



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0293OH-1 for Piqua City School District

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision and provides a clear and credible approach as evidenced by the following examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• creating collaborative learning environments</li> <li>• implementing strategies and tools to support administrators, teachers and students by attending the national Model Schools Conference thus creating collaborative leadership teams at each building and establishing annual goals that will be progress monitored throughout the year.</li> <li>• becoming a member of the Success Practices Network which helped to establish the ground work for transitioning to Common Core Standards and assessments.</li> <li>• adopting Common Core and Ohio Academic Standards in all content areas and building capacity by having the district curriculum department attend state and national training in order to have 100% of teachers fully trained in the implementation of the new curriculum</li> <li>• having students participate in more benchmark testing using assessments from Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) in order to do local, state and national comparisons of student achievement</li> </ul> <p>The strategies outlined demonstrate that the district has worked to establish strong professional development for faculty to ensure that teachers will properly implement Common Core Standards and newly adopted assessments. All teachers were trained on implementing the new standards during the 2010 school year. At the building level, the applicant has shown a continued focus through building collaborative leadership teams, staff meetings, team and grade level meetings, district created website (Curriculum Pow Wow), and weekly Common Core Tips of the week developed by the curriculum department. In addition, the strategies provided by the district utilizes data gained from assessments to make informed data driven decisions regarding the creating District Strategic Plan.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>a. The applicant demonstrates an adequate approach to implementing its reform proposal that will support quality LEA-level and school-level implementation of that proposal. The applicant is currently in the process of streamlining the number of schools currently in the district. The district currently has nine schools on line. By January 2015, there will only be a total of five schools in the district. The applicant has stated that due to the low number of buildings and enrollment, the district will serve all students. The applicant does not provide a clear and explicit rationale to the school selection process. The applicant does not describe a process which was used to decide all schools would be included in the reform initiate.</p> <p>b. The applicant provides a thorough listing of schools which will participate in the grant activities throughout the phases of restructuring. The following schools will participate through December 2014: Nicklin Learning Center (K), Favorite Hill Primary (1-3), High Street Primary (1-3), Springcreek Primary (1-3), Bennett Intermediate (4-6), Washington Intermediate (4-6), Wilder Intermediate (4-6), Piqua Junior High School (7-8), and Piqua High School (9-12). Beginning January, 2015 the following five schools we be participating: Springcreek Primary (PK-3), Washington Primary (PK-3), Piqua Central Intermediate (4-6), Piqua Junior High School (7-8) and Piqua High School (9-12).</p>		

c. The applicant has illustrated in the narrative and in the chart that it will have full educator participation in professional development opportunities which increases the likelihood of quality implementation. As listed in the narrative of the 3,700 participating students, there are 2,394 students identified as low-income and 3,009 students are high-need and at risk of educational failure or otherwise in need of special assistance. By serving all schools, the applicant ensures that it will address the needs of all grade levels, socio-economic subgroups and academic levels.

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant includes a plan which describes how the reform proposal will be scaled up. The applicant provides a basic outline of strategies which are currently being used for meaningful reform such as implementing curriculum mapping; focusing on reading comprehension in all content areas; implementing curriculum alignment, pacing and benchmark testing and partnering with other entities to increase professional development. The applicant has developed a detailed proposal to scale up what is currently being successfully implemented. The Districtwide Strategic Plan has been instrumental in transitioning to the Common Core Standards. The following strategies are examples of what will be implemented as a result of grant funding:

- using periodic benchmark testing (NWEA) to track AYP subgroups thus allowing the applicant to determine which subgroups will need additional academic assistance;
- extending learning by providing students with the means to access technology beyond the regular day;
- increasing professional development opportunities for teachers thus ensuring that all teachers have the ability to implement new programs with fidelity, rigor and relevance;
- employing a graduation coach to monitor the progress of students as they prepare for college or career readiness thus increasing the likelihood of the number of students graduating from high school and entering college.

However, the applicant fails to provide evidence of the potential effectiveness of these strategies.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant outlines how the applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals. The applicant outlines some ambitious goals for performance on summative assessments for the participating school district. The district illustrates a four to seven percentage point gain each year to reach the target of 100% of each subgroup reach proficiency in reading and math on the Ohio Achievement Assessment and Ohio Graduation Tests. However, the IEP and LEP subgroups have a more aggressive track to achieve 100% proficiency making the goals for these subgroups ambitious but unlikely to be achievable. For example, the fourth grade IEP subgroup's baseline proficiency in math is 29.4%. The goal for the subgroup is expected to be 50% proficiency which is an increase of 20.6% in one year. Similar increases are expected for each IEP subgroup in each subject. The applicant does not clearly demonstrate how it will reduce the achievement gap for each subgroup in each tested subject. The goals remain the same for each subgroup across each subsequent year.

The applicant outlines ambitious and attainable goals for increasing graduation rates. The high school graduation rates are to be increased by two to four percentage points each year. Based upon the current strategies and scale up strategies listed in the narrative, these goals are achievable. The applicant does not state how graduation rates will be calculated. It is not uncertain whether the state or district will determine the percentages nor does the applicant state if graduation rates will include students who graduated post cohort. The applicant outlines ambitious and attainable goals for increasing graduation rates for the overall population, students with disabilities and white subgroups. College enrollment is calculated as the ratio between college-enrolled students and their graduating cohort. As evidenced in the chart, goal increases are shown in comparison of baseline data presented. The goals for black and economically disadvantage student are ambitious as is evidenced by the double digit jump increase in each subsequent year. It is uncertain if the applicant will be able to attain the goals listed for these subgroups.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant has established a record of success based upon student learning and achievement. The applicant has provided consistency and continuity of the K-12 curriculum within the district by implementing curriculum alignment, pacing and short cycle assessment development which began in the 2006-2007 school year. The district has a proven success record as it has improved from earning 4 of 23 indicators on the local report card in the 2004-2005 school year to earning 25 out of 26 indicators in the 2011-2012 school year. Since 2008, graduation rates have remained above 90% and college enrollment has remained at 60%. The applicant provides no information related to persistently low achieving schools.</p> <p>The applicant provides a record of success as it conveys student performance data to key stakeholders. The district uses short cycle assessments with administration and teachers to make data decisions. Using the program, Just5Clicks, the administration tracks student progress, create intervention plans, and make decisions regarding the curriculum adjustments that must be made. In addition, assessment results are sent home to parents and bi-annual parent-teacher conferences are held to inform parents of their children's progress. Parents are encouraged to attend Response to Intervention meetings where data intervention plans and student progress is discussed. It cannot be ascertained if the strategies yeild a positive impact on student achievement.</p> <p>The applicant has provided a clear explanation of the various avenues which are used to share information regarding instruction and services; however, it is unclear how well attended the conferences and meetings are.</p> <p>The applicant failed to explicitly discuss low performing schools and reforms being made to turn these schools around.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant is transparent in the LEA process, practices and investments as it produces and publishes the Certified Annual Financial Report Card (CAFR) for the public. The document provides a review of district revenue, spending and future projections. The financial status is presented to the public in various ways including monthly board meetings, website, and the State of the Schools yearly presentation. The CAFR contains the elements listed in the criteria. For example, all of the district salary information and classroom focused spending are included in the CAFR.</p>		
<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant minimally demonstrates evidence that the LEA passed has sufficient autonomy. During the summer of 2011 the Ohio General Assembly passed a new law that necessitates one half of a professional educator's evaluation must be based on student growth. The district is piloting the new mandatory teacher evaluation system which integrates student performance. In addition, the LEA was able to choose a vendor which provides tests which measure student growth. The applicant does not provide any other common examples of autonomy such as the ability to create local salary schedules for teachers and principals, merit pay or alternative pathways to certification.</p>		
<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant has demonstrated some evidence of meaningful stakeholder support such as the Piqua City Schools and Piqua Education Association working collaboratively on the application. In addition to student surveys, parents at Title I building provided input through parent meetings, surveys, and conferences. Outreach was expanded to other stakeholders. Business partnerships and a superintendent's executive advisory committee consisting of business professionals, local citizens, and parents of students in the school district provided their feedback and are represented in the proposal.</p>		

The applicant does not present information on whether the LEAs have or do not have collective bargaining representation. No evidence is presented specifying that at least 70 Percent of teachers from participating schools support the proposal.

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

**5**

**4**

**(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has demonstrated evidence of an adequate plan with goals to implement personalized learning environments. The plan includes data collection and report development. Each time students engage with NWEA short cycle assessments, Yearly Progress Pro (math), Total Reader (reading), or state data is released, reports are generated for teacher and administrator analysis. This allows students to be placed in flexible groups to meet individual needs. Initial training for NWEA and RTI process began during the 2011-2012 school year with full implementation in the current school year. Parents are encouraged to provide feedback and participate in their children's education. Upon grant award, the applicant plans to include the scale up plans mentioned in previous sections in order to achieve their goals by 2016. The applicant fails to provide full details regarding the activities, timelines, and deliverables. The applicant stated that it would use the results from the Value Added and AYP status to determine effective teachers and those needing professional development. The applicant does not clearly explain the plan for determining effective professional development..

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant has documented a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. The plan includes an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students that enable participating students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards. The applicant has developed a K-12 district-wide College and Career Readiness Plan that was adopted by the Board of Education in 2010. According to the plan, all stakeholders have monthly responsibilities which increase personalized learning. Students are involved in their goal setting which in turn engages and empowers them as learners. When the NWEA assessment data is generated, teachers receive detailed curriculum alignment reports for each student thus creating targeted instruction. Beginning in the eighth grade, students are able to be involved in learning experiences in areas of interest by taking the Explore assessment which helps students learn more about potential careers, goal clarification, future high school coursework planning. Once in high school, the students are able to make more decisions regarding their education by taking the Plan Assessment. The Plan Assessment is a practice version of the ACT and includes an interest inventory. Using the data gleaned from both the Explore and Plan Assessments, high school counselors can assist students in creating their Career Pathways. Students are also given the opportunity to earn college credit while in high school which will further encourage students to pursue college experiences. Students will be granted the opportunities to have exposure to diverse cultures by participating in Rosetta Stone World Language courses in 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades and an Intro to World Languages in high school. The courses are offered to provide students with a better understanding of other cultures.</p> <p>The applicant provides limited examples of mechanisms to provide training and support to students by having teachers at all levels have participated in inquiry training which is based learning and the International Center for Leadership in Education training for Rigor and Relevance.</p> <p>The roles of parents to help ensure strategies are accomplished, or to help determine if individual student learning is appropriate to the child is not fully described. The applicant failed to provide details regarding the accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students.</p>		

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant outlines a strong plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. Teachers have access to, and know how to use tools, data and resources to accelerate student achievement. This is evidenced by the applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• training all participating educators in the K-12 district-wide College and Career Readiness Plan;</li> <li>• purchasing Discovery Education, a resource which uses interactive lessons in classrooms that support individual needs of students. In addition, teachers can also design specialized assignments for one-on-one student engagement;</li> <li>• providing professional development opportunities to help with the transition to Common Core Standards district wide and analyze data from the NWEA test;</li> <li>• providing lesson plan development assistance and a common storage utility for teachers to share their work;</li> <li>• providing educators with common planning time, which allows teachers to analyze data, share pedagogical techniques, and identify students with intervention needs.</li> </ul> <p>All of the opportunities demonstrate the applicant's ability to effectively prepare teachers to personalize learning while increasing the fidelity of executing the district's plan to increase achievement.</p> <p>The applicant displays the ability to improve the teachers' practice and effectiveness by principals engaging in classroom walk-throughs using a district created tool that tracks successful implementation of planned best practices. In addition, the teacher's ability to demonstrate student growth accounts for half of the formal evaluation.</p>		

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant has provided minimal detail regarding the LEA practices, policies and rules. The applicant has provided a listing of the members of the central office, but fails to provide detail as to any of the responsibilities of key personnel. Each of the nine participating schools have a Collaborative Leadership Team that reviews the district and building needs, develop goals for achieving student success and monitors the progress of the goals. It is unclear how the members of the team are selected to guide the school. Based on the information provided, it cannot be ascertained if the leadership team has flexibility or autonomy to control calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing roles.</p> <p>Students are given the opportunity to earn credit in a variety of ways. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• students can earn recovery credits at their own pace utilizing an online learning program called NOVA NET;</li> <li>• students at the middle school can earn high school credit in math and science through advanced learning classes.</li> <li>• high school students have the opportunity to enroll in a dual enrollment program is offered through a partnership with Ohio Northern University if they meet the minimum criteria</li> </ul> <p>Giving students these options encourage students to graduate and possibly continue their education beyond high school. In addition, students are given opportunities to demonstrate mastery of standard through the administration of the NWEA formative assessments and the Response to Intervention program.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant describes Local Education Agency and school infrastructure to help demonstrate it has a plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student the support and</p>		

resources needed. Resources and instructional practices in the districts are cited to be adaptable and fully accessible to all stakeholders. For example, all stakeholders have access to the Curriculum Pow-Wow which offers curricular information related to standards, assessment data, curricular changes, pedagogical strategies, and district procedural updates. Each building in the district has a website that offers the community pertinent information and news updates as well as the district website which offers information related to Board Policy, community newsletters (Drumbeat), and general news. It is uncertain how the same information is conveyed to parents and students who do not have internet access at home.

The Treasurer's Office uses interoperable systems for budget data while the Education Management Information System (EMIS) Coordinator uses state software to track all student subgroups and certificated staff data.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant presents a limited approach for a continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements. The applicant has identified 16 staff and administrators to serve as RttT team. The team will meet monthly to discuss progress toward goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements. The plan is to be reviewed twice a year to change or update information. The applicant does not provide thorough details as to how it will share the information with the public.</p> <p>The applicant does not elaborate on strategies that support the measures of fidelity of the implementation and student outcomes. For example, the applicant does not state key personnel roles in ensuring the strategies are being implemented properly or that milestones are being met. Strategies will need to be translated into procedures at the school level to ensure efficacy.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant provides limited strategies for ongoing communication with internal and external stakeholders. Quarterly newsletters will inform internal stakeholders such as district personnel. Parents and other external stakeholders will be informed via a periodical newsletter and website. The applicant does not address how external stakeholders will be able to communicate questions or concerns to the RttT team. The plan provides minimal examples of communication methods and avoids seeking more modern methods of engagement such as Twitter and Facebook or hosting school events which highlight some of the strategies being used by the LEA.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant has provided a chart which illustrates achievable performance measures. The reports support the Response to Intervention process, demonstrate growth measures, and meet the needs of all students at all spectrums of the curriculum. Rigorous and timely data is measured in the fall, winter, and spring of each school year.</p>		
<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>
<p><b>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant does not address how it will evaluate the effectiveness of investments.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b> The applicant requests \$7,016,820 of RttT-District funding to serve its 3,700 students. The funding equates to \$1,896.43 per pupil. Overall costs appear reasonable to support services. Costs are presented for all major line items. The applicant clearly provides a clear rationale for investments and priorities. The applicant demonstrates that funds will be budgeted to provide the required services to eligible schools. For example, costs for a Graduation Coach and a College/Career Coach associated with the Career and College Readiness Program which is designed to prepare students and families for the workplace and college. It is unclear if the applicant will seek additional financial support from other external foundations; LEA, State or other Federal funds.		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b> The applicant has not provided a plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant.		

**Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</b> The applicant presents information on efforts to integrate public or private resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students. For example, the applicant's goals with these community partnerships include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· preparing students for a strong entrance into their first year of kindergarten.</li> <li>· providing social, emotional, and behavioral, and academic support for all students with a focus on high needs students</li> <li>· providing unique programming opportunities for our students</li> <li>· ensuring strong ties to their community through STEM activities</li> <li>· preparing students for the career and college opportunities so they can easily transition in to their post-secondary experiences.</li> </ul> Using data collection and surveys to teachers and parents, Parents as Teachers tracks students that have participated in their program seeking feedback on academic and social progress of the students. The feedback is used to make necessary adjustments in their program so they can ensure that the students and parents that participate in their program are being prepared for current educational needs.		

**Absolute Priority 1**

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

The applicant has presented reform initiatives that will build on the core educational assurance areas as a personalized learning environment is implemented. The initiative uses collaborative, data-based strategies, add 21<sup>st</sup> century tools such as online learning platforms, computers, and learning strategies to deliver instruction and supports tailored to the needs and goals of students, with the aim of enabling all students to graduate college- and career-ready.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>138</b>
--------------	------------	------------



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0293OH-2 for Piqua City School District

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

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The vision outlined by Piqua City Schools was not coherent. There were many programs and initiatives: RTI, Common Core, Discovery Education, digital learning academy, but they were not packaged as one coherent reform vision. The activities in the reform vision were undeveloped; one example of this was a 1 to 1 laptop program that was only mentioned briefly two times. It was not explained how extensive the 1 to 1 program would be or how it would work toward the four core educational assurance areas.</p> <p>The applicant did not outline a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement and deeping student learning. The district made a move to Common Core and its partner assessments, but there was not a direct focus on how to prepare and support students for these standards. The reform vision was a continuation of past work, rather than new reform to personalize student learning.</p> <p>The application described professional development that was being provided to district personnel; however, there was no evidence illustrating how this professional development increased student outcomes. No data was presented that showed improved student performance based on teacher and administrator training. Collaborative teams were also described as part of the reform vision; there was some evidence that the collaborative teams were working together to improve student learning through analysis of data and discussion of opportunities for change.</p> <p>The applicant mentioned Discovery Education, a potential digital learning academy, and 1 to 1 computing as means to increase equity through personalized student support; however, none of these initiatives were developed.</p> <p>A1 received a mid-range score of 4 for a comprehensive and coherent reform vision because there were more than six reform initiatives mentioned (i.e. mandatory online class, Discovery Education, graduation coach, digital learning academy, IB program, dual credit), but the plan did not show how these improve student achievement. There was also not a clear depiction of how each of these individual programs and initiatives will work together in one comprehensive and coherent reform vision to improve student learning at all ability levels: low, middle and high.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

All schools/students in Piqua City Schools were defined as "participating students." The applicant did not undergo a process to determine which students' needs could best be addressed by the plan. The applicant stated that "due to the low number of building facilities and moderate student enrollment" all students will be included. This argument does not explain why all schools and students should be included.

3,009 of 3,700 students were identified as "high need students." The plan does not explain how or why these students were high need. 62% of students were listed as low income, which does not explain the greater number of "high need students."

A2 received a 3, a low mid-range score, because the district did not make a compelling argument as to why their entire population would benefit from the plan. There was evidence that there are several students who are low income, but it was not clear why 3,009 out of 3,700 students are "high need" or at risk of educational failure. The 3,009 were not disaggregated by English learners, homeless, in foster care, etc.

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The plan focused on the entire district. The applicant described the district's strategic plan that was used annually to address the highest need areas with the input of staff. The strategic plan included such activities as transitioning to the Common Core and using data to monitor instruction. The plan described by the applicant will help support district-wide change. The applicant demonstrated that the district strategic plan has already been successful in achieving some district-wide change (i.e. the transition to Common Core and its related assessments).

Many of the initiatives in the reform proposal were already in place in the district (i.e. Academic Signing Day, College 101), and the RTTT grant would maintain programs that are in need of more funding to continue. The plan did not present new, innovative ideas to improve student learning outcomes.

A3 received a mid-range score of 5, because the plan described a district wide strategic plan that is being leveraged to move the district forward. However, the district did not adequately provide a high-quality plan for implementing new reform strategies into the strategic plan that is already at work in the district.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

Piqua City Schools was starting with already high test scores in most areas, students on IEPs and African American students being two of the exceptions. The goal was raise all students in all subgroups for all areas of the plan to 100%, which was not an achievable goal. 100% was uniformly applied as the goal four years out irrespective of the current proficiency rate. For example, many of the subgroups showed target goals of a 6% increase a year, which was achievable (i.e. reading, grade 3, Hispanic). But, reading, grade 3, IEP students had a goal of a 10% increase every year (from 50% to 100% in 4 years), which does not seem achievable. The goals for IEP students at other grade levels and test areas were comparable. For math, grade 4, IEP, the percentage went from 29.4% to 100% over four years.

The goals for decreasing the achievement gaps were also filled in uniformly instead of addressing unique goals for different subgroups and situations.

The applicant provided goals of increasing graduations rates for all subgroups to 100%. The applicant did not demonstrate that this was an achievable goal.

There was also a disparity in the goals for college enrollment. All but one subgroup were listed at 75% by the end of the four years. However, the subgroup black went from 7% to 75%, while the subgroup SWD went from 5% to 25%. No rationale was provided to explain the discrepancy between these two groups. It was also not illustrated how the district will be able to raise the other subgroups' enrollment that significantly, but they will not be able to impact the SWD group.

This section received a 3, a low score because the goals were ambitious, but it was not demonstrated that they are achievable. They did not always seem realistic because, in many cases, they were moving from status quo to 100% regardless of where status quo was and the unique qualities of the subgroup.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The district showed that they have: hired personnel, participated in initiatives (i.e. STEM, Discovery Education), adopted Common Core, provided access to professional development for teachers and administrators, used data, and implemented RTI. The district did not provide data and/or charts to show the impact of these on student outcomes.</p> <p>The district did not show decreasing achievement gaps.</p> <p>The district did not show ambitious and significant reforms in persistently low achieving schools or the results of these reforms. Persistently low achieving schools were not specifically identified or discussed.</p> <p>The application stated that communication is important, and the applicant described several forms of data that were provided to teachers, students and parents. However, it did not show how making student data available to stakeholders improved student performance.</p> <p>B1 received a low mid-range score of 4. Almost all of the components in the application are currently in place in the district; it was not demonstrated that the implementation of these components has positively impacted student achievement over the last four years. No data was provided to illustrate how the district has improved student learning outcomes and closed achievement gaps, including raising student achievement, high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The application did not detail what information about spending was presented to the public. The application mentioned one annual report which was widely available; however, no specifics of the report were detailed. The applicant stated that the document "offers the public a transparent, comprehensive review of district revenue, spending and future projections." It does not detail which salaries were included.</p> <p>B2 received a 2 because a report and some sharing of information exists, but no details were presented.</p>		
<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The application was focused on the change the state mandated in the teacher evaluation system. Section B3 explained that the state enacted a law to include student growth in the teaching evaluation. The applicant did not explain how this new system of teacher evaluation has affected student performance or teaching quality. However, it does indicate that the state is interested in student growth and achievement.</p> <p>The applicant claimed to be fully compliant with IDEA, Title I and gifted programming.</p> <p>The applicant did not specify other ways the state regulates personalized learning environments.</p> <p>B3 received a low score of 3 because the applicant did not demonstrate evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy. The applicant did demonstrate compliance with one state mandate in relationship to student growth.</p>		

<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant worked collaboratively with the Education Association on the application, which indicated that teachers were engaged in the process of development.</p> <p>Students completed surveys, which contributed the writing of the application. Parents also completed surveys.</p> <p>Five letters from the community were presented with the application. There were no letters from parents, students, teachers or administrators. There was evidence of collaboration with stakeholders in writing this application.</p> <p>B4 receive a mid-range score of 7 because it was evident that the application was written collaboratively. It was not evident what suggestions stakeholders provided or what was specifically revised in the plan based on stakeholder feedback.</p>		
<b>(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant demonstrated a plan for analysis of the applicant's current status. The plan included some activities, rationales for the activities, deliverables, timelines, and parties responsible. The applicant explained several sources of data: NWEA, Yearly Progress Pro, Total Reader and other state data. The applicant explained that this data is analyzed, and from the data students are grouped by needs. Administrators, teachers, parents and students are involved in the process.</p> <p>The applicant did not detail strategic activities to analyze the current status, nor did it demonstrate a thorough analysis of the current status. The applicant cited two gaps that the plan will address, but there was not a thorough analysis.</p> <p>B5 received a low-range score of 2 because there was a plan for analysis, but the plan was not developed. The applicant identified two gaps that the plan will address, specifically sustaining growth in the areas of AYP or Value-Added; however, explaining how stakeholders should be included in the process was not sufficient to address a high-quality plan for analysis.</p>		

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12</b>
<p><b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Piqua City Schools defined "all participating students" as everyone in the district, which would include students of all ability levels: low, middle and high. The plan did not detail specific instructional approaches to target students of each range. The plan addressed all students in one batch, instead of addressing specific, targeted interventions for different levels of students. Different approaches were not delineated even at the elementary and secondary levels.</p> <p>Piqua City Schools demonstrated a plan that addressed college and career-ready standards. The district has had a K-12 district wide college and career readiness plan since 2010. The district described an extensive use of data from NWEA to determine where each student was performing academically. The plan described learners being engaged and empowered to create goals to personalize learning; however, the applicant did not sufficiently prove that students have the knowledge or support to move from personal goals to the desired outcomes.</p> <p>Outside of standardized testing, the plan lacked a system to measure progress toward the student defined goals. The applicant did not develop a support system to help move students from self-defined goals toward college and career-readiness.</p>		

Piqua City Schools did not define mastery, nor did the applicant provide a plan of support to achieve mastery.

Some high-quality content, including digital learning content was mentioned: Discovery Education, possible development of a virtual academy, and a "Bring Your Own Technology" program. An 1 to 1 technology program was mentioned twice during the application, but a plan for implementing an 1 to 1 program was not described.

Personalized learning recommendations from assessments were evident; however, available content, instructional approaches and support were lacking to move students from their personal goals to attain college and career-ready standards.

High needs students were not specifically addressed. There was not detailed support for those who struggle to progress toward their defined goals. Piqua City Schools did not provide evidence that students would receiving training and support to use the goals they set, monitor these goals and make adequate progress toward them.

For C1, the score was mid-range, 12. Some progress toward college and career-ready standards was evident; however, Piqua City Schools did not demonstrate the support, monitoring and resources for students along the way. The plan centered on the common student, and students of low, middle and high range abilities were not differentiated in the plan. These students often require different types of interventions.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>
--	-----------	-----------

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

Training was prioritized in the district's plan. The focus of training was on strategies (inquiry-based learning, Common Core); the applicant did not demonstrate that these strategies necessarily support students to graduate on time college and career-ready. The plan proved the educators have access to training and tools but they did not provided evidence of follow-through on implementing the training.

Online opportunities through Discovery Education and Bring Your Own Technology adapt some content and instruction. Broader opportunities to adapt the curriculum, especially for students with varying abilities, was not evident.

Data from assessments was distributed to inform stakeholders. There was not clear evidence to support the meaningful usage of the data by stakeholders. Tha applicant explained that teachers have access to a detailed curriculum alignment reports, but there was not evidence regarding the usage of these reports to change instruction.

A process was described for evaluation of teachers; however, it was not readily evident how the evaluation process improved teaching and learning. Supports and interventions for teachers and/or administrators who are not successful in their evaluation were not presented.

Processes and tools to match student needs with specific resources were absent. The plan described approaches for teaching all students, and it did not specify targeted interventions for different types of learners.

The applicant did not provide evidence that school leaders were being developed and supported.

Training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress were not evident. There was not a plan for increasing access to effective and highly effective teachers and principals; the status quo was just described.

C2 received a mid-range score of 10 because the applicant did not develop a high-quality plan aimed at raising the capacities of teachers and leaders in the district. The applicant described an evaluation plan that included student growth, but the applicant did not provide evidence that this would improve teachers or leaders. The applicant did not provide evidence that the data, training, or evaluation were effective for improving student learning.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

It was not clear from the description in D1 how the central office provides support, guidance and autonomy to the schools. There was not a description of the scope of what school leadership teams are given authority to do.

While credit recovery programs were described, there was not a clear description of how general students can progress based on demonstrated mastery. NovaNet and a flex credit opportunities were explained as ways for students to earn credit based upon mastery.

Title I funds and identifying English learners were mentioned, but it was not clear how learning resources and instructional practices are adapted for all students. There was very little discussion regarding students with special needs and providing them access to a high level of learning.

D1 received a mid-range score of 5. The applicant did not provide a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure. The district did not outline activities, rationale for activities, deliverables, timelines and parties responsible for supporting the project. The district had or was exploring some options to provide additional resources to personalize student learning, but they were not fully developed.

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
---	-----------	----------

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

Access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources was described as being available (through Curriculum Pow-Wow and some web resources); however, availability does not ensure access to all, regardless of income. Piqua City Schools did not describe a process to assist stakeholders in accessing the resources, namely stakeholders without computers, or internet, etc.

Technical support for stakeholders was not described in the plan. Allowing parents and students to export information was also not addressed.

The district described interoperable data systems, including student achievement data.

D2 was in the mid-range and scored a 4 because the applicant proved some infrastructure for supporting personalized learning, but not all of the subpoints in the criteria were addressed. The applicant did not provide a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure, specifically they did not address access and utility of information provided to stakeholders.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant described a team that currently reviews the district's strategic plan twice per year and would be able to monitor the RTTT plan.</p> <p>The applicant described the Northwest Evaluation Association assessment as a measure that would be most useful in analyzing progress toward their goals because of the link to Common Core standards.</p> <p>The applicant described newsletters and websites to publish information.</p> <p>E1 received a mid-range score of 7 because Piqua City Schools explained a collaborative team of teachers and administrators that would meet to review the plan. It did not explain the processes or strategies this team would use to evaluate and improve the effectiveness of the plan.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>

**(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

External newsletters were mentioned; however, internal communication was largely unaddressed. It was also not evident how the communications would support the on-going efforts of the RTTD grant.

E2 received a low-range score of 2. The strategies for communication were largely those currently in place in the district; the applicant did not express new methods for engagement with stakeholders, nor did they prove the current communication methods were sufficient.

<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
---	----------	----------

**(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

Grade-appropriate indicators of health or social-emotional issues were not included in the performance measures.

FAFSA information was also not included in the performance indicators.

Not all of the performance measures included are identified and explained; one of the performance measures had data, but did not specify the measure being addressed. For Performance Measure 9-12 c, the heading required "Please describe the Performance Measure here, as well as the methodology for calculating the measure." The applicant did not complete this information; however, there was a table of data below. It was not clear what 90% of "all participating students" were on track for in the baseline year.

Most of the performance measures were based on NWEA; the rationale for choosing NWEA was supported throughout the application based on the transition to Common Core State Standards. The applicant provided 14 performances measures, which will help them assess progress.

There were some indications that the measures were formative, but it was not demonstrated that these measures would lead to changes in instruction. The applicant stated that teachers would have access to data to re-shape the curriculum, but no specific examples were provided of teachers changing their instruction due to the data.

No review and improvement process was identified.

E3 received a mid-range score of 3, as some of the information was missing or incomplete. The applicant did not provide performance assessments that addressed the whole student: academic, health and social-emotional. The performance measures provided by the applicant were not ambitious (because they did not include FAFSA and health or social-emotional components that address the whole student) and the applicant did not prove that they were achievable (many were at 100% by the end of four years, without a strong explanation as to how to achieve that goal). The information provided did not provide a complete depiction of rigorous, timely and formative measures.

<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>
--	----------	----------

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

E4 was unaddressed, and therefore receive a 0. Plans and strategies to improve the RTTD plan were not discussed. Professional development was a major emphasis of the applicant's plan; implementing technology and working with community partners were also components. The applicant did not discuss how to evaluate and/or improve these activities.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>Funds, other than the RTTD funds, were not described. Without additional sources of funds, sustainability beyond the grant was not evident.</p>		

Not all costs associated with the programs were thoroughly explored and cited. For example, to start a digital learning academy, training will be necessary. However, training costs were not listed in the budget associated with that reform. There was a cost for purchasing laptops for students; however, there was not a cost for maintaining and supporting the laptops. A server was one of the budget items, but costs for on-going technology support and infrastructure upgrades were not included. Based on this example, it is evident that not all necessary costs were not accounted for.

Long-term sustainability was not evident as other sources of funds and on-going funds were not mentioned.

F1 received a low-range score of 3 because the budget was not reasonable and sufficient to support the applicant's proposal.

<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
---	-----------	----------

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant did not present a high-quality plan for sustainability; activities, rationales, deliverables, timelines, and parties responsible were not included.

The applicant did not prove the the State and/or local government leaders would provide continued financial support. One of the rationales provided for needing the funding from this grant was to replace funds provided by the current Race to the Top funding. This diminished the credibility of the applicant to find sources of funding outside of Race to the Top monies to fund the project.

F2 received a score of 0 because sustainability was not evident. The applicant did not mention any other sources of funds to support the plan long term. The applicant did not provide a high-quality plan for seeking out other funds.

**Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant listed several community partnerships including Upper Valley Medical Center; however, not many details were provided about the partnerships.

The population-level desired results were vague, and based on how they are currently written, it will be difficult to ascertain if they have been reached. However, the applicant did provide strong goals of having community partnerships involved in the school. The applicant also described Public School Works that provided data to determine which programs were needed in the schools and provided training for staff.

There was also evidence that the community partnerships were working to improve the social, emotional and behavioral health of students in order to help them attend school more often and achieve at higher rates.

The competitive preference priority received a mid-range score of 6 because the applicant listed partnerships that were working in the district, and there was some evidence of the effectiveness of these programs. However, the applicant did not provide a plan to scale-up the work of the partnerships in the district or a direct connection between the support of these partnerships and their plan to personalize learning for students.

**Absolute Priority 1**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>	<b>Met/Not Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant did not provide one coherent and comprehensive vision to personalize student learning to accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning; expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps and increase the rate students graduate prepared for college or career. The applicant proposed five projects: Reform Through Technology, Career and College Readiness, Intervention, Student Engagement Platform, and Professional Development; however, these projects were not clearly linked together, nor was there evidence to support these projects' success in personalizing learning.

The applicant did not demonstrate a clear track record of success over the last four years, even with a current Race to the Top grant. There was not credible evidence to support the applicant's move toward personalized learning.

Through a transition to Common Core and a prior infusion of Race to the Top funds, the applicant has done some work to move students toward college and career-ready standards. This application does not sufficiently explain or prove that these five projects will be effective in personalizing the environment for students, or working toward the applicant's stated goals.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>85</b>
--------------	------------	-----------



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0293OH-3 for Piqua City School District

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>

**(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

In this section the applicant does not articulate a comprehensive and coherent reform vision or specific reference to college and career readiness, although the applicant describes in section (A)(3) an aspiration "to be a district that achieves the State of Ohio Excellent with Distinction on the state reported local report card", The applicant does describe activities in its strategic plan that are focused on structural aspects of the four core educational assurance areas. Examples of this includes:

- a. The official adoption of the Common Core and Ohio Academic standards in all content areas and grades levels, K-12 and research into PARCC and SMARTER Balance next generation assessments.
- b. Adoption of computer-based assessments and instructional interventions to monitor student progress and respond to gaps in student learning. The implementation of Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) assessments as a means to monitor student growth, establish a way to compare student outcomes against state and national results and to inform and improve instruction. The use of technology to support instruction, such as Yearly Progress Pro, Total Reader and NWEA's Des Cartes, to complement instruction and accelerate student learning to improve student outcomes. Using data from assessments and instructional outcomes to inform curriculum decisions (e.g.. the introduction of AP classes).
- c. A human resources process that describes recruitment, selection, induction and performance management practices. The investment in professional development to prepare teachers and leaders to sustain the implementation of the

Common Core Standards and use next generations assessments such as that offered by Northwest Evaluation Association.

d. The applicant states it does not have low achieving schools.

It is worthwhile to note that the applicant has described efforts to establish a culture of collaboration among administrators, teacher representative and the union representative by creating Collaborative Leadership Teams within each school to establish and monitor goals. This system of support is the basis for improvements to the Strategic Plan.

The applicant describes efforts to use technology based assessment and instructional support to inform and accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning and describes the use of two technology based platforms - EXPLORE and PLAN - that are used to assess student interests and establish a learning plan for each student. What is lacking is evidence of a plan to identify and respond to individual student academic interests.

**(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)**

**10**

**3**

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant plans a district-wide approach to implement its reform proposal and offered the following information:

- a. All students in all schools are planned for inclusion in the applicant's plan. The applicant will begin the implementation of the plan in 9 schools and in 2015 will open three new schools, close seven schools leaving 5 buildings in place.
- b. A list of all schools, both now and in the future, is included in this plan is provided.
- c. A total of 3700 students are the focus of the applicant's plan. Of these 2394 are identified as low-income, 3009 are identified as high need and at risk of failure or otherwise in need of special assistance and 187 educators will participate.

Information provided in the table indicates that a total of 3605 students will participate (a reporting difference of 95 students) and a total of 236 educators will participate (a reporting difference of 49 educators). Additionally, the applicant indicates that 3009 students (approximately 83%) of students are identified as high need and at risk. This is curious because the applicant report of the Ohio Achievement Assessment results in Section (A)(3) suggests that reading scores in Grades 3 - 10 exceeds 80% proficiency and math scores among students in Grade 3 - 10 exceeds 75% proficiency. Additionally, the table in section (A)(4) graduation rates indicates an overall graduation rate of 93.8% with the lowest rate being 84.6% for African American students.

While the applicant provided the data requested to complete this section, the data provided by the applicant in subsequent sections does not point to a prevailing need in specific schools among a large population of high need or at risk students. It is not clear which student populations, specifically, will benefit from the reform proposal.

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

**10**

**3**

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant describes district wide reform efforts spanning from 2004 - 2011. These efforts appear to serve as a foundation for ongoing efforts to improve student outcomes and achieve its aspiration and achieve the State of Ohio Excellent with Distinction ratings. The narrative describes the applicant's investment in many different activities; including K-12 curriculum mapping, pacing, alignment, short cycle assessments, data discussions, implementation of a data warehouse, STEM initiatives, implementation of Common Core standards, the introduction of NWEA formative assessments, the implementation of the Response to Intervention model and the use of Yearly Progress Pro, and placement of literacy coaches, to improve student outcomes. It appears from the narrative that these reforms efforts are currently in place in the existing nine schools; however, according to the applicant they have not been sufficient to achieve the applicant's goals.

The applicant's reform proposal is guided by the district's Strategic Plan. The Plan focuses on Academic Performance, Facilities, Staff, School and Community Relations and Finance. The strategies, as stated in this section of the applications include:

- Building the academic excecutions and foundation for students to the highest rating from the State of Ohio,

- Transition to the Common Core Standards in Science and Social Studies,
- Utilize data to drive instruction and monitor student levels of mastery and individual growth,
- Apply co-ownership strategies with classroom teachers and support staff to strengthen instructional opportunities that increase Value-Added results for students of all performance levels,
- Meet AYP progress for all students.

These strategies are in addition to the district's Race to the Top professional development plan and its four goals that are focused on new academic content standards, assessment practices aligned to the Common Core standards, Value-Added student reports and the alignment of teacher and principal evaluation systems to state and federal models.

The consolidation of schools is seen by the applicant as a strategy to narrow the district focus on student subgroup deficiencies. Additional activities are highlighted in the narrative, such as, the introduction of a home-school connection and development of student accounts, a comprehensive data system, in classroom flexible grouping, extended day, the employment of a graduation coach, a district digital learning academy, the introduction of the International Baccalaureate program, online learning skills, the use of technology to increase student engagement and finally, the implementation of the Academic Signing Day.

The applicant describes in great detail the curriculum and instructional activities that will be implemented; however, the theory of change to ensure adoption and impact on student outcomes is not described. It is not clear from the narrative how the reform proposal will be transitioned and translated into the newly consolidated schools. Nor is it clear which student subgroups, with the exception of a reference to Grades 4-8 Science, will be the focus of the applicant's reform plan; which activities will be matched to student groups, how each school will adopt the various elements of the plan, the details of the timeline, the key stakeholders and accountability. Specifically, it is not clear, given the past and notable improvements in academic achievement, the value of the reform agenda in a relatively high performing district.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

It appears from the narrative in previous sections that the applicant's past efforts to improve student outcomes have proven to be successful among the total student population. It also appears from the student data for each grade level and subgroup that there is an opportunity to improve the performance of different students subgroups in each grade level.

The applicant's vision springboards from previous efforts and introduces student assessment and data mining strategies and activities designed to provide instructional staff, parents and students with student growth data and insights into career interests that can be used to define personalized learning road maps. This strategy to isolate and respond to individual student needs has been shown to increase the likelihood of student success. The applicant did not provide information about the State of Ohio ESEA targets to use as a reference.

- The applicant has set a goal of 100% proficient in SY2016 - 17 for Reading and Math in Grades 3 - 10 for all subgroups. 100% proficient is certainly ambitious; however, it does not seem reasonable because it is not clear how the vision, the use of data and related strategies will meet the personalized learning needs of students with IEP's and Hispanic and African American students who appear to be underperforming other students and would need to make significant growth gains relative to other students.
- The applicant has not provided State data as a reference; therefore, the data provided does not have a context for analysis to determine the extent to whether the applicant has set an ambitious and reasonable goal to close the achievement gaps. It is noted that even without the reference to the State data the applicant's data does not demonstrate any appreciable change in the achievement gap between subgroups for grades 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 or 10
- The applicant's graduation rate goal is 100% for all students and student subgroups. Currently the overall SY2011-12 graduation rate is 92.6%. It should be noted that certain subgroups included in the previous two categories for proficiency and achievement gaps are not present in this data. These include student subgroups with IEP's and those that are Multiracial. The applicant's goal is ambitious; however, it is difficult to determine whether the goals are reasonable without the State data as a contextual reference and more explicit information from the applicant that describes

how individual students and student subgroups (academic and/or demographic) will benefit from the strategies detailed in the narrative.

d. The current college enrollment rate for SY2011-12 is 57%. The target goal is 75%. Currently students in the African American subgroup have a rate of 7%, economically disadvantaged students have a rate of 17%, students with disabilities at rate of 5% and White students a rate of 41%. The goals established for college enrollment while ambitious are unrealistic given the baseline data and the significant gains that would be necessary by students in every subgroup. This goal category appears to be that which there is the greatest need for improvement and for which the applicant has described specific strategies to address this goal area.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant describes a six year effort to introduce, implement and support many initiatives to improve organizational and staff capacity and to provide staff and students with resources to improve and impact student outcomes. It is stated in the narrative that in the 2011-2012 academic year the applicant earned 25 or 26 indicators on the local report card. This is an improvement from the 2004-2005 academic year when only 4 of 23 indicators were met.</p> <p>Although it appears that the applicant's efforts have resulted in improved outcomes, the absence of student data in this application, arrayed in graphs or charts or other evidence makes it impossible to determine the extent to which the applicant has a) demonstrated the ability to improve student learning outcomes and close achievement gaps, including raising student achievement, high school graduation rates and college enrollment and b) achieved ambitious and significant reforms in low performing schools.</p> <p>In contrast, the applicant does make student data available to students, educators and parents via the use of an on line grade reporting system called Progress Book to give parents daily updates about student progress in any give subject. Additionally, parents are invited to parent-teacher conference twice a year, invited as needed to RTI meetings and provided information after each round of formative assessments (NWEA reports) that are conducted three times a year.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
<p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>In its narrative the applicant describes the Certified Annual Financial Report (CAFRP) to provide the public with information about district revenues, spending and future projections. The CAFR contains salary information as part of the five year projections which is shared at monthly board meetings and the State of the Schools annual presentation. Additionally, the application describes the Board of Education Taxpayer Bill of Rights promising transparency, classroom focused spending and fiscal responsibility.</p> <p>The applicant does not provide the information requested - actual school level salaries for all school level instructional and support staff, actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only, teachers only, and non personnel expenditures at the school level.</p>		
<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p>		

The information provided in the narrative does not provide sufficient evidence that successful conditions and sufficient autonomy exists to implement the applicants plan for personalized learning environments. The narrative does describe State legislation in House Bill 153 mandating changes in teacher evaluation and the use of student growth metrics and inclusion of these data in teacher performance evaluations.

Ohio is a Race to the Top - State grantee and the applicant has made many references throughout the application about its involvement. It is not clear from the narrative the extent to which the conditions established in the Ohio Race to the Top supersede or support the opportunity to create successful conditions and allow sufficient autonomy to implement the applicants plan.

It is important to note that the letter from the Ohio Department of Education, signed by the Acting Superintendent of Public Schools and the Director, Office of Race to the Top contains this statement - "At this time, we decline to comment on your application." This statement brings into question State support for the applicants autonomy.

<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant describes a collaboration between the district and education association and also describes involvement by the leadership of the teachers association, student feedback, parents, business professionals and local citizens to define and write this grant application.

The narrative does not contain any information about overt actions to engage students, families, teachers and principals in participating schools specifically related to the development and refinement of the proposal. Aside from the required signature by the President of the Local Teacher's Union or Association there is no evidence of support from this organization, other than a statement in the application "the leadership of the teacher association has verbally agreed on the expectations of the professional staff laid out in this proposal." This is not sufficient evidence to ensure sustained support for the plan.

Letters of support from City of Piqua, Edison Community College and Piqua Chamber of Commerce are included in the Appendix of the application. The absence of letters of support from parents and parent organizations, student groups and other stakeholders who will be served by and impacted by the proposed plan leads this reviewer to conclude that the proposed plan is absent input from those who will be served and impacted by the plan and informed by those who've created the challenges this proposal is intended to resolve.

<b>(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
---	----------	----------

**(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant cites four sources from which to mine student data. These include NWEA (all content), Yearly Progress Pro (math), Total Reader (reading) and state provided data. The applicant also describes how the data is used to group students, engage student goal setting, inform parents of student progress as well as ensuring teacher responsibility for the student's academic plan.

Although the applicant provides specific information about the use of assessments to capture and use student academic data, there is no reference to the previously mentioned EXPLORE and PLAN assessments and how these data will shape the personalized learning environments to address individual student goals and needs; deepen learning experiences through individual and group tasks; and develop such skills and traits as goal setting, teamwork, critical thinking, communications, problem solving, etc.

Additionally, the applicant has not included and does not describe an analysis or plans for an analysis to identify the specific needs and gaps of the student population to inform district, school and classroom action.

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

	Available	Score

<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12</b>
------------------------------------	-----------	-----------

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant describes a plan to improve the academic achievement of all students through five component projects; Reform Through Technology, Career and College Readiness, Intervention, Student Engagement Platforms and Professional Development. Included in these projects are -

- The NWEA formative assessment aligned to the Common Core State Standards,
- The EXPLORE interest assessment to help students clarify goals to determine high school and potentially college course of study (8th graders),
- The PLAN assessment that includes an academic test and an assessment of study skills knowledge and an interest inventory,
- Guidance counselor developed program of study guide entitled Career Pathways,
- Partnership with Edison State Community College and Upper Valley Career Center,
- Flex credit options for students that demonstrate personal responsibility to participate in learning activities outside of the traditional classroom,
- Nova Net credit recovery program for students that have fallen behind and need to accelerate credit acquisition to graduate on time,
- Night school and summer school to help students earn needed credits,
- The Ohio Career Information System to provide students in Grades 8 -12 with information about occupational, post secondary education and financial aid information. The system also includes career exploration, interest assessments and an online Portfolio for the creation of an Individual Academic and Career Plan for each student,
- The College 101 course for freshman and sophomores to explore learning strategies, college choice, student's rights and responsibilities, time management, study skills, etc. Student who participate earn college credit from the local community college,
- Dual enrollment with Ohio Northern University
- A Digital Learning Academy
- 1:1 Technology
- SMALLab (Situating Multimedia Arts Learning Lab)

It is evident that the applicant makes available to students and parents many different options for college and career readiness and through its efforts touch upon the criterion in (a) and (b) of this section of the application. At first glance these appear to be sufficient; however, missing from the narrative is a detailed plan that includes the goals, strategies (specific to individual student and groups of students needs), processes, structures (curriculum offerings connected to individual interests) and meaningful metrics to ensure that students and parents in fact make use these resources and that these resources do indeed to create an individualized learning environment to impact student outcomes.

This reviewer makes this statement because there is a seeming disconnect between the overall graduation rate of 92.6%, the low college enrollment rate of 57% and limited emphasis and options for technical career readiness. In other words, there is no reference or acknowledgement of the aforementioned gap and strategic and/or targeted focus on the individualized learning needs of those who choose not to attend college and want to develop technical skills and go into the workforce. Based on the applicants goal to have a 75% graduation rate in 2016, if not addressed, this would seem to be an on-going and persistent challenge for students and parents.

Criterion (b)(v) references the need to accommodate high-needs students. The applicant has a goal of 100% proficiency and 100% graduation rate (in five years) among all student groups. Based on applicant achievement data students with IEP's, Hispanic, Black and White students are challenged to keep pace and have the greatest gap to close. To accomplish this goal requires that the applicant define and implement specific strategies to address the individualized learning needs and create individualized learning environments for these groups of students. The application does not provide this information.

In response to criterion (c) it is noted that reference is made in the narrative that students are partnered with a teacher to oversee their college and career plans. It is not clear from the narrative that there are mechanisms in place to train all students in the processes to track and manage their own learning.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>11</b>
--	-----------	-----------

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides information about many different efforts underway that support participating educators in their efforts to establish and ensure that personalized learning environments support student needs and interests. These include professional development to build capacity in the areas of State Common Core Standards and the Rigor/Relevance and Relationship model, teacher evaluation, technology in the classroom and collaboration.

It appears that the successful implementation of personalized learning environments in the applicants district schools and classrooms is based on the NWEA growth assessment as a means to identify student academic strengths and gaps, to inform instructional strategies and to engage students in setting personal goals for learning. Investments are being made in professional development to ensure that participating educators understand how to use the data and resources (Lexiles, Des Cartes) to accelerate student outcomes. The NWEA assessment is conducted by the district three times a year and provides insight to inform student progress towards achievement of college and career ready graduation requirements.

House Bill 153 that mandates the use of student growth data to inform teacher evaluations. The new teacher and principal evaluation system is currently being piloted based on agreements between the district and the local education association. The evaluation will include domains of performance determined by the State Department of Education; half of which will include a measurement of student growth (based on NWEA and Value Added data). If approved, the evaluation will be fully implemented beginning SY 2013-2014. No mention was made in the narrative of plans for a performance management process to use data from the evaluation for purposes of continuous improvement, including processes for on-going and frequent feedback and the aggregation of data to inform professional development as well as to adapt instructional practice.

Previous sections have provided information about the EXPLORE and PLAN assessments and their value to identify and reinforce student academic and career interests. There is no mention about plans to use the NWEA data to complement the EXPLORE and PLAN data to adapt content and instruction to meet the unique needs and interests of each student. It is mentioned in the narrative that the district uses a three tier system - a district wide model implemented in each school - to rank students based on their academic performance and to inform academic and/or behavioral prevention or intervention strategies. The mention of this model does not include an explanation about how educators will adapt their teaching to meet the unique student needs.

Additionally, there is no mention of efforts to assess and improve the school culture and climate. Although it is mentioned in the narrative that educators meet twice a year to set annual goals for each school and grade level. Each school provides common planning time for educators to share pedagogy, analyze data and plan for needed student interventions.

Teachers are provided with technology to introduce digital content into the classroom. The introduction of Discovery Education, a digital teaching and learning tool gives the participating educators the opportunity to use interactive lessons in the classroom and the student the opportunity to engage with technology to work independently or collaboratively with other students. The school board has also approved a policy, BYOT (Bring Your Own Technology) to encourage students to use their own technology to maximize and tailor their learning. Teachers are using other formats for collaboration and presentation of content such Google Docs, Edmodo, Glogster and other Web 2.0 tools.

Data provided in section (E)(3) suggests that only about 30% of students have a highly effective teacher or principal and only about 20% of students have an effective teacher or principal. The narrative indicates that a teacher must be highly qualified to be employed by the district. It is surprising that given the previous data no plan is mentioned to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals.

In conclusion, the applicant provides a general description of efforts to equip educators with the data, tools and resources needed to create and sustain personalized learning environments to respond to the needs of individual and groups of students. What is missing is evidence of a detailed and cohesive plan complete with goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties to ensure that every teacher and principal in every classroom is equipped to adapt content instruction to support personalized student learning.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant describes the following practices, policies, and rules that support the district's efforts to create and sustain personal learning environments —</p> <p>(a) The applicant's central office consisting of a Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, 2 Directors of Curriculum and Instruction, a Director of Student Services, a Business Coordinator and an Education Management Information Systems Coordinator provides support service to each school. In addition, each school has a Collaborative Leadership Team to provide building support and monitoring of progress to goals.</p> <p>b) There is no evidence that leadership teams in participating schools are given sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and noneducators and school budgets. It is stated in the narrative that all applicant school qualify for Title I funds and that efforts are made to ensure the equal distribution of resources in all buildings.</p> <p>(c) Students are given the opportunity to recover credits through the NOVA NET offering. There is no evidence that students have the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic; however, the applicant does indicate in the narrative that middle school students have the ability to earn high school credit in math and science through advanced learning classes. Dual enrollment classes are available in partnership with Ohio Northern University for student's with a 3.5 grade point average or above.</p> <p>(d) The applicant has invested in the NWEA growth assessment which is administered three times a year to give students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards. It is not evident from this application that there are other methods, such as performance based assessments, the use of portfolios or other assessment options that allow the student to demonstrate mastery of standards.</p> <p>(e) The applicant describes a Second Shift Program, taught by a licensed teacher and certified to assist students with learning disabilities. There is no mention of efforts to support the need so English Language Learners.</p> <p>The absence of sufficient autonomy and flexibility in decision making and other compelling strategies that allow a student to experience an individualized learning path based on mastery rather than seat time reduces the scoring of this section.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
<p><b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant has provided the following information to demonstrate LEA and school infrastructure support for personalized learning —</p> <p>(a) The applicant states that students, parents and educators have access to the district Curriculum Pow-Wow, a data base that offers information about standards, assessment data, curricular changes, pedagogical strategies</p>		

and district procedural updates. Additionally, each school offers a website to communicate pertinent information and news updates and the district offers a website to share information about Board Policy, community newsletters and general news. A Home-School portal is planned as part of the focus on the science curriculum to give student access to the Discovery Education at home. Via a student account students and parents will be able to gain access to curriculum information - students will be given technology to access the portal from home.

(b) The narrative does not include reference to levels of technical support other than providing home based technology to access the Discovery Education portal from home.

(c) There is no reference for plans to provide 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 (e.g., electronic tutors, tools that make recommendations for additional learning supports, or software that securely stores personal records); and

(d) The applicant describes an Education Management Information System (EMIS) that offers inter operable systems for human resources, student data and budget data.

The absence of additional strategies to provide technical support and the lack of information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open format contribute to the reduce rating.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant describes a continuous improvement process currently being used as part of their State Race to the Top Involvement. This process engages members of the community, school and district leadership to review progress to goals and opportunities for corrections and improvements. For purposes of the Race to the Top - District continuous improvement process, the applicant does not provide specific information about the steps that will be taken to monitor, measure and publicly share information on the quality of its investments in professional development, technology and staff to create personalized learning environments that ensure students are meeting college and career standards for graduation.</p> <p>To achieve this criterion it will be necessary for the applicant to improve the quality of its overall plan by being more specific about the goals for each aspect of the project, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant describes several strategies to communicate with its internal and external stakeholders. A combination of newsletters; a quarterly publication called Drum Beat and a student and parent newsletter called Backpack Express; informs stakeholders and parents. As well, each school publishes newsletters and offers information through its website.</p> <p>These communications strategies while important are not evidence of strategies to communicate and engage stakeholders with a vested interest in the applicant's project.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant has provided plans for required performance measures with the exception of -</p> <p>PreK - 3: One age appropriate non-cognitive indicator of growth.</p>		

Grade 4 - 8: One grade-appropriate academic leading indicator or successful implementation of its plan and one grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator of successful implementation of this plan.

Grade 9 -12: The number and percentage of participating students who complete and submit the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) form; one grade-appropriate leading indicator of successful implementation of the plan; and one grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator of the successful implementation of the plan.

It is not clear from the information provided to describe the performance measure whether the performance measure represents the percentage of students that achieve growth targets, the percentage of students that meet the national norm or the percentage of students on grade level based on the State Common Core Standards. Clarification of this performance measure is important to determine the success of the plan. The applicant does describe the rationale for using the NWEA assessment as the basis for its performance measures for K-10 Reading and Math and how it will use the data to inform progress and use the data to gage the need to make changes and improvements.

The performance measure indicators for most of the grade levels show 10% year over year growth increments and achieving 100% of the target. It is highly unlikely that all students in all subgroups will progress in this lock step manner and achieve targets within the grant period.

<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>
--	----------	----------

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**  
 The applicant has not provided information or referenced plans to evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities, such as professional development and activities that employ technology, and to more productively use time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results, through such strategies as improved use of technology, working with community partners, compensation reform, and modification of school schedules and structures (e.g., service delivery, school leadership teams and decision-making structures).

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>

**(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:**  
 The applicant’s budget, including the budget narrative reflect the following information or (lack of information) —

The applicant does not provide specific or detailed information about all funds that will support the project (e.g., Race to the Top – District grant; external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds).

The applicant's budget consists of five different projects. Each would require 100% Race To The Top - District funding. The absence of other sources of funding brings into question whether the budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant’s proposal; as well it appears that the applicant is seeking to replace the loss of Race to the Top State funds to sustain existing programs.

The applicant provides a detailed description of the investments and priorities, however, the applicant's budget does not include other funding sources and there is no delineation between 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.

The applicant does not describe a plan with strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments beyond the term of the grant. This could be problematic given that 53% of the budget is allocated to ongoing costs associated with the NWEA assessment (the backbone of the plan) and staff to support the implementation of programs.

<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
---	-----------	----------

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**  
 There is no reference made or details of a high-quality plan provided to that demonstrate the project can be sustained for three years beyond beyond the conclusion of the grant period.

**Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides information about the following -

The applicant describes many public-private partnerships to support the social, emotional and academic growth of students in the district. For example, the district has a joined efforts with Upper Valley Medical Center to open a community clinic in the kindergarten center to serve students and their families. The district has developed a "wrap around" program that involves Children's Services and other stakeholders to monitor the success of student support services to meet the "non-educational" needs of students.

Most notably, the applicant describes the engagement of business partnerships active in each of its schools to bridge the school to the community and the community to the school. Volunteers read with students, support one-on-one learning, provide extended learning and mentor students. Students are provided the opportunity to visit partner businesses to link their learning to real world circumstances.

Additionally, the district has secured a Ready Schools Grant and has established a strong connection between all community preschool programs to enhance communications and bridge transition processes, parent and student supports, early intervention and guidance with curricula. Finally, Parents as Teachers has a strong presence in the community to help parents and children learn the value of play, reading, basic math, and social skills.

The applicant has identified three population level desired results:

- Kindergarten: Educational Results - Kindergarten readiness
- High Need Students: Family and Community - Meet the basic needs of students so they may be successful in the classroom
- All Students: Educational, Family and Community - Community integration and college and career readiness

The applicant intends to use the NWEA assessment and Response to Intervention to track and monitor selected indicators that measure each result in the aggregate and at the student level for the participating students. The applicant will integrate the data into the district's Strategic Planning process and will make modifications, if necessary, to improve results for participating students, especially those in Kindergarten, high needs students and those needing support for college and career readiness. There is no mention in the narrative about scaling the model beyond its current scope.

Each of the public-private partnerships noted above in this section are designed to engage parents and families of participating students in decision making and determining and addressing student, family and school needs. The applicants identifies its annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population-level and describes desired results for students as evidenced in the performance measures established for the next four years.

While the applicant provides evidence of its existing public-private partnerships; the applicant's plan does not include staff capacity building or the introduction of tools and resources to assess the needs and assets of participating students and family and community supports; identification and inventory of the school and community needs and assets; or the creation of a decision making process and infrastructure to address the individual needs of students. The absence of this information contributes to the reduced score.

**Absolute Priority 1**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>	<b>Met/Not Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not offer a coherent and comprehensive high quality plan to build upon the core educational assurance areas. Although the applicant's plan does include many innovations and best practices - the most notable being the NWEA assessment, the EXPLORE and PLAN interest inventories, and the Discovery Education digital technology - absent are the specific goals, activities, timelines, and responsibilities necessary to bring a plan to fruition. Also absent was a clear pathway between the Strategic Plan and its translation into specific action at the school and in the classroom.

It was not clear that teachers have or will have the resources and tools to improve student outcomes, that educators and administrators have the autonomy to decide and act on what's best for students and that parents and the community have been engaged in the process. Also, it was never fully described just how educators would identify and meet the academic needs of each student, deepen student learning, expand student access to the most effective educators and decrease the achievement gaps across student groups.

Throughout the application this reviewer was puzzled by the paradox in the data - that is that the district has a relatively high graduation rate, relatively high proficiency among all grade (in the aggregate) and yet only about 60% of students go to college. The applicant gave no explanation for the gap between the graduation rates and college attendance. Nor did the applicant propose specific strategies for those students with IEP's, students who are Hispanic and those who are African American.

Additionally, the district is facing a significant consolidation of its schools in 2015. This is often a time of significant turmoil and change. The application did not acknowledge the significance of this event (except as an opportunity to have decidedly better focus on student needs) nor lay out an integration and change management plan.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>85</b>
--------------	------------	-----------