44 rural Oklahoma school districts dire need for support to improve the quality of their educational systems. In order to meet individual student learning needs and to prepare students for career and college readiness reforms must be implemented. This reform will in turn improve the quality of the workforce and standards of living in the State of Oklahoma. The districts have not had a track record of success and that is why they want to begin the initiative toward ambitious yet achievable reform.

- Data was collected from the Oklahoma Department of Education over a five year period that demonstrated the need for reform.
- The State is looking carefully at the evaluation of teachers and administrators, this will be coupled with intensive professional development, moving in the direction of data driven instruction and individualized learning environments with an overall focus on raising student achievement.
- The goal will be to develop curriculum maps and improve teaching methods to adapt to the new CORE Curriculum building from the previous Oklahoma PASS standard and objectives.
- These goals will allow the State to comply with the requirements of the new A-F grading system instead of the former AYI guidelines to meet federal standards and benchmarks.
- Student data will utilize a model to begin the process by evaluating previous year's data that will be kept in a usable form and booklet for each teacher to use to evaluate data and then placed into an Excel format for easy use and access from year to year.

If the preceding bullets are followed with integrity significant reform is possible.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The State Oklahoma has a Transparency Act that requires all school districts to provide easily read financial materials. This information is placed on the district webpage and open to public view.

- Each year the district allocated budget must be approved by the County Excise Board to prevent the district from overspending.
- An annual audit is also required to be done by an independent auditing firm to provide insurance that the district is spending what is coded each year.
- Maintenance of Effort budgeting is required where the district must explain how money is used from year to year.
- All salaries are posted on the district website and considered public record.
- All administrator salaries must be posted on the Oklahoma State Department of Education website yearly.
- All instructional and non instructional costs are posted monthly by the local LEA on their website which includes a record of al incoming and outgoing monies.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

This is a strength of this RTT application which is demonstrated in the LEA's interest in developing the necessary individual learning environments that improve student achievement.

- A benchmarking system has been developed to personalize learning environments to prepare students for long term sustained academic growth.
- This benchmarking system is based on regular snapshots 5-7 times a year of student learning that are based on State norms.
- Teachers and administrators are being trained in the use of data driven instruction, that are based on norms of each individual student's learning style.
- Next each student's learning will be evaluated by a group consisting of the previous years teacher, current teacher, Title I teacher and an administrator to insure that individual needs are being met and if not how to remediate or enrich.
- Long term and short term goals of the benchmarking is to develop an individualized learning platform for each student then to push the student to new learning levels to prepare them for career and college readiness.

Through the programing methods the LEA's have used over the last five years they have used the autonomy allowed by the State of Oklahoma. Through this autonomy they are developing individualized learning programs that focus on the benchmarks necessary to prepare students for the Oklahoma Criterion based test as well as the ACT.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Meaningful stakeholder by in has been established by the LEA's through the support given by the State of of Oklahoma, State Department of Education, the schools, educational agencies, local government, Tribal and Business supporters. This support is evident in the number of letters of support, data benchmarking systems in place, snapshots of student learning shared and commitment to on going professional development to improve student achievement.

Evidenced by-

- Number of LEA's (44) participating
- Group dynamic study of student needs
- Benchmarking system
- Collaboration with Higher Education Agencies
- Collaboration with state, military and business to prepare students for career and college readiness in the Twenty First century.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The Oklahoma State Pipeline was the main source of data that was collected for the RTT grant. Gaps were discussed in the following areas-

- It will take several years to gather the data necessary for this grant.
- A network will need to be built to be able to incorporate existing data with the new benchmarking system.
- This network system needs to be able to sequence, build and easily retrieve data and follow a student throughout their school career.
- Consortiums need to create a value added model that would compare benchmarking standards with criterion reference testing requirements.
- Students must be prepared for career and college readiness by teaching them the math, reading, study and test taking skills they need to succeed.
- The goals are ambitious yet achievable if the districts use fidelity in benchmarking.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The LEA's are very clear that their end goal is to help each student to understand the importance of Career and College Readiness skills. The student is the most important stakeholder and along with their teachers and families they need to prepare themselves so they are equipped and ready for many possible career changes in their future. In order to do this they must have strong math, reading and writing skills. High demand fields of work expect students to be proficient in math, science literacy and problem solving skills. In order to make this a reality the LEA's have identified specific areas of need to be addressed and met by the Oklahoma Data Pipeline information. The goals are ambitious yet achievable with the following goals they have laid out;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early childhood reading intervention programs • Middle level reading interventions that may include Lexile and Dibels leveled instruction to further student reading levels • Secondary reading interventions to prepare students for the technical language of various career and college expectations • Identifying and remediating specific reading needs and develop programs to meet those needs • Addressing the high poverty levels of the families in the LEA's and build curriculum and instruction that is infused with literacy knowledge and skills. • Bi-monthly benchmarks assessed in the area of reading to stay on top of student needs and a full reading evaluation five times a year on every student so that no one falls through the cracks. • Research based LEARN and Literacy First programs currently in use demonstrate the value of constant evaluation. • The needs of the student must be met by continuous improvement of their learning environment. • Due to the high mobility rate of students in the Oklahoma public schools the Data Pipeline will allow student data to be continually available for evaluation when ever they move to another school in the state. • The RTT grant monies would be used to purchase technology to be use by the students in the classroom, by teachers and administrators and would also purchase the internet and computer services and infrastructure necessary to operate this technology in these rural areas of the state. • This technology would also create a portal for parents to view their student's grades and progress. • Another very important aspect of this technology is that it would allow students with special needs to more easily access curriculum and instruction in the regular classroom by highly qualified teachers along with their peers preparing all students for Career and College readiness. <p>The district does need to show how it is going to support students that are not reading proficiently after going through the LEARN, Literacy First and reading interventionist support offered by the district. The proposal stated the continuous improvement is only possible when the learning environment is customized to meet the needs of the individual student. What is not communicated in the proposal is what further processes are in place for students that are not succeeding. Is there a student assistance team, specialized tutoring and some supports more effective then a few software programs the districts rely on from intervention support. There is a deeper more complex need to build the necessary background knowledge a reader must possess. A reading program is not enough. A deep rich student centered curriculum and instruction based in benchmarks is needed to help these students many of whom are coming from significant poverty achieve the skills and content knowledge necessary to be college and career ready.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	20

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The consortium will use a variety of professional development models in ensuring student success including;

- Research based early intervention reading programs as well as intermediate and secondary intervention models will be used to develop high quality reading instruction.
- Several software programs will be implemented to intensify reading instruction and insure students are receiving proper intervention.
- Struggling readers will get additional support by qualified professionals
- Technology will be purchased and used for whole class instruction as well as individualized instruction. Technology such as computer labs, iPads, iPods and other wireless devices to support learning, instruction and assessment.
- Travel would also be funded by the grant so that educators could come together for professional development and collaboration.
- Web technology will also be created so educators can communicate data, best practices and share web based training and research.

Teacher and administrator evaluations programs will be implemented to insure high quality curriculum, instruction, assessment and data analysis is used and delivered continuously to drive student success. The combination and alignment of best practices, personalized programs, technology use and students data analysis implemented by the consortium meets selection criteria for RTT. The goals the consortium has laid out are ambitious, however with the struggling track record they have the plan will need to be carefully monitored and adapted and a scheduled preferably quarterly review would need to be conducted.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

There are many good schools acknowledged with in the Oklahoma Consortium of Rural Districts. The Lead LEA has partnered with other high achieving schools to drive how the grant will move forward. Schools will not be forced into following the guidelines of the grant but instead will be encouraged to share best practices and research based programming and materials to provide supports raising student achievement across the districts. to govern policy the following procedures will be put into place-

- Each LEA will have one voting member in the Consortium to establish bylaws that are in line with the state and federal government regulations.
- Each school will be audited yearly.
- There will be a representative Executive Committee comprised the the Lead LEA and four other members from District Level Administration of participating LEA's.
- The Executive Committee will collect data and report that funds are being used correctly.
- Each LEA will be trained how to collect data and make decisions about the data collected.
- Each individual school can build their own schedules and calendars in compliance with state requirements.
- Each LEA will commit to continuous progress monitoring of student data.
- All technology purchased with grant monies will be used to improve student achievement, professional development and stakeholder access 24 hours a day.
- All districts in the consortium will have access to all Oklahoma Data Pipeline in order to be able to provide a central link to disaggregated student data.

The plan fulfills the requirements and meets the criteria of a high-quality plan by allowing autonomy and flexibility to individual districts and students included. In additional there are a variety of opportunities for students to be able to show mastery and resources and instructional practices are adaptable and fully accessible to all students.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA consortium has made it a priority of this RTT grant proposal to include all stakeholders. A large percentage of the funding being requested will be used to purchase the technology necessary to effectively implement the desired school reforms and to do so effectively-

- All stakeholders will have access to student data, educators salaries, budget expenditures and sustainability plans for the proposal.
- Educators will use data to drive instruction and provide interventions as needed
- A Data Pipeline will be constructed where all stakeholders can access student and district data.
- A network will be established where districts can collaborate, share data and access professional development opportunities.

The plan outlines ambitious yet achievable goals to meet high quality individualized learning programs and accountability systems.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The consortium used data from the College Board and several other sources to determine the best use of funds, time, resources and professional development to form scientifically research based objectives for this curriculum project. They studied Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Models from the Gates Foundation as well as the McRel and Marzano Research studies on effective methods of programs, instruction and evaluations that would benefit individual student learning and classroom best practices. They also consulted with the Oklahoma Department of Education developing a dialog that was centered on the utilization of a combination of strategies to reach all students. This was motivated by the state colleges and Department of Education reporting that too much remediation was necessary when students attended college. These strategies included-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The districts working together do develop curriculum that would reach College Readiness preparation by compiling a map made up of three components to measure student progress. • Data is to be gathered and reported using Snapshots taken throughout the student's academic career, yearly, quarterly each school year and even on an actual school day. • Further work constructed a rubric to measure these three basic components. • Diagrams and other visuals were created to guide strategic planning. • The benchmarking system was taught to the students so they would be cognizant and responsible for what they need to learn to be career and college ready. • All districts need to be accountable for improvement to increase educational capacity across the state. <p>The consortium has established a structure for continuous improvement by working collectively to develop scheduled growth targets, design high quality personalized learning environments, using technology to gather and follow data as well as to deliver aligned curriculum by qualified teachers. In implementing the timeline, data and accountability measures outlined above the proposed reforms are ambitious yet achievable as well as flexible and sustainable.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>All parties in the consortium agree that moving towards high quality individualized curriculum and continuous assessment is what is necessary to improve student learning in preparation for future career and college readiness. More guidance and higher expectations are necessary to raise the bar for all children to succeed. Too many students currently are not adequately prepared in the areas of reading, writing and mathematics. The consortium has studied scientifically research based evidence and is direly aware of the correlation of poor reading levels and the cycle of poverty. To try to break that cycle the Consortium has established a plan of ambitious yet achievable measures to enable all students to be fully prepared for career and college readiness. Student data will be carefully evaluated throughout the school year using specific appropriate benchmarks to measure progress and future success. Trends will be evaluated to establish weaknesses in each school as well as the consortium as a whole. The rural districts will develop rubrics for each subject area and work together to build a cohesive curriculum across the consortium. The RTT grant would allow the consortium to build a set of benchmarks and evaluation rubrics that would be available to students, parents, teachers and administrators, Boards of Education and all stakeholders to evaluate classroom instruction and student effort. The benchmarks will be aligned to current state tests and tied to the new objectives and testing maps associated with the PARCC assessment model. The proposal provided structures, strategies, information gathering and sharing tools to provide ongoing, sustainable reform.</p>		

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The 44 Rural School District LEA's will have all educators and students in their districts participating in the goal of improving student readiness for career and college readiness. All sub groups especially the high number of students that come from poverty will be carefully monitored by continuous data collection which will be posted on the Oklahoma Data Pipeline for all stakeholders to view. There has been established 12 performance measures that will be followed by all participating parties. Some examples of these measures will include-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All students in the lead LEA being served by highly qualified teachers and administrators. • Students will display reading comprehension in Zone of Proximal Development. • The number of students that are demonstrating Pre College and Career Readiness are at least 65% in the Lead LEA. • Students will demonstrate reading fluency and comprehension with in the Zone of Proximal Development. • 100% of the Lead LEA Students will fill out free and reduced lunch forms and 75% will fill out FAFSA forms. <p>If the consortium administers and does ongoing progress monitoring of student success and teacher effectiveness these goals are ambitious yet achievable for all students to be career and/or college ready.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicants have studied and referenced high quality teacher effectiveness and research based curriculum and resources in an effort to form scientifically based set of objectives to steer their plan.They built benchmarking standards, rubrics and maps to articulate and communicate their goals effectively. They researched effective practices in other states with similar demographics such as Florida to study the importance of aligning curriculum by benchmarking and aligning curriculum objectives to insure student preparedness for careers and college.</p> <p>The consortium has outlined the performance measures it will comply to which are ambitious yet achievable. They have clearly discussed the technology and strategies they will use to target growth, align assessments to the upcoming PARCC assessments and invest in the professional development, administrative support and changes in school structures and scheduling necessary for sustainable student growth and career and college success. The consortium needs to continually work with an outside agency to effectively monitor and evaluate the ambitious goals it has developed. The information provided by this outside auditor they are stating they will use needs to be used to improve quality programming and not just be used to satisfy grant criteria on paper.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The budget from the RTT grant will be utilized as a supplement to the Consortium's operating budget. The funding will increase expenditures of \$550.00 more per student over the four year period. There is a plan to build instructional technology resources, travel allowances that will allow members of the Consortium to construct a sustainable model. A model that will benefit all students throughout their academic preparedness for future Career and College readiness in an ever changing world in which they may pursue many different career paths. The budget represents mindful attention to all grant proposal requirements including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying all funding that will support the reform project. • Gives clear rationale for budget priorities and investments • Ensures sustainability of programs, supplies and materials. • The programming and purchases requested are supportive of consortiums commitment to preparing all students for career and college readiness. <p>The budget expenditures are front loaded to cover the costs for the technology hardware, software and technical support necessary to make sure the proposal can be effective and successful. All costs for training, supplies and materials were well prioritized and cost effective. Again, if the consortium uses rigor and fidelity in adhering to their budget narrative they will have made high quality use of funding and resources that are ambitious yet achievable to ensure all their students will be successful.</p>		

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The consortium decided that 45% of the grant monies will be used the first year to purchase the technology, equipment and supplies necessary to sustain the project as well as the software needed to store, evaluate and services the student data system, curriculum programs and assessment tools for student success. Funding will be budgeted across four years to purchase all the necessary hardware, software and technological support to service grant objectives. The grant funding will be supplemental to the LEA's regular budget increasing funding form \$8000 per student to \$8,550 for the duration of the grant. Once the computer hardware, software and data management systems are purchased the consortium is confident by working collaboratively they can sustain programming.</p> <p>The professional development part of the grant is geared to establish a long range goal of building a sustainable set of grant activities. Once the professional development is completed the staff will support and continue to train each other. The LEA's have moved their In Direct Costs back into the grant to afford extra travel and grant development activities. The consortium has outlined and established specific ambitious yet achievable goals that will be effective investments towards student success in career and college readiness which will have positive implications on the State of Oklahoma's future.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Consortium of 44 Rural Oklahoma School Districts is proposing that they join together to build a statewide network of highly effective schools that will prepare all students for Career and College Readiness and be ready to compete in a world where they may pursue a number of different career paths. In order to have the skills necessary for the problem solving needed in the workplace students must be challenged by research based curriculum and programs that will meet their individual learning needs and styles and raise their academic level of achievement. Many components are required to provide these services some of which would include-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All stakeholders being involved; students, parents, teachers, school and district level administrators. • Counseling, child welfare services, tribal support, the faith community and other philanthropic organizations are essential for individual student and systematic reform success. • First and foremost students must be trained and reminded that they must take responsibility, set goals, work hard and invest themselves in their education for future success. <p>The 44 Rural Oklahoma School Districts have provided a coherent and sustainable plan where resources will be shared in a partnership that will support the academic, social, emotional as well as behavioral needs of all students in an ambitious yet achievable outcomes for all participants. The rural achievement component of the grant proposes the districts work together to build a strong statewide network of schools. It is the collaboration of this network working towards meeting the expectations of the upcoming PARCC assessment that will build capacity for students to have the skills necessary for multiple career and college readiness opportunities,</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Absolute Priority was met by this Consortium of 44 Rural School Districts in the State of Oklahoma. This is the first time this consortium has applied for RTT funding and it has been mindful and inclusive in coordinating for all stakeholders. Research and planning is focused on the importance of building curriculum, individualized instruction, creating personalized learning environments, using technology support and resources as well as the evaluation and assessment necessary to insure individual student success. Extensive ongoing professional development and support between the consortiums is the key to</p>		

the sustainability of the reform proposal. The investment the consortium is making in technology and technical support will enable ongoing sustainable professional and student growth as well as systematic improvement for public education delivery across the districts. The students will have Career and or College Readiness to succeed in the Twenty First Century in the United States of America. The plan is ambitious yet achievable if followed and adapted with rigor and integrity on the part of all stakeholders.

Total	210	196
-------	-----	-----