



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0446KY-1 for Paducah Public Schools

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant's vision was not coherent in its information presented. It was not comprehensive and clear in what the Applicant wish to have as its outcomes.</li> <li>The Applicant indicated in the application that the vision and objectives for this project were independent of the comprehensive vision of the district.</li> <li>The vision for this project focused on the African American Target Population and expected achievement outcomes for that population.</li> <li>The vision was unclear in its focus and does not align with the four core educational assurance areas as outlined in the notice and did not address a clear approach for accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in tasks that were based on student academic interests.</li> </ul>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	4
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant's process to identify participants is vague other than using achievement gap data. The historical data back drop describes the changing demographics of Paducah and the decreased enrollment of Caucasian students. The Applicant indicated that 100% of the African American Students are in poverty. The Applicant identified a challenge: African American Community Parents file "out of Control" on their children 7 times more than parents in the Caucasian Community per court documents( "This translates into discipline problems during the day"). The Applicant shared that this target group has a high mobility rate. It is unclear as to how this data was used in identifying the target population since there were no quantifiable information given.</li> <li>The Applicant identified in its narrative the schools that would be recipients of the grant activities. There are 3 elementary schools, 2 middle schools and 1 high school.</li> <li>The Applicant fulfilled the requirements of the grant notice by providing the following information: total number of students, participating students from low -income families, participating students who are high-need students and participating educators.</li> </ul>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant's application lacked a high quality plan that identified how the reform proposal would be scaled up and integrated into the district wide change initiative. The Applicant identified an approach at five levels. Little detail was provided making it difficult to have its plan be of high quality. The five levels were: (1) High quality teacher training in Discovery Educational Streaming; (2) Discovery will align the curriculum to new common core; (3) Training on Laptop computers; (4) Reach 1000 families; (5) work to keep positive programs in place. There were no rationales or defined deliverables.</li> <li>The Applicant identified the services of Discovery Education Streaming Agency and its logic theory as the focus of its reform. There were no specific timelines provided for services nor the integration of those services.</li> <li>The Applicant indicated that the Learning Standards of the "Targeted" schools were not equivocal to the other schools in the State. The data analysis revealed significant achievement gaps in the African American and Caucasian</li> </ul>		

performance. The rationale for this plan can be seen in the vision reform. The deliverables can be seen in the goals but lack specificity of the processes/strategies to accomplish them.: close the achievement gap of the subgroup and middle class students to no more than 5 percentage points; close the college/career ready gap to five percentage points; and close the graduation rate gap to within 5 percentage points.

- The Applicant did include a detailed professional development plan of services to be provided by Discovery Education over the four year span.
- The plan lacked specifics necessary to label it high quality.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- The Applicant's application was ambiguous in defining what success would look like for the target populations.
- The Applicant's application referenced maintenance of positive programs utilizing RttD funding, Questions to be considered are:
  - Are these programs successful?
  - If they are, why are there increasing achievement gaps?
- The Applicant's application was missing summative assessment performance data for 2011-12.
- The Applicant's enrollment data was missing for School Year 2011-2012.
- The Applicant's application indicated that a tracking system for Post secondary Degree attainment will be initiated.

**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	4

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- The Applicant's Application gave detailed descriptions of attempts/activities to decrease student achievement gaps. The Applicant's information lacked cohesiveness in the explanation of activities or practices in the improvement of learning outcomes, closing the achievement gaps and lack of success in reform initiatives. Examples include statements such as the following: "Year after year, our white middle class students do very well receiving instruction from the same teachers that teach our poverty African American children. We have been through every kind of training you could possibly imagine but the gap has remained." There were no rationales provided for the initiative.
- The Applicant's Application detailed assessment analysis in chart form: "End of Year testing scores in Algebra II, Biology, English 10, US History" and "Act Scores from 2008-2012 and State 2008-2012 and State Scores. This data confirmed what the Applicant shared earlier in the proposal: discrepancies in achievement performance.
- The Applicant's application does not reflect consistency in student achievement successes and the inconsistencies in information in the application do not lend to future likely successes.
- The Applicant addresses access to student performance in another section of the application.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- The Applicant's proposal provided the following information accessibility and transparency of information: (School Staffs and salaries, announcement of Board of Education Meetings) are published in local newspapers. The Applicant indicated that all processes, practices, investments, and politicizes are "open to the public." The Applicant indicated that all Board meetings are set in advance and are advertised in the local newspaper and on the local website.
- The Applicant indicated that schools individually announce their site-based council meetings and building budget meetings.
- The Applicant provided sparse detail in this response which indicates a limited level of transparency.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	4
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- The Applicant's Application shared that Kentucky received a waiver that aligns with the CCSS and that there is inconsistency in successful learning conditions.
- The Applicant's Application shared that the schools' expectations and goals are not aligned with the State.
- The information as presented in the application is insufficient to determine the state's context for implementation.

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

10

5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- The Applicant's application referred to the participation of board members, teachers, teachers' union, administrators, parents, city agencies, the local NAACP and the Community Poverty Task Force in putting the proposal together. The dialogs and planning included in the application had a poverty focus as to why students were not learning,
- The Applicant's application emphasized the role of the collective bargaining unit in the development of the plan.
- The Applicant's application included several letters of support from various stakeholders endorsing the efforts of the school district; however, the letters lacked convincing information that the reform proposal's scope of work was clear.
- The proposal lacked specific indicators as to how students and parents were to be engaged during the implementation process.

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

5

2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

- The Applicant's application presented a comprehensive diagnostic system which is in place for Preschool - 12.
  - The Applicant included a narrative which addressed the various data sources that are used to assess students; however, strengths or specific areas of weaknesses were not identified.
  - The Applicant's application lacked specifics that would identify a status for implementing personalized learning environments. The Applicant did not specify research based rationales for its current state of affairs. The Applicant provided little or no information on activities that addressed timelines, expected outcomes or deliverables..

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	10
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Applicant's application to address personalized learning and personalized instruction is limited and unclear in accomplishing the core educational areas as defined in the grant and in rolling out a comprehensive plan for implementation of individual learning plans. The application did not provide specific details on the premise that if students are given a laptop and videos for instruction, then improved student achievement will happen. The Applicant did not provide details on the indicators as listed in this segment of the grant's notice.</li> <li>• The Applicant's application indicated that Discovery Educational Steaming would provide the professional development for teachers. The application did include program goals and objectives as provided by Discovery Educational Streaming for the staff development..</li> <li>• The Applicant's application incentive initiatives are unique; however, it is undocumented how struggling students will see this as an achievable endeavor.</li> <li>• The Applicant's application indicated that the "Community Active Parenting Program" is a vital link for families. The goal to reach 1000 families is ambitious but a plan of action to implement was not included and will probably not have the desired results.</li> <li>• The Applicant's application reads with conviction about involvement and participation by middle class families but lacking the African families' participation and involvement (reference to culture). The application is insufficient in addressing the issues that are identified as possible sources of challenges. The application does not provide sufficient information to address the indicators in this section.</li> </ul>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	10
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:		

- The Applicant's application described a comprehensive plan for "high quality sustainable professional development that is job embedded delivered by Discovery Education.
- The Applicant's application detailed in a comprehensive manner - the support system to enable staff to master skills of the reform strategy:
  - Quarterly Leadership meeting with leaders to build capacity
  - monitoring of leadership and teaching practices
  - monitoring participant responses and perceptions to professional development
  - one-on-one and small-group coaching.
- The Applicant's application professional development plan has the following comprehensive goals:
  - reverse the culture of low achievement for students of poverty
  - increase student achievement through school wide literacy and Math initiatives
  - identify skills and knowledge to make instruction relevant to students' lives
  - foster positive relationships between and among students and teachers and parents/community
- The Applicant's application indicated that trained Discovery Learning Specialists will use a case consultancy model to foster effective teaching behaviors and instructional delivery with whole group, small group and peer to peer for leadership practices and approaches. Teachers will receive support such as one-to-one student laptops.

The application does not specify the improved academic achievement that would be evident at the conclusion of this project.

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

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	8
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ The Applicant indicated that the School District Planning Committee appointed by the Superintendent and approved by the Board of Education develops, monitors and annually updates the District Improvement Plan. The Committee operates as a cooperative body to support each school. The Applicant did not provide information on the use of school leadership teams and provided little information on learning resources and instructional practices.</li> <li>◦ The Applicant's application indicated that the District provides a comprehensive menu of learning opportunities for students; however the applicant stated that the challenge "is leading students of poverty to avail themselves of the opportunities." The Applicant stated that there are numerous opportunities available to all students at no cost.</li> <li>◦ The application was limited in addressing differentiated student learning needs. The application described some opportunities and learning resources which are accessible to all students.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Applicant did not provide convincing details that all stakeholders have all the necessary tools and resources.</li> <li>• The Applicant specified a strong parental outreach and the capability for disaggregate data; however, the application did not provide adequate information to ensure the success of the strategies such as ongoing technical support.</li> <li>• The Applicant's application indicated that the District has developed a plan to ensure accessibility to learning content and student progress; however, middle class families are using the tools, but African American families are not.</li> <li>• The Applicant's application indicated that the school personnel is doing an exceptional job in reaching out to families through home visits, and church presentations,</li> <li>• The Applicant's application indicated that the District Planning committee serves as an effective monitoring agent to ensure that schools use data to make decisions based on student data analysis.</li> </ul>		

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

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

(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	4
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Applicant's application provided a brief but concise description of the LEA process for each school's Annual Comprehensive Improvement Plan. There was no information provided as to review or evaluation intervals of the plan. The Applicant did not provide sufficient data to address a strategy to provide timely and ongoing feedback to change the plan.</li> <li>• The Applicant's application information did not address the RttD investments. There was no strategy to assess the components of the RTT-D investments.</li> <li>• The Applicant addressed communication plans at monthly Board meetings by School Councils. The information did not provide a plan of communication on objectives met or not met.</li> <li>• The elements of a high quality plan in terms of rationales, timelines, and deliverables were not provided.</li> </ul>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Applicant's application shared that the ongoing plan of posting information on the Website, the monthly team meetings and the monthly Board of Education meetings as the main communication channels. There were no established timelines for dissemination of information to specific stakeholders.</li> <li>• The application did not address how the services provided by RttD monies would be monitored or evaluated.</li> </ul>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Applicant's application outlined performance measurements. The Applicant's application included the assessments that will be administered in the future as mandated by Kentucky's Waiver approval. The waiver exempted Kentucky from Performance Measures a and b until year 2014. The Performance Measures did not include timelines, deliverables, and persons responsible.</li> <li>• The application indicated that field testing of the proposal concepts was done in 2011-2012 school year. The pilot study is being done through the Commonwealth this school year.</li> </ul>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Applicant did not address this component in the application.</li> </ul>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Applicant presented a concise narrative detailing how monies would be spent. A Chart depicting the information was included. The Applicant did not include a rationale, deliverables or persons responsible for implementation as outlined in the grant's notice.</li> <li>• The Applicant indicated that a significant part of the budget for the four years would be used to prevent dismissal of eight teachers that are deployed to keep small class sizes.</li> <li>• The Applicant's budget requests are reasonable; however the proposal lacks a comprehensive approach and specifics that would ensure the mastery of the four core educational assurance goal areas.</li> </ul>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	4
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:		

- The Applicant's Application described sustainability of project goals in a limited manner.
- The Applicant expressed confidently that the Paducah Public School Foundation will ensure the continuity of the Community College Initiative.
- The Applicant expressed that the training provided by Discovery Education would build capacity for "training the trainer" model after the four year grant ends.
- The Applicant expressed vaguely the anticipation of the Commonwealth of Kentucky to make economic recovery and provided support as was done in 2009.
- The Applicants' application did not provide sufficient information to deem it a high quality plan.

### Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

#### Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

- The Applicant did not respond to this component with sufficient details as outlined in the grant notice.
- The Applicant provided limited information regarding several partnerships that are integral in their educational delivery system.
- The Applicant provided several components of the partnerships, but information was insufficient as to how the partnerships operate in a comprehensive way.

### Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

#### Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

- The Applicant's application reflected much passion and many attempts to address the challenges facing the district.
- The Applicant included a comprehensive plan of work to be performed by Discovery Education Streaming. The work will involve a comprehensive staff development plan that will eventually address the "poverty African American Students and a small group of poverty white students.
- The Applicant's proposed goals for this targeted population are in alignment with the core educational areas as identified in the grant notice:
  - Decrease the academic achievement gap within 5 percentage points of the White
  - Decrease the gap of being college/career ready to within 5 percentage points of the white middle class student
  - Decrease the graduation rate gap of poverty African American students to within 5 percentage points of the white middle class students.
- The Applicant documented work with the Poverty Advisory Task Force and other partnerships in attributing the educational challenge to poverty and limited information as to the state of the learning environment ,culture, climate and transparency elements.
- The Applicant's application had many facets and initiatives for improvement; however, the plan lacked connectivity and alignment of goals and resources to ensure achievement of goals.
- The Applicant's application provided information but was inadequate in convincing the reader that the application is reasonable and achievable.

Total	210	87
-------	-----	----

### Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	0
Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments: The Applicant did not respond to this component.		



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0446KY-2 for Paducah Public Schools

### 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>Initially, the applicant articulates a reform vision by providing some background information about the school district. The reform vision is built on the adoption of Discovery Education Streaming which is aligned with the Common Core Standards (CCS) and exciting to adolescents. The applicant's reform vision encompasses all four core educational assurance areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college. All district teachers and administrators have had training in Common Core Transition Planning and have received state training on the new CCS and its assessments.</li> <li>2. Building data systems that measure student growth and success. The Discovery Education curriculum system tracks and supports student achievement. Data drives decisions from the classroom to the district level.</li> <li>3. Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and school leaders. The applicants plan of attack starts with teacher training. Principals recruit teachers at teaching fairs in four states. The school district provides a financial incentive to African American teachers who are hired.</li> <li>4. Turning around lowest-achieving schools. The district has a 73 percent level of students who receive free and reduced lunch. Their African American children sometimes score as much as 44 percent lower than their white, middle-class peers.</li> </ol> <p>The applicant articulates a clear and credible approach to accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through student support. Examples include: teacher training, curriculum alignment, increase in student technology by purchasing laptop for their at risk students and implementation of the Discovery Education curriculum, and expansion of their Community Active Parenting Program.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The applicant provides a comprehensive description of the school selection process.</li> <li>b) A complete list of the schools that will participate in reform activities is provided.</li> <li>c) The applicant appropriately provides: the total number of participating students, the total number of participating students from low-income families, the total number of participating students who are high-need students, The total number of participating educators was provided in the (A)(2) demographic tables.</li> </ol>		

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a high-quality plan which describes how the reform proposal will be scaled up. Steps include: teacher training in the Discovery Education Streaming curriculum, alignment between the Discovery Education Streaming curriculum and CCS, laptop computer training, and expansion of the already successful Community Active Parenting program.</p> <p>When discussing the laptop computer training the applicant is unclear as to exactly who receives this training and who provides the training. Additionally, the applicant writes about the successful Community Active Parenting program but is vague about specific steps for scaling up this program.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's vision for improved student learning and performance is set forth in a series of tables. Ambitious yet achievable goals are found in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance on summative assessments (Brigance for K, STAR Reading, STAR Math, and state Pearson Tests). The applicant's goals are ambitious yet achievable for the overall group and the two subgroups. However, the applicant projects no improvement or change in the "white middle class" subgroup.</li> <li>• Decreasing achievement gaps (prominent goal is to close achievement gap at every grade level). The applicant combines reading and math projections on the same graph. This is confusing information. Again, no changes predicted for the "white middle class" subgroup.</li> <li>• Graduation rates (overall rates and two subgroup rates). The graduation rates projected seem ambitious yet achievable.</li> <li>• College enrollment. The applicant fails to project an overall college enrollment rate for SY 2011 through SY 2017. The applicant does provide projections for its two subgroups. The projected enrollments are ambitious.</li> </ul> <p>Applicant did not exercise its option to provide projections around postsecondary degree attainment.</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	6
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In an attempt to demonstrate a clear record of success during the past four years, the applicant provides ACT scores from 2008 through 2012.</p> <p>a) The applicant demonstrates the increases in student achievement scores. However, the applicant provides no evidence for a four year clear record of success in the two following categories: high school graduation rates and college enrollment as requested.</p> <p>b) In order to provide evidence of ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools the applicant provides evidence that they invited Geoffrey Canada to their school district to serve as an educational consultant. However, this is an insufficient evidence of an ongoing, clear record of success in this area.</p> <p>c) What remains undocumented in this section is the district's record of success in making student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant portrays adequate transparency for the school district by regularly providing the following information to the Paducah Sun, School Board meetings, and local websites:</p>		

- The personnel salaries at the school level of all school-level instructional staff.
- Actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level.
- The entire school district budget.

The information provided by the applicant appears to be organized, complete, and efficiently managed.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant indicates that they plan to implement the Common Core Standards. The applicant states that they have not yet specified expectations and goals. However, the applicant goes on to state in the next sentence that their expectations and goals are extremely high. This is contradictory and confusing.

The applicant inadequately describes its desired outcomes for students. Therefore, the applicant does not sufficiently address the successful conditions and sufficient autonomy to implement personalized learning environments described in the proposal.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

a) The applicant provides evidence of how families, teachers, and principals participated in the development of the proposal. However, there is no evidence of student participation.

i) The teachers' union (PEA) participated in the formation of the grant proposal and provided a letter of support for the school district.

ii) Five letters of support are presented in the Appendix. The letters of support are from the president of the PEA, the Paducah Chamber of Commerce, the NAACP, and the mayor of Paducah. However, there are no letters of support from parents, parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, advocacy groups, local civic and community-based organizations, or institutions of higher education.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a quality plan for implementing personalized learning environments. The applicant believes they will be more successful in their implementation of personalized learning environments if they start by moving their elementary students first; The applicant believes that proceeding in this manner will provides benefits to the community for years to come. However, the plan is insufficient and vague in terms of details around the implementation of learning environments.

Lastly, the applicant identifies the needs and gaps that the plan will address. The needs and gaps were identified by the applicant through formative assessments and summative assessments

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	11

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment.

a) With the support of parents and educators all students will understand the following:

i) The high-need students in the district will understand what they are learning is key because the Discovery Educational Streaming curriculum is aligned with the CCS and they appear on each and every student laptop computer.

ii & iii) The applicant provides evidence that deep learning goals are linked to college- and career-ready standards because the Discovery Educational Streaming provides a video content that engages students, improves teacher performance and facilitates student achievement.

iv & v) All students experience adequate exposure to diversity on a daily basis due to the demographics of the school district. However, while the participating students will master academic content it remains unclear and vague to what extent the discovery Educational Streaming curriculum addresses such traits as: goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, or problem-solving.

b) With the support of parents and educators, there is an adequate strategy to ensure that each student has access to the following:

i) A personalized sequence of instructional content via the Discovery Educational Streaming curriculum.

ii) A variety of high-quality instructional approaches; one example includes the combination of the Discovery Educational Streaming curriculum combined with the CCS.

iii) The students have access to digital learning content because the Discovery Educational Streaming curriculum will be utilized via laptop computer.

iv) The students have ongoing and regular feedback from the Discovery Educational System because the online system differentiates learning.

v) Adequate accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students. Examples include: home visits and credit recovery.

c) The applicant does not describe the mechanisms they will have in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use their new laptops and/or the Discovery Education Streaming curriculum. Since this information was requested in the selection criteria it will result in a lower score for this section.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	12
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

According to the proposal submitted by the applicant, all participating educators will engage in Discovery Education training to:

- support the effective implementation of personalized training environments.
- adapt content and instruction via the Discovery Education software.
- learn to frequently measure student progress.
- improve teacher practice as the result of teacher evaluations.

However, there is no mention of improving principal effectiveness via the principal evaluation system.

According to the high-quality proposal submitted by the applicant, all participating educators will have access to and know how to use all of the Discovery Education resources which include:

- information that helps educators identify optimal learning approaches for student academic needs and interests.
- high quality digital resources.
- processes and tools to match student needs.

According to the high-quality proposal submitted by the applicant, all participating school leaders will have the Discovery Education training which includes:

- information/feedback from the district's teacher evaluation system that helps school leaders improve the school culture and climate.
- training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress.

Lastly, all applicants were asked to submit a high-quality plan that addresses hard-to-staff schools, hard-to-staff subjects, such as math and science, and hard-to-staff specialty areas, such as Special Education. The applicant provides no plans for these three hard-to-staff areas.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	15
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has a quality plan to support project implementation.</p> <p>a) The LEA central office is engaged in this proposed reform plan and seems completely prepared to provide support and services to all participating schools. The applicant provides compelling evidence that its Central Office was engaged in the creation of this proposal and will remain a resource to the schools it serves.</p> <p>b) The applicant provides adequate evidence that the school leadership teams have sufficient flexibility and autonomy. One example is that they have flexible daily schedules that are driven by student need.</p> <p>c &amp; d) The applicant provides adequate evidence that students are given the opportunity to progress, earn credit, and demonstrate mastery in multiple ways. Examples include: credit recovery during the regular school day and vocational/technical programs.</p> <p>e)The applicant's proposal provides complete evidence that its opportunities and learning resources are accessible to all students including students with disabilities. The applicant does not address English learners- -however, this district may or may not have English learners.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presents a plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participating stakeholders benefit from the recently improved infrastructure in the district. Examples include: wireless infrastructure and SMART boards.</li> <li>Information technology systems utilize an open data format.</li> </ul> <p>Insufficient aspects of this plan include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient information about appropriate levels of technical support for students, parents, educators and other stakeholders.</li> <li>Applicant inadequately addresses interoperable data systems in that there is no evidence of human resources data.</li> </ul>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	8
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has a Comprehensive Improvement Plan in place in their school district; their current plan provides timely and regular feedback. The applicant's Comprehensive Improvement Plan appears to have most of the requirements of a high-quality plan (goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties). However, the applicant does not provide this required information in its response.</p> <p>However, their strategies are vague around how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the investments funded by RTTD, such as investments in professional development, technology, and staff.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presents a plan that involves strategies for communication and engagement with all stakeholders. Examples</p>		

include:

- Improvement information presented on school district website.
- District management team meets monthly.
- Principal's meeting occurs monthly.
- Curriculum report provided monthly at public school board meetings.

However, the applicant inadequately describes a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve its plan.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- All: The applicant notes its recent waiver from the Department of Education. Because of this waiver they will not be using the words "effective" or "highly effective" when describing teachers and/or administrators.
- K-3: The applicant plans to utilize the BRIGANCE Kindergarten Screen. Additionally, the applicant plans to utilize STAR reading and STAR math scores as additional performance measures.
- 4-8: The applicant plans to utilize the Pearson math and the Pearson reading tests for students in grades 4-8. Additionally, the applicant plans to monitor discipline referrals. Lastly, the applicant plans to administer the Explore test to its 8th-graders.
- 9-12: The applicant plans to monitor and track the number of students completing the FAFSA form. They also plan to monitor and track the number of students who are on track to college- and career-readiness. The state of Kentucky has a formula that has been approved by Federal waiver and this will be utilized as a performance measure. Lastly, the applicant plans to monitor discipline referrals.

For each performance measure the applicant:

- a) provides an adequate rationale for the selection of each performance measure.
- b) adequately describes how the measure will provide information critical to its proposed plan.
- c) However, the applicant does not describe how it will review and improve each measure over time if they find that the measure is insufficient to gauge implementation progress. This information was required; therefore, the applicant received a score of 3.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant's response to (E) (4) appears to be missing.

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

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- a) The applicant provides a budget narrative and budget tables. The applicant identifies the anticipated RTTD funds. However, the applicant provides no evidence of LEA funds, State funds, or other possible Federal funds.
- b) The budget narrative and the budget tables are sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal.
- ci) The applicant clearly provides a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities. However, the applicant provides no information about LEA funds, State funds, or other possible Federal funds.
- cii) The applicant identifies that the cost of the laptops for students will be a one-time investment. However, the applicant does not provide strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides its plan for the sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. Paducah's business community shows evidence of support in that they have set up a fund that provides tuition for students attending community college. Additionally, the teacher training for the Discovery Education program will be self-sufficient after the term of the grant. However, this plan is insufficient and is not evidence of a high-quality plan for sustainability.</p> <p>However, the sustainability plan provides no evidence of support from State and local government leaders and financial support.</p> <p>The applicant opted to not include a budget for the three years after the term of the grant.</p>		

### Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	4
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>1) The applicant provides a description of two partnerships that it has formed with two organizations. One partnership is with the local United Way and the other partnership is with local churches. The applicant also provides information about a program, sponsored by community businesses, in Paducah in which students are provided with tuition for two years at a community college.</p> <p>2) The applicant identifies two population-level desired results for students in their LEA. A) Reading Buddies from United Way and at-risk students; and B) All high school graduates with at least a 2.5 GPA and local businesses. The applicant does not designate the type of result (educational vs. family and community) as requested.</p> <p>3) However, proposal details are vague when it comes to tracking and measuring these two programs as they move forward; the applicant is unclear about using data to target its resources in order to improve results for participating students. As a result, the proposal receives a lower score for this section.</p> <p>4) The applicant vaguely describes how the partnership would, within participating schools, integrate education and other services for participating students. Examples include the United Way "Reading Buddy" program that occurs in two of its elementary schools and the community college tuition program that is continually shared with parents and families throughout K-12.</p> <p>5) The applicant describes a feedback system that supplies program information to those involved. However, there is insufficient evidence that the applicant will build the capacity of the staff in participating schools.</p> <p>6) The applicant identifies its performance measures. However, they are not ambitious and will result in a lower score for this section.</p>		

### Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal does not coherently and comprehensively address how it will create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and teachers.</p>		

The applicant provides an insufficient plan to accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning, to increase the effectiveness educators, to expand student access to the most effective educators, to decrease achievement gaps across student groups, and to increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

Total	210	130
-------	-----	-----



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0446KY-3 for Paducah Public Schools

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

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	4

##### (A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant does not speak about personalized student support. The "plan of attack" says that the vision will be accomplished through 1)Teacher training, 2)Curriculum development; 3)Student technology; 4) early, early childhood parenting program and 5) keeping existing programs in place. There is no mention of personalized student support.

Refinement and realignment of curriculum is talked about a lot, but how (and if) it would be applied to each student personally is not mentioned.

The four core educational assurance areas that the item asked the applicant to address are not specifically addressed - (1)adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and workplace and to compete in the global economy; (2)building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how the can improve instruction; (3) recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especial where the are needed most; and (4) turning around lowest-achieving schools.

The teacher training would keep existing teachers in place and train them. There is no mention of recruitment, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals.

The applicant did briefly address two parts of the question - accelerating student achievement and deeping student learning.

The score of 4, which is a low score, is based on the failure to addresss the majority of the sections of the question.

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

##### (A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

All of the eligibility requirements are met in the proposal - all schools in the district have been chosen, there is a list of participating schools, and the number of students and high need students as well as participating educators is listed. The applicant's approach to selecting schools and participants is logical and well explained.

a) All of the schools in the district are included, as they all have the targeted percentages and they are all eligible to participate.

b) There is a complete list of the schools that will participate.

c) The applicant proposes to only serve high-need students, so the total number of students served is the same as the

number of participating students.

All elements are met, and the methodology is logical and explanations are clear - score of 10.

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

10

3

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

To provide a high-quality plan, the applicant should describe, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties (for further detail, see Scoring Instructions in Part XV or Appendix A in the NIA).

The plan is weak, and a low score of 3 was awarded.

The goals and activities are discussed but timelines, deliverables and responsible parties are not.

The applicant does not discuss how the reform proposal will be translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools and will help to reach outcome goals.

There is weak evidence as to how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools, and will help the applicant reach its outcome goals

There is no evidence of a logic model or theory of change of how its plan will improve student learning outcomes for all students who would be served

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

10

4

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

There are no goals for Post-grant numbers on the charts provided - making them incomplete. The application states "annual goals that are equal to or exceed State ESEA targets for the LEA..." Although annual goals are listed, it is unclear how close they are to the state ESEA targets for the LEA.

There is evidence of planning for goals and timelines, so a low-medium score of 4 was assigned.

(a) There is no evidence providing the state ESEA targets, so it is impossible to determine if the performance on summative assessments exceeded the state targets or what the state target goals are. The chart labeled "End of year State Testing provided by the Kentucky Dept. of Education" is very ambiguous - is it for statewide results, the school, the district? What does @.92 mean?

(b) Decreasing achievement gaps - the plan addresses decreasing achievement gaps but does not include activities, deliverables, or timelines.

(c) Goals and timelines for Graduation rates and college enrollment are included, but again, the state ESEA targets are not mentioned, so it is not possible to determine if they are ambitious

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	5
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>a) There is evidence that the applicant has worked toward closing the achievement gap in the past four years as shown in ACT test scores and state end of year testing. High school graduation rates are not addressed - nor are college enrollment rates.</p> <p>b) The district has not ever had a persistently lowest-achieving school or a low-performing school.</p> <p>c) Student performance data is not addressed.</p> <p>Since all of the items with the exception of part of (a) were not addressed or evidence was not presented, a low score of 2 was awarded.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is no evidence or discussion regarding LEA processes, practices and investments.</p> <p>(a) There is evidence that actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff are made public, but no evidence that they are based on the U.S. Census Bureau's classification used in the F-33 survey of local government finances</p> <p>(b) There is evidence that actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only are made public;</p> <p>(c) There is evidence that actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only are made public</p> <p>(d) There is no evidence that actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level are made public (budget development is not the same as actual expenditures)</p> <p>The information provided for 2 out of the 5 elements of the criteria was sufficient, so a score of 2 was assigned.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	0
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The evidence discussing Kentucky's waiver from the Federal government is insufficient to determine the LEA's autonomy.</p> <p>Since to this point in the application personalized learning environments have not been described, it is difficult to assess whether or not they have the autonomy to implement such a program.</p> <p>The State of Kentucky has been awarded a waiver from the federal government, and the state's autonomy was discussed. However, the autonomy for the school district itself as a result of the waiver is not discussed, and the information provided did not address the criteria. The evidence is insufficient or absent. A score of 0 was assigned.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	2
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is little evidence of meaningful stakeholder involvement in the preparation of the proposal. The letters of support speak</p>		

specifically to ending poverty in the district but do not specifically address the criteria of the proposal and how they would support it.

A low score of 2 was assigned due to evidence that teachers and principals were engaged in the development of the proposal.

a) There is no evidence that students and families were engaged in the development of the proposal. Although there is evidence that such groups have participated in conversations about poverty in their community, there is no evidence that they participated in the development of the proposal or had a chance to give feedback.

b) There is evidence of letters of support - from community organizations and the state department of education. 2/3 of the letters appear to have been written from a "boilerplate" without the writer having knowledge of the program specifics.

(a)(i) The letter of support from the Teacher's Union speaks to poverty and studying poverty, but does not specifically speak to the requirements of the project and what it might mean to teachers. There is no evidence that the writer is aware of the direct engagement and support required.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

There is no evidence of any plan other than the "plan" to provide teacher training and keep class reduction teachers. More importantly, there is no mention of implementing personalized learning environments. A plan should, at a minimum, describe the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

The applicant failed to provide a plan and failed to identify needs and gaps. A score of 0 was assigned due to lack of any evidence.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

A high quality plan with have goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties. There is no evidence that a high quality plan is in place. There is no evidence of a plan - high quality or otherwise.

A score of 0 is assigned as a result.

There is no evidence to show that students will

- (i) There is no evidence to show that students will understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals;
- (ii) Identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements , understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goals;
- (iii) Are able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest;
- (iv) Have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning; and
- (v) Master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving;

(b) There is no evidence that students will have access to

- (i) A personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals and ensure he or she can graduate on time and college- and career-ready;

- (ii) A variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments;
- (iii) High-quality content, including digital learning content as appropriate, aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements
- (iv) There is no evidence of a plan to ensure ongoing and regular feedback, including, at a minimum—
  - (A) Frequently updated individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice), or college- and career-ready graduation requirements; and
  - (B) Personalized learning recommendations based on the student's current knowledge and skills, college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice), and available content, instructional approaches, and supports; and
- (v) There is no evidence of accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students (as defined in this notice) to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice); and
- (c) There is no evidence of mechanisms being in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning.

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

20

4

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A high quality plan will have goals, activities, timelines and list parties responsible. There is no evidence of a high-quality plan. The response to this question centers around a professional development program for teachers, and addresses a plan for implementing a digital content learning environment for students. However, it does not speak to academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches (e.g., discussion and collaborative work, project-based learning, videos, audio, manipulatives), but only to providing digital curriculum.

The use of teacher and principal evaluation systems was not addressed.

Since there is a professional development and training program included in the response, but all other elements are absent, a score of 4 was applied.

- (i) There is weak evidence of a plan to support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student's academic needs and help ensure all students can graduate on time and college- and career-ready through Discover Education's professional development program. However, it is not in the form of a high quality plan.
- (ii) There is no evidence that content and instruction would be adapted for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches
- (iii) There is no evidence of a plan to frequently measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards , or college- and career-ready graduation requirements and use data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators;
- (iv) There is no evidence of this element of the criteria in the response(b) (i) Actionable information that helps educators (as defined in this notice) identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests;
- (ii) There is evidence of digital resources in the plan, but it is unclear if they are aligned with college and career ready graduation requirements. There is no evidence of the tools to create and share new resources being available.

(iii) There is some evidence of processes and tools to match student needs with specific resources and approaches, but no evidence that the plan will provide continuously improving feedback about the effectiveness of the resources in meeting student needs.

(c) All participating school leaders and school leadership teams (as defined in this notice) have training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and accelerates student progress through common and individual tasks toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice). The training, policies, tools, data, and resources must include:

(i) There is no evidence of Information, from such sources as the district's teacher evaluation system that helps school leaders and school leadership teams assess, and take steps to improve, individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate, for the purpose of continuous school improvement; and

(ii) There is some weak evidence that training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps exists

(d) This element is not addressed in the response

#### 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>A high quality plan will have goals, activities, timelines and deliverables. There is no evidence of these. Although the applicant spoke to personalized learning and the district's intention to increase these opportunities, it is not in the form of a high quality plan.</p> <p>A high quality plan will have goals, activities, timelines and deliverables. There is no evidence of these. Although the applicant spoke to personalized learning and the district's intention to increase these opportunities, it is not in the form of a high quality plan.</p> <p>A low score of 3 was applied due to the lack of evidence for most of the elements.</p> <p>a) There is some evidence around how the plan would go about organiz(as defined in this notice);</p> <p>(b) Although there is some evidence that school leadership teams in participating schools have sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, but no evidence supporting that they have sufficient flexibility and autonomy around school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and noneducators, and school-level budgets;</p> <p>(c) There is no evidence that the plan wil give students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic;</p> <p>(d) There is weak evidence that the project would give students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways; and</p> <p>(e) This element of the criteria is not addressed.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	1
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A high quality plan includes goals, activities, deliverables, timelines and parties responsible.</p> <p>There is no evidence of a plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator and level of the education system with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.</p> <p>A very low score of 1 was awarded due to the absence of evidence supporting a plan and other tools. There is weak evidence of wireless</p>		

capability and some training for parents on smart phones, but that is not sufficient to justify that a plan is in place.

Although there is evidence of wireless capability and a new middle school is being built, there is no evidence of a plan and other tools and resources besides wireless capability are not addressed.

(a) While there is evidence that parents, educators and other stakeholders have access to grades and state test scores, there is no evidence that they have access to content, tools and other learning resources.

(b) There is some evidence that parents have access to training for using their smartphones to access SKYWARD, the plan does not address ensuring that students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders have appropriate levels of technical support

(c) There is no evidence that there will be information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format and to use the data in other electronic learning systems

(d) This element of the criteria was not addressed

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	2
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Since the elements of the criteria were not addressed, except for weak evidence regarding a process that is already in place, a low score of 2 was assigned.</p> <p>A high quality approach will contain goals, activities, timelines and deliverables, and parties responsible.</p> <p>There is no evidence for implementing a 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>The response speaks about the current process of schools presenting their results each year to the school board, which is not rigorous. There is no evidence of a plan specifically for evaluating the project.</p> <p>There is no evidence to support a strategy must address how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top – District, such as investments in professional development, technology, and staff.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Because the response only addresses internal stakeholders and not external, a score of 3 was assigned.</p> <p>While there is some evidence that strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders exists, it is not clear which external stakeholders are communicated with or have access to the communications.</p> <p>A website that contains all of the information is mentioned, but that is not an intentional plan, and the applicant does not speak to how it will provide for ongoing communication and engagement with stakeholders. There is no evidence of a plan or high quality approach.</p>		

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The K-3 chart does not have any measures entered - it simply lists "baseline" and "growth" for each of the four years. The method for calculation on the grades 1-4 chart is not present, so it is not possible to determine how students are being measured. The subgroups are not labelled on the chart for FAFSA completion, so it is not possible to determine if it is a reasonable goal. There are 3 charts that are complete and can be read.</p> <p>(a) The performance measures are listed, but there is no evidence of the rationale for selecting that measure;</p> <p>(b) Due to the confusing and incomplete charts, it is not evident how most of the measures will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern. There is evidence of performance measures that are rigorous for grades 9-12.</p> <p>(c) There is no evidence of how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>since the applicant did not respond to the criteria at all, a score of 0 was assigned.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The budget is clear and well thought out. However, the applicant did not respond to (a), (c)(i) and (c)(ii)</p> <p>A score of 5 was assigned due to the missing components of the criteria.</p> <p>(a) The budget does not Identify all funds that will support the project</p> <p>(b) The budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal</p> <p>(c) (i) A description of all of the funds (e.g., Race to the Top – District grant; external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds) that the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal, including total revenue from these sources; and</p> <p>(ii) There is no mention of the funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grant period, as described in the proposed budget and budget narrative, with a focus on strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>There is no high quality plan, which would include goals, deliverables, timeline and activities. The applicant states that they are hoping the economy recovers.</p> <p>There is community support, but this was not demonstrated with support from the community for sustainability. No budget was included.</p> <p>A score of 0 was assigned to this criteria, as it does not have any of the elements of a high-quality plan, does not contain a</p>		

budget, does not address support from state and local government leaders.

### Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

#### Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

3 points were awarded for evidence of a sustainable partnership and evidence of how Reading Buddies would move the program forward. Most of the elements of the criteria were not addressed or the evidence was inadequate.

- (1) There is evidence of a description of the coherent and sustainable partnership that the applicant has formed with public or private organizations,
- (2) There are 2 population-level desired results for students.in The Reading Buddies program meets this criteria of including family and community supports. The other desired result is ambiguous and the evidence does not support that it meets this criteria.
  - (a) There is evidence that the plan will track the selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all children within the LEA or consortium and at the student level for the participating students (as defined in this notice);
  - (b) There is no evidence that the applicant will use the data to target its resources in order to improve results for participating students with special emphasis on students facing significant challenges, such as students with disabilities, or English learners
  - (c) The applicant already proposes to serve all high-need students in the district
  - (d) There is evidence that it will Improve results over time;
- (4) There is evidence that at the elementary school the partnership would integrate education and other services (e.g., services that address social-emotional, and behavioral needs, acculturation for immigrants and refugees)
- (5) Describe how the partnership and LEA or consortium would build the capacity of staff in participating schools (as defined in this notice) by providing them with tools and supports to –
  - (a) There is no evidence that the partnership and LEA would build the capacity of staff by providing them with tools and supports to assess the needs and assets of participating students e aligned with the partnership’s goals for improving the education and family and community supports (as defined in this notice) identified by the partnership;
  - (b) There is no evidence that the partnership and LEA would build the capacity of staff by providing them with tools and supports to Identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community that are aligned with those goals for improving the education and family and community supports(
  - (c) There is no evidence that the partnership and LEA would build the capacity of staff by providing them with tools and supports to create a decision-making process and infrastructure to select, implement, and evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating students
  - (d) There is no evidence that the partnership and LEA would build the capacity of staff by providing them with tools and supports to engage parents and families of participating students in both decision-making about solutions to improve results over time and in addressing student, family, and school needs; and
  - (e) There is no evidence that the partnership and LEA would build the capacity of staff by providing them with tools and supports to routinely assess the applicant’s progress in implementing its plan to maximize impact and resolve challenges and problems; and
- (6)Although the applicant does identify its annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population-level there is no evidence that it has described the desired, results for students.

### Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score

Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
---------------------	-------------	---------

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not address how any of its responses to the items would build on or how it would create personalized learning environments. Although some of the planned initiatives, such as Discover Education, would perhaps enable students to have personalized learning environments, it is not clear exactly how that would work, how it would be implemented. The applicant spoke a lot about curriculum alignment, professional development for teachers and laptops for every student.

However, these were not tied specifically to improving learning and teaching through the PERSONALIZATION of strategies, tools and supports. None of the criteria had a high-quality plan in the response. The responses were not consistently coherent and comprehensive.

Total	210	66
-------	-----	----