



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0486MO-1 for Raytown C-2 School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The vision described by Raytown applicants clearly articulates a credible approach to accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning, and increase equity through a personalized learning approach involving technology. Their vision incorporates investing in teacher and leader training, building technological infrastructure and increasing student access to technology and individualized learning opportunities. Some issues addressed and indicators are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) an acceleration of student achievement. <p>This is evidenced by their goals of 80% of students at participating schools being proficient by the end of the grant and overall graduation rates increasing to 95% or above. The means to achieve that comes by way of increasing teacher and leader training in multiple areas including curriculum, best practices and the use of data.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.) deepening of student learning <p>This is shown by their intent to create a culture of reflective practitioners that are able to evaluate the instructional environment and their own personal performance. Also, their reliance on the Common Core Standards and effective student assessments that require higher-level thinking will increase the rigor of what is taught and assessed and, therefore, deepen student learning.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3.) personalizing learning opportunities through the use of technology <p>By creating the infrastructure and providing training and equipment to personalize learning, Raytown plans to invest in ubiquitous student access to learning opportunities that are based on individual student interests.</p> <p>Raytown has a thoughtful plan to build on existing initiatives as they implement this Race to the Top model. Training that was started in the past few years will provide a foundation for the more comprehensive plan put forth by the Raytown district in this Race to the Top proposal.</p> <p>In seeking out endorsements from entities such as the teachers' association, the parent-teacher organization, and the University of Missouri at Kansas City School of Education, Raytown is ensuring there is strong communication between these various groups and support for implementation going forward. Support from local business partners and/or the community at large could have made this plan appear wider in scope. To make it a high-quality plan, Raytown specifically lists activities, timelines, persons responsible and deliverables.</p> <p>Because of the thoughtful plan to meet the goals of the RTT program, this proposal scores in the high range.</p>		

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Raytown applicants provided a clear outline of the process used to select schools to target with RTT funds, a list of schools that will be focused on and the demographic information on the total number of students being impacted.</p> <p>a.)Process</p> <p>The rationale for school selection was clearly articulated in the Raytown plan. Raytown sees the need for shifting the current delivery model of instruction used in their district to accommodate their increasingly challenging student population. The choice to focus on 8 lowest achieving and highest poverty schools will intensify the Raytown plan as it is implemented. Raytown's use of data to select schools for this initiative is evidence of the increasing culture of data-driven decision-making that is the new reality in this district.</p>		

b.)List

The list of 8 schools from their 19 instructional centers shows which ones Raytown wants to focus on.

c.)Demographics of Impacted Students

Raytown includes a chart that shows the demographics of the targeted population. All 8 schools meet grant requirements for eligibility. The list includes 5 elementary schools, 2 middle schools and one high school in the Raytown district.

Overall, this section deems a score in the high range. The plan is articulated clearly. The grant criteria have been addressed and the participating population is noted.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
---	----	---

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Indicators are as follows:

Meaningful reform:

Raytown's focus on whole school reform through expanding principals' expertise as well as teacher expertise, is evidence of the district leadership's understanding that all staff have talents to be developed and school leadership comes from everyone's involvement.

Scale up :

The plan states how the goals of the RTT initiative will be embedded in district policy as one means of scaling up their plan. Another is the enhanced district-wide data collection system as well as the changes in curriculum and accountability framework that will form a structure for Raytown to build on. Although generally stated, the applicant's response in this section does not specify which exact activities will be part of the scaling up process.

Reach goals:

Because of the thoughtful approach to decisions made in the Raytown district (i.e. weed out programs that were not effective, stay the course on other programs to give them time to take effect even though there may have been an initial drop in scores,etc.), this section earns in the middle range. The lack of specificity in planning and in providing detailed data supports this score.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	3
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Indicators are as follows:

Vision results in improved student learning

Because of the general nature of the description in this section, it is difficult to ascertain that there would be an improvement in student learning.

Increased equity

Because of the universal screeners and inclusion of all students in the assessment (i.e. screeners and monitoring) and support process (i.e. tiered intervention, community support, etc.), this plan would guarantee equitable services.

Ambitious, but achievable goals

- Summative assessments (proficiency and growth): The proficiency target of 7% increase over all is a lofty goal considering the history and uneven progress seen in the data provided.

- Decreasing achievement gaps: The increase in expectations for subgroups to 9% would mathematically close the gap, but seems an unrealistic goal for the populations described.

Another concern in this section is the trend of lower final expectations for ELL students than for IEP students (i.e. in 3rd grade Communication Arts the ELL target is 46.5% and IEP target is 57.9% in the 2015-16 school year; 3rd grade Math expectation target for ELL is 54.8% and IEP target is 64.4%) This may be an indication of the lack of supports built into the plan that

would specifically address the growing population of English Language Learners in the Raytown district.

- Graduation rates

Graduation information is provided. Goals are set at a 1.5% annual increase for all and all subgroups except the IEP category which has a 2% annual increase. These targets seem achievable, but are not ambitious considering the support system focused on high school in the plan.

- College enrollment

College enrollment targets are provided. The estimate of an annual increase of 5% overall seems realistic. The concerns are that the expectation for ELL students is set at 90% by the 2015-16 school year. Considering the note about ambitious yet achievable goals mentioned earlier (the lower MAP targets for ELL students in various subject matter and at different grade levels), it is difficult to guess why the district would expect 91% to be enrolled in college - the highest subgroup expectation.

Overall, because of the lack of specificity in the analysis and the details provided in this section, it scores in the low range.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	6
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Indicators are as follows:</p> <p>1. clear record of success in the past four years</p> <p>As indicated on the 2012 District Report of APR, Raytown has made consistent growth in only one area: 3-5gr. math. The other content areas and grade levels areas are uneven and do not show a stable positive trend.</p> <p>2. improve student learning outcomes</p> <p>Although there have been pockets of success for the Raytown district (i.e. higher scores in 2012 from 2011 in 4 of the 6 measured areas), the lack of a consistent positive trend is a wide-ranging and deep concern.</p> <p>3. close achievement gaps</p> <p>Again, although there are some things to celebrate such as data showing improvement in closing achievement gaps (i.e. minority students improved more than state majority in 4 out of 6 areas), there remain areas that show an increasing gap(i.e. minority students in 6-8th grade communication arts had an increasing gap as did those in Algebra I). The consistency in the information is difficult to interpret since there does not seem to be a pattern in closing gaps as students progress through the Raytown system. This may be due to the growing population that the district serves and/or the concerted awareness and efforts to close subgroup gaps in the past.</p> <p>4. Achieve ambitious and significant reforms</p> <p>There is evidence that Raytown is striving to achieve reforms. The reconstitution of the 2 lowest performing schools and a consistent approach to behavior management through the Positive Behavior Support initiative district wide are two examples of the steps taken to improve schools.</p> <p>5. Make student performance data available to all</p> <p>Through the PowerSchool software, all involved stakeholders have access to posted data. The addition of the new School Information Data Warehouse will enhance the capabilities and offer more frequent and more detailed information to students, parents, teachers, and leaders.</p> <p>Overall, because of the lack of specificity in the analysis and the details provided in this section, it scores in the middle range.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

Indicators are as follows:

A high level of transparency

- Processes

Raytown administration follows the required processes outlined by the Federal government by using the F-33 survey information from the U.S.Census Bureau. Also, an Annual Secretary to the Board Report required by the state of Missouri is produced on a yearly basis.

- Practices

Raytown administration makes sure that

- the district website holds a link to all personnel salaries at the school level as well as those of instructional staff and support staff.

- information about the non-personnel expenditures are available by request through the district office in the Annual Secretary to the Board Report

- the new information system will have an easy-to-read dashboard format that allows for immediate analysis and response.

It is admirable that the Raytown district provides salary information on the district website so that all stakeholders have access to that 24/7.

At this point in time, the non-personnel information is not maintained on the district website and that adds a layer of non-accessibility to anyone who would be interested in reviewing it. This will be addressed with the new information technology system that Raytown is planning to install.

One concern is that there was no mention of parents of English language learners and the need to have documents in multiple languages.

-Investments

- a.) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff

- d.) Actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level

Overall, by providing the required information to stakeholders, there is a sense that Raytown has some transparency and is looking to make district information more transparent. Besides the concern of translation of documents that would meet the needs of some district families, Raytown has the minimum information in place, but not expanding beyond into multiple media and other opportunities to communicate with district stakeholders. Because of those factors, this section scores in the low end of the middle range.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	9
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Indicators are as follows:

State Context for Implementation

-Successful conditions: The Raytown District generally has freedom to implement initiatives that fall within the framework of the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and the Missouri School Board Association. There is no competing impediments for Raytown to consider as it goes forward with its plan. The local school board has established 5 goals:

1. High student performance
2. Retain high performing instructional staff

3. Ensure the safety of the school community

4. Maintain high levels of parent involvement

These are in line with the goals of the RTT proposal - especially the first goal of ensuring high student performance.

- Sufficient autonomy: The Raytown Superintendent of Schools has complete autonomy to implement curriculum and set performance expectation for employees and students. He does so within the parameters of the local board of education's guidance and support. Raytown's history is that the superintendent or his designees propose plans to the board based on data. If the board is convinced there is a need, they will support the proposal with funds while noting goals to be met that are attached to the funding. Periodic review of programs includes bringing data to the board to show progress.

Overall, because of the alignment of the Raytown School Board goals with the vision Raytown has set forth in this proposal, this section receives a score in the high range. More specificity in this section would have earned a top score.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Indicators are as follows:

Stakeholder Engagement and Support

- Meaningful stakeholder engagement and support

The letters of support for the Raytown plan are exemplary in their detail and heartfelt desire to help this succeed. The letter from the teachers' organization is especially important as the plan was developed through discussions with them and then revised based on feedback. Also, the support of the staff in the schools who will be implementing most of the plan was overwhelming. To have 85% participation in the survey and then a 98% approval is extraordinary.

Although it was definitely clear that the teachers were involved in the development of the plan, it is less clear that the families, students, and principals were involved.

Overall, because of the meaningful engagement and support of the teachers in the district balanced with the absence of evidence that families, students and principals were involved in the development of the plan, this score falls in the middle range.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Indicators are as follows:

Analysis of Needs and Gaps

- Current Status - Not specifically described
- Logic in analysis of needs and gaps - Not specifically noted
- Identified needs and gaps - Generally addressed through the objectives and activities Raytown plans.

Because of the global nature of the Raytown proposal and the lack of specific analysis of needs and gaps in their school system, this section scores in the low range.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	8
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Indicators are as follows:</p> <p>Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Engages and empowers learners in age-appropriate manner - Although addressed for middle and high school to some degree, there is no mention of the elementary schools that will be participating in this grant. - Understand what they are learning is key to their success - Missouri Connections, ACT Explore, ACT Plan and ACT - Identify and pursue learning and development goals - Personal Plan of Study in the middle school -Deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest - job shadowing, work experience and internships -Exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives - not specifically addressed for students - Master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development - course selection - Variety of high-quality instruction - data review teams, pilot professional learning community, online professional community through e-Source -High-quality content - expose students to real world problems and skills through personalized planning of courses and through the use of technology -Ongoing and regular feedback - review plan twice a year, Moodle as mechanism for teacher and peer feedback -Frequently updated individual student data - use of new technology system -Personalized learning recommendations - Moodle -High-quality strategies for high-need students - Not addressed -Training for students to track their progress - Not specifically addressed <p>Overall, this section has some indicators learning is improving at the Raytown Schools, but it is lacking in several important ways: specific details of how personalized learning will transpire besides the general notion of students choosing courses that lead to a chosen career, how students in the high-needs category will specifically gain support in learning through this general plan, what the specific vision is for elementary students with this plan, etc.</p> <p>Because of the issues mentioned above, this section scores in the middle range.</p>		

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	18
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Indicators are as follows:</p> <p>Teaching and Leading</p> <p>Participating educators engage in training, and in professional teams or communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Support personalized learning environments: Did not specifically address personalized learning for students (ii) Adapt content and instruction, providing opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests: Did not specifically address ways students would be engaged in tasks according to their needs and interests 		

(iii) Frequently measure student progress and use data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators - Through the implementation of Data Teams, the Raytown plan exemplifies a powerful model of educators improving collective and individual practice by analyzing authentic student artifacts. Because these teacher teams meet frequently and share best practice in teaching, this format accelerates student learning and the effective instruction.

(iv) Improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback: Raytown has described multiple ways tha teachers and principals reflect on effective practice through feedback (i.e. walkthroughs, Data Teams, portfolios, and the district and state evaluation instruments).

(b) Use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress: Raytown is using multiple formats to analyze and accelerate student progress (i.e.Data Team process, walkthroughs, literacy coaches, principals who are instructional leaders, the technology system of collecting information, etc.)

(i) Respond to individual student academic needs and interests: The Raytown plan describes students using personal tech devices, but does not expand or go into direct detail on how individual needs and interests are addressed specifically.

(ii) High-quality learning resources:Through the purchase of personalized learning tools, students will have access to new and better learning resources

(iii) Processes and tools to match student needs and feedback about effectiveness: The Data Teams, walkthroughs, portfolios, and the evaluation tool are all representative of the multiple ways Raytown monitors and gives feedback on educator effectiveness.

(c) Training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and accelerates student progress through common and individual tasks: Raytown has multiple policies, practices, and plans for training and personnel to structure an effective learning environment

(i) Improve, individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate, for the purpose of continuous school improvement: The Data Team model used in the Raytown district is one powerful means of supporting continuous school improvement.

The change in culture as teachers support each other's practice is one main benefit of this approach.

(ii) Training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress: By having district personnel trained as Data Team trainers, Raytown has embedded one system of cotinuous school improvement. Another is the use of literacy coaches that provide building based staff development. There is also a plan for providing technology training through a district staff member.

(d) Plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals.

By partnering with University of Missouri at Kansas City, the district is enhancing the number of teachers for English Language Leaners. Because this is a growing segment of Raytown's population, it is an important piece of their ability to provide highly effective teachers. Through the ongoing and embedded district staff development coupled with the multiple evaluation tools, Raytown is poised to continue to develop effective teachers and principals.

Overall, because of the embedded staff development and evaluation tools reviewed in concert with district staff as well as the collaborative approach to instruction and leadership in Raytown, this section earns a score in the high range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	5

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Organizing the central office: Not addressed specifically. Only in terms of the superintendent and his leadership team

Flexibility and autonomy of school leadership teams: The Raytown plan shows that the school leadership teams will meet with

the district administrators to plan the details of the course of action to be taken.

Ability of students to demonstrate mastery: This is very minimally addressed by saying that students can "test out" of courses. It is not clear how this issue would be addressed in the 5 elementary schools that are in this grant.

Students have multiple times and multiple ways to demonstrate mastery: Although there is some plan to restructure the grading system in Raytown, this is described in a vague reference to the philosophy behind standards-based grading where students have multiple chances and multiple ways to show mastery.

Resources that are adaptable and accessible: Raytown's plan includes the use of personal learning devices that can be used 24/7. This section does not address specifically how even those would impact students with special needs and English Language Learners.

Overall, this section scores in the low range because of the general approach to the responses and the lack of describing how the elementary students are impacted by all of the district's changes. They represent 5 of the 8 schools in the Raytown plan.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	4
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Indicators are as follows:

1.) access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school - Although the network of technology is globally accounted for, there is no specific timeline or commitment described that ensures the resources will be made available to students and families that do not currently have that kind of technology access now.

2.) appropriate levels of technical support, which may be provided through a range of strategies (e.g., peer support, online support, or local support)

3.) open data format - The Raytown plan describes in detail what the merging of systems will be and how the data will be accessible on multiple levels in a user-friendly format. They have also addressed the security systems and policies that will protect the students and the students' information.

4.) interoperable data systems - Through thoughtful technical planning, the data systems will be able to interface with other data bases to create a meaningful and complete picture of what is happening in the Raytown schools.

Overall, there is a lack of specificity in the potential funding and shortcomings of a huge project like the Raytown plan as far as the infusion of technology goes. Also, besides the technology support, the Raytown plan did not address in detail the human level of support for students and families as this shift in educational delivery occurs. However, the district technology department seems to have an idea on how all the multiple systems and multiple sources would merge. Because of the foundational knowledge of the department described in the plan, this scores on the low end of the middle range.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Indicators are as follows:

1.) timely and regular feedback and opportunities to change - The evaluation system described in the Raytown application is extensive and allows for continuous improvement through an ongoing loop. (i.e. evaluation and recommendations for change)

2.) how to publicly share information - Although the evaluation system is described, there is no information about how the changes found would be publicly shared. This is a key piece to the whole process.

Because of the comprehensive evaluation system used by Raytown to review success of district initiatives including a grant like RTT, this score falls in the high end of the middle range. As mentioned before, the proposal is lacking the feedback to stakeholders which is a key element in continuous improvement.

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

5

3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Indicators are as follows:

Communication and engagement strategies for

internal stakeholders: Some communication with internal stakeholders quarterly.

external stakeholders: Minimal communication with external stakeholders. The ongoing communication plan described does not seem to be inclusive enough or often enough to keep all external stakeholders engaged in the district's progress.

Because of the factors mentioned above, the score for this section is in the middle range.

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

5

4

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Indicators are as follows:

Performance Measures

1.) Twelve to 14 ambitious yet achievable performance measures overall and by subgroup

a.) rationale for selection - Raytown gave a logical rationale for the selection of each of the 12 measures selected.

b.) how the measures provide rigorous and timely formative information tailored to the proposed plan - As the measures assess multiple aspects of the district performance (reading and math, attendance, behavior, graduation rates), some measures are not as timely as others. Because data on MAP testing and graduation are gathered annually, those would not give timely feedback, but are valuable just the same. The substitute STAR testing may not be as rigorous as MAP testing, but does give timely feedback. At the K-2 level, there seems to be a mix of assessments that are not all yielding rigorous information and/or not necessarily age-appropriate for younger students as assessments are given in computer-based whole group formats. (i.e.Aimsweb)

c.) how it will review and improve the measure over time is sufficient. The review process described by the proposal is thoughtful and realistic.

Because of the comprehensive nature of the plan to select and review district performance measures, this section earns a high score.

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

5

3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Although the plan to evaluate the effectiveness of RTT investments touches on the personnel structure, salary schedule and informal data gathering aspects of the RTT investments, there are many other aspects of the original plan that are not addressed (i.e. the huge investment in technological infrastructure itself, the impact of the human investments made by way of additional trainers, school leadership teams, etc.)

Because of the balance in the issues addressed in the effectiveness of investment plan and the comments mentioned above, this score is in the middle range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Indicators are as follows:</p> <p>Identifies all funds -Funds of support are clearly identified.</p> <p>Is reasonable and sufficient -The amounts listed in the budget seem reasonable and sufficient.</p> <p>Thoughtful rationale for investments - The rationale for investments is well planned and would support the vision of the Raytown district.</p> <p>Total revenue from these sources - Total revenue from other sources is provided.</p> <p>One-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operation to sustain personalized learning - There is a description of one-time investments versus those that will require ongoing funds. There is a concern that the Raytown plan relies heavily on the partnership with Google that has not yet been established. Also, there is a concern that there will be adequate funds from local businesses to maintain the ongoing costs for student devices.</p> <p>Overall, there is a budget plan in place to support the vision of the Raytown School District. Because of the determination of district leaders to make this vision a reality, there is a commitment to using district and federal funds to support this plan over the long term. The concerns mentioned above about the undeveloped partnership with Google and local businesses make this section score in the middle range.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	7
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>High quality plan for policy and infrastructure (See F1 comments)</p> <p>Sustainability -Although there are some funds to provide sustainability for this plan over the long term, without firm partnerships and commitments from Google and local businesses that will play an important part in this plan being viable and sustainable for the future, it is hard to say that the vision will be realized as originally described.</p> <p>Support from state and local government leaders - There is some evidence of support from local leaders such as the mayor also letters from the state including one that provided points to make the Raytown application stronger. This indicates that the state department of education is very supportive of Raytown's application and ultimately their successful fulfillment of their vision.</p> <p>Financial support from state and local government leaders - Although a specific financial commitment from local leaders is not evident, there is a state commitment to reimburse the Raytown indirect costs.</p> <p>Overall, Raytown provided exemplary documentation of their budgeting process and plan. Their thorough explanation and detailed description lend credence to the vision they had put forth. Because of concerns about sustainability, this section receives a score in the middle range.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	4
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Indicators are as follows:</p> <p>coherent and sustainable partnership: There is some indication of a partnership with the local community, but not enough specifics to determine exactly who would be responsible and what the level of commitment really is. The fact that this plan hinges on community internet access to be successful leaves some question about the fact that these partnerships are still in the early stages or not yet developed. Besides the partnership with the business community and community at large for the infrastructure needs, there is an outreach to the community by way of the Raytown Community Awareness Program they plan</p>		

to implement that would highlight the benefits of the initiative and promote good will in the community toward the schools. This is one step in building some kind of informal partnership at the community level.

population-level desired results: The Raytown plan describes their desired results in qualitative terms (i.e. increase student engagement, increase student leadership, etc.) and concludes that those factors will lead to improved attendance and achievement.

Track the selected indicators: There is a mention of tracking attendance and achievement data to measure success. However, in this section, there is not a specific mention of the partnership being involved or important.

Use the data to target its resources: Although there is a description of Raytown using the data to measure success of the program and identifying students in need through that, there is no concrete involvement of any outside partnership in any of this.

a strategy to scale the model: There is a strategy to scale up the model. Since so much of the cost is front-loaded in building the infrastructure during the early years of implementation, it will be viable to expand that to other schools. Again, there is no concrete description of the community partners being committed to this.

Improve results over time: There is an expectation that attendance and achievement will improve over time, but no involvement with community partners in this.

integrate education and other services: Through the technology infrastructure piece of the plan, there is an integration of education and outside services. There is no evidence in this section that the Raytown plan would address the social -emotional needs of the targeted students.

build the capacity of staff: Raytown is truly dedicated to building the capacity of its staff and is one of the areas where they have seen some success in the past few years. There is no indication that the community partnership is involved in this aspect.

Assess the needs and assets of participating students: Thorough the assessment system in Raytown, there is a way to determine needs of participating students. Again, there is no involvement of a community partner for this.

Identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community: There is a general statement, but no specific person accountable or survey tool to do this in the community.

Create a decision-making process and infrastructure: Not addressed specifically.

Engage parents and families of participating students: The community awareness program described in the Raytown plan would help familiarize parents and families, as well as the community at large, with the benefits of the Raytown RTT initiative.

Routinely assess the applicant's progress: The multiple benchmarking tools that Raytown identified earlier in the application would be used to note progress on a regular basis. There is no indication that any partnership is part of this process.

Identify its annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population-level and describe desired results for students: Earlier in the application, the details of performance measures were outlined. The general statements about students "increasing achievement and attendance" and "increasing student social skills through global learning environments" are qualitative in nature. Although the targets were described in an earlier section of the application for achievement and attendance, it will be more difficult for Raytown to provide evidence to stakeholders that this initiative is increasing student social skills because of the global learning environments they will have access to.

Overall, because of the lack solid evidence of a firm partnership relationship, it is difficult to say that this project will develop as planned. This section receives a score in the low middle range.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Although Raytown's vision represents a new way to teach and learn in schools by addressing ways to personalize learning for students and staff, there is not the level of specificity or commitment described in the application to justify that it meets the requirements. Their dedication to staff development for both principals and teachers is extraordinary. Also, it is obvious that

they have a very comprehensive budgeting and evaluation process in place in their district. Another area that stands out is the extensive knowledge their technology staff has in providing the hardware and software to bring new 21st century applications into their schools. However, the lack of specifics on how to deepen student learning and on the dedication of partnerships to assure students are ready for college and careers through Raytown's personal learning plan is the weakness in this proposal.

Total	210	126
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0486MO-2 for Raytown C-2 School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant's vision is comprehensive, coherent, and ambitious focusing on a few specific goals that, if attained, will create a reform model that is achievable. The district has been engaged in intensive work in the four core educational assurance areas since 2009. This vision builds on that work.		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (a) Very specific criteria were used to identify participating schools, students, and educators: 1) lowest achieving elementary schools, 2) high level of poverty among students, and 3) significant number of students needing specific interventions to facilitate graduation. (2) A list of the 8 schools is included. (3) The number of participating students from low income families, who are high need, and participating educators is included.		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	0
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: The narrative did not include information about how the reform proposal will be scaled up or translated into district-wide change.		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	10
(A)(4) Reviewer Comments: (a) The applicant's vision is convincing and demonstrates extensive performance, behavioral, and summative data review to determine student's needs. (b) The vision provides strong interventions to attack and decrease achievement gaps. (c) Students' identification of career goals and the proposals plans for student and family support throughout the time until graduation should increase graduation rates.		

(d) The completion of a FAFSA by every student will encourage college enrollment. This is a major hurdle for low-income and ELL families.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	15
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (a) A record of success has been shown through student achievement data for subgroups. Incremental improvement has been made in all areas. (b) The reconstituting of the lowest performing schools has shown ambitious and significant reform in the lowest-achieving schools. Data is being collected to show behavioral changes, as well as academic achievement. (c) Student performance data is shared quarterly at Board meetings and individually with parents and students to improve participation, instruction, and services.		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: Salaries are available on the District's website. The District plans to have a more robust data warehouse and information dissemination in place by January of 2013. Expenditures beyond salaries are not available at the building level.		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: There are conditions under State legal, statutory and regulatory requirements to implement the proposal set forth.		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	6
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments: (a) It appears students and families were not engaged nor given an opportunity for feedback on the proposal. Teachers supported the proposal with 85% voting and 98% of those highly supportive of the proposal. (b) Letters of support have been included.		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5
(B)(5) Reviewer Comments: A thorough, thoughtful, evidence-based plan has been set forth based on identified needs and gaps using student data.		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	18
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: Learning (a) The applicant's proposal is ambitious yet justified based on the participating student's academic and career and college ready data. Students will fully understand career goals based on their own planning with parent and educator involvement. In addition, they will plan a course of study to provide them with the skills necessary to attain their goals. The only area lacking from the subgoals listed under (a) is exposure to diverse cultures.		

(b) All areas included under the (b) criteria have been addressed and achievable. The plan is convincing in its overarching insistence on students' being involved at every step of their educational process and then provides the student with the resources and tools necessary to attain their goals. Continuous feedback keeps the student motivated because they can see how they are moving along a continuum toward successful acquisition of their goals.

(c) Mechanism are in place to provide initial and on-going training both for the educators involved in this reform effort and the students so they can keep track of and manage their learning.

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

20

20

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant requires high quality teachers to provide rigorous instruction every day in every classroom. Extensive teacher evaluation and improvement plans are in place to justify educators' professional learning specific to their individual needs. The plan for training and over site of the educators in the participating schools where the participating students are enrolled should be supportive to the students as they create and move toward their individualized learning plan.

The applicant has a rigorous plan for increasing the number of students who are taught by highly qualified educators including collaboration with higher ed to train highly effective teachers..

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
(a) Support and services are, and will continue to be, provided to support participating schools.		
(b) Autonomy to school leadership teams will be given in the areas of schedules, curriculum deliver, calendars and other decisions based on data. Budget decisions will be made at central office.		
(c & d) Planning is taking place to allow students opportunities to demonstrate proficiency beyond seat time and in multiple times and ways.		
(e) Learning resources are being assigned based on student needs as determined by student achievement data.		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	3
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
The applicant has identified challenges to making access outside of the school walls a reality. Collaborations are/will be forged to deal with these challenges. This is probably the weakest area of the plan. It does not meet the definition of a high quality plan.		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
A rigorous, multi-step process is in place to monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments of every program at Raytown.		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
Information is available through the district's website. It is not clear if this is accessible by all internal and external stakeholders, especially those from low-income families and those with limited English proficiency. A Superintendent's		

Citizen's Advisory Council meets quarterly where communication about school programs and their efficacy are discussed.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The narrative provided by the applicant was very explicit and thorough in its explanation of: a) its rationale for selecting each measure based on data; (b) how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative information to the teams, and (c) how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gage implementation progress. Definitely meets the definition of a high-quality plan.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant explained the major changes in the compensation structure of employees at Raytown. Specific plans to evaluate the effectiveness of the RTTD funded activities has been explained in multiple sections throughout the application. Those plans are feasible, justified, and should provide exhaustive data for decision making.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6
---	----	---

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- (a) Identification of funds beyond the grant funds to support the project is vague.
- (b) The budget is reasonable. The amount requested for equipment may be insufficient.
- (c) There is a complete, thoughtful rationale presented for investments and priorities. Ongoing operational costs were presented and a thoughtful design for sustainability was provided.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	9
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

There is a plan for sustainability that is very specific as to continuation of project goals and their impact on improving student achievement and career ready skills.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	9
---	----	---

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

As discussed throughout the sections. The reviewer was impressed with the tightness of the plan and the flexibility if the plan is not working to put adjustments in place. A high-quality plan with ambitious yet achievable goals has been set forth. The number of goals are limited in such a way as to allow Raytown to focus their attention and monitor their success on achievement of the deliverables. Points were deducted because there were a limited number of letters of support provided.

Absolute Priority 1

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

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

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Raytown has created an ambitious and achievable plan to create Personal Plans of Study for each student based on data. In addition specific supports have been planned to provide wrap around services to struggling students and families. The completion and submission of FAFSA will provide parents and students who never believed college was possible with some very specific ideas about possibilities and planning for college and beyond.

The district has reconstituted schools in an effort to make the most effective teachers available to the most needy students. In addition there has been, and the proposal sets forth, very targeted teacher and administrator training to prepare the educators to use data, strengthen curriculum and its delivery while using technology effectively for delivery of the curriculum and for data collection.

The district began reform in 2008 and is seeking a RTTD grant to further strengthen their efforts in the areas of teacher and administrator training, technology infrastructure and maintenance, creation of even more rigorous curriculum, and personal learning environments built around differentiated instruction that permeates the school and follows the student home for any time, any place learning through personal technology devices.

Total	210	171
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0486MO-3 for Raytown C-2 School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant articulated a clear, comprehensive, and coherent vision for instituting educational reform, personalizing learning, and increasing student achievement. The vision directly builds upon the work already taking place to address the majority of the four core educational assurance areas as outlined in this competition.

- The applicant addressed the adoption of CCSS, but also referenced how part of the district's vision is to build a rigorous curriculum around them.
- The application discusses data multiple times, but did not communicate a comprehensive plan on building data systems as part of the district vision.
- There was direct mention of recruitment of highly qualified staff, particularly in the area of supporting teachers as they work to implement and adjust to teaching with technology.
- The district has demonstrated the ability and willingness to take significant measures to turn-around low achieving schools. The vision as articulated aligns with the same principles used in the philosophy that led to the reconstituting of two schools in the district over the past four years.

The vision outlines three credible areas of focus with several sub-goals that if enacted would accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning, and personalize the learning experience.

- The areas of focus include: comprehensive staff training programs, creating a technology infrastructure to support student learning, and increasing student access to technology.

The application provided examples of how the district plans to increase equity for all students, but did not provide a comprehensive plan.

- The plan directly addresses creating a better system for high need students through improving access to technology and improving the curriculum and instruction students receive.
- No direct mention occurred regarding the creation of curricula grounded in student academic interests and/or significant practices of differentiation.

Overall, this criterion scores in the low end of the high category. While some areas were not specifically addressed, or could have been discussed more comprehensively, the overall vision and adherence to three of the four educational assurance was strong and provided support indicating that if enacted it could significantly impact student achievement.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided a thorough explanation of how schools participating in grant activities were selected, inclusive of detailing the selection criteria used.

The schools that will be participating in grant activities meet the requirements set forth for this competition.

The schools participating in the grant were listed and the requested information was provided in the data chart embedded within the application.

The applicant failed to provide totals on chart (A)(2) for any category, with the exception of identifying the percentage of the total LEA or consortium low-income population.

Overall, this criterion scored in the low end of high. All requested information was provided thoroughly with the exception of the applicant totaling the numbers provided in chart (A)(2).

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	1
---	----	---

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not provide a high quality plan discussing how meaningful reform would extend beyond the schools participating in the grant process.

- The applicant outlined the systems set in place currently that have led to moderate success over the past four years.
- The district, however, did not provide many aspects of what is considered a high quality plan.
 - The narrative did not produce a timeline, specific activities that would take place, deliverables that would come from such activities, firm goals, or people responsible for ensuring the aforementioned take place.

The applicant did focus on continued gains in student achievement focusing on the belief that their current plan of focusing on teaching and curricular improvement would continue to bring about positive results.

Overall, this section rates in the low end of the low section. The applicant failed to address the vast majority of components in this criterion and did not provide ample support to show that there is a cogent plan on how to extend the work done under the RTT grant for the benefit of schools within their district not directly participating.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	9
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The goals set forth by the applicant are ambitious, achievable, and focus on increasing the educational equity within the district while improving achievement for all.

- The goals as presented deal directly with student achievement and in all cases establish an ambitious plan to close the achievement gap for each subgroup listed. Subgroups listed include: Hispanic, Black, IEP, LEP/ELL, White, and Free/Reduced.
- There was no direct mention in the narrative or charts of meeting ESEA requirements. Given the state of the current scores, however, that may not have been an achievable goal if it were set forth.
- The data presented, analyzed, and goals set forth as a result are from statewide, grade-level summative assessments, graduation rates and college enrollment
- It should be noted that in terms of college enrollment, the achievement gap between black and white students is currently inversed.

Overall, this criterion scores in the high range. The applicant addressed all subgroups as presented in this application and completed a thorough data analysis resulting in very ambitious goals moving forward focused on increasing equity and student achievement for all.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	13

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided evidence of longitudinal success in a variety of areas of schooling through the narrative and the additional documentation provided in the Appendix.

- The district has demonstrated success over the past four years as a result of significant reform.
 - Overall elementary achievement has increased over the past four years
 - District minority students have shown greater growth in four of six measures as compared to the rest of the state majority students
 - The data provided indicates mixed success in closing the achievement gap within the district. Growth is evident, but success in closing the achievement gap is sporadic and not uniform throughout the district as evidenced by materials provided in the Appendix and chart (A)(4).
 - Student enrollment in career education courses rose as well as the graduation rate in the past two years. The applicant also discussed college placement data, but was unable to communicate positive changes in that data at this point.

The district has undertaken ambitious and significant reforms over the past four years, concentrating on those schools with a history of low achievement.

The narrative explains how data has been progressively made more available to stakeholders and discussed plans moving forward to continue to increase accessibility.

- The applicant discussed the use of PowerSchool for grade communication and the extension of a data warehouse in the coming years.

Overall, this criterion rates in the low end of the high category. The district has witnessed a relative level of success in closing the achievement gap and improving overall student achievement. In addition, the district has demonstrated a commitment to reform through the actions taken to reconstitute two schools over the past four years.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district reports that they are in firm compliance with U.S. Census Bureau's F-33 survey and that a link to all personnel salaries is available from the school website. The applicant, however, did not provide a screen shot to support this explanation. The applicant did provide the BOE policy dictating that this precise practice.

The applicant also noted that they are currently unable to make public school expenditures through their normal reporting system. The applicant did not that the plan is have this available through the data warehousing system by January 2013 and that it is reported in an open manner to the BOE on a quarterly basis.

The candidate will score in the high area for this criterion. The applicant provided sufficient evidence to support their narrative indicating how they met the components of this criterion.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided clear evidence that they have sufficient autonomy under state law to implement their reform plan as proposed throughout their RTT application.

- The applicant provided specific language from state code to support their narrative as to why they had sufficient autonomy.
- The application also discussed the role of the local BOE and their support for the plan as it in place.

The applicant will receive full points for this criterion as they have sufficiently addressed each component of the criterion.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The narrative for this criterion thoroughly explains how stakeholders were communicated with in the formation of the plan, however there was no mention of how families, teachers, principals were engaged in the development of the plan.

The applicant's district does not have a collective bargaining unit so they needed to receive approval from 70 percent of the teaching staff.

- The applicant only surveyed those teachers that would be directly impacted by receipt of the grant.
- The survey had an 85 percent return rate with a 98 percent approval rate. This equals more than 70 percent of the teachers in the building impacted.

The applicant had letters of support from many organizations including:

- Parent organizations
- Local leaders
- Educational associations
- Local universities

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

5

0

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Criterion (B)(5) requires the applicant to submit a high quality plan to analyze their current reform status, logic behind the plan inclusive of the identification of needs and gaps. The applicant produced a high quality plan as submitted in the Appendix, but it did not in any fashion address the area to be assessed in this criteria.

- The plan submitted in the Appendix for criterion (B)(5) is a plan on how the district plans to achieve the goals set forth in the total application.
- The plan does not discuss an analysis of the current situation or provide logic for plan as it currently exists.

Overall, the applicant will receive zero points for this criterion as they failed to address any of the components of the criterion.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	9

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The narrative for criterion (C)(1) did not provide a high quality plan that involved contributions from parents and teachers. The narrative discussed many progressive and research based ideas around which to base their reforms, but did not do so in a manner which involved concrete timelines, deliverables, or identification of people responsible to ensure all parts of the plan were to occur.

The narrative focused heavily on Absolute Priority One and constructing a personal learning environment for students. While delving into the concept of personalized learning environments in detail, the involvement and support of parent and teachers in these reforms failed to be addressed.

- The application stated that the district would use multiple college and career interests to create personal plan of study for each student
- A rigorous and meaningful curriculum delivered with best practice instructional methodologies was a focus on how learning would improve
- No mention of non-assessed curricular items such as goal-setting and teamwork were mentioned, however a focus on 21st century learning skills was embedded within the narrative.
- The narrative discussed an expansion of rigorous course offerings as key to providing learning experiences for students in areas of their interest.

The narrative for this criterion articulates a clear strategy to ensure a personalized sequence of instructional content and increasing student access to digital content.

- The application directly addresses that 21st century learning is very different from traditional methods.
- The narrative expresses that how and where learning takes place is substantially different than the traditional educational model and that strategy of blended learning will help make this a success with their students.
- The narrative discusses how learning in their district as a result of RTT can be self-directed at times because of 24/7 access to resources.

The application directly mentions setting mechanisms in place to provide training so that the adults (teachers and community)

can understand and make best use of the digital tools being provided them, but does not address student training in a comprehensive manner. The plan does address students having a direct say in their personal data tracking and course planning as part of the Personal Plan of Study concept.

Overall, this section scored in the middle range of middle (9/20). A high quality plan did not exist as was called upon for this criterion, but many strategies and goals that would support their district's reform were clearly articulated and aligned to the central goals of the application.

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

20

3

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The application described the process that all educators go through in order to receive training to improve capacity. While this is discussed, the narrative did not explicitly discuss how such training time would be used to help facilitate the reform plan as proposed.

- The district has weekly meetings of 90 minutes to support the professional growth of teachers.
- The 2012-2013 professional development focus will be on data teams.
- There was no direct mention of adapting curriculum to meet individual needs, academic interests, or systematic strategies of differentiation.
- The application did discuss providing training on effective evaluation (both principal and teacher)

The narrative did not address providing training to ensure all educators have a firm understanding of how to use tools mentioned throughout their reform proposal and that are consistent with 21st century learning skills. All educators know and are able to use tools (digital), data, complex feedback

The district has already constructed and began practicing a complex system to use information from teacher evaluation to drive personal professional development for teachers.

- There were many components of the plan including the formation of several different growth models depending upon teacher level of need. This ranged from a professional enrichment plan to an improvement necessary professional plan.
- The narrative did not mention any system in place to capture information from a survey designed at gauging building and district-wide climate and culture.

The applicant mentioned many times that the district belief was the high quality instruction from high quality teachers lead to increased student achievement. The narrative, however, was void of a plan that had:

- Deliverables
- Activities
- Goals
- Responsible parties
- Timelines.

Overall, this criterion scores in the middle of the low category. Many components of the criterion were ignored or not answered in a manner which addressed the issues at hand. The narrative did describe the teacher evaluation system very comprehensively, but failed to link that system to the rest of the plan for reform in a substantive manner.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	3

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not demonstrate a high quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure which provide support throughout the reform process. Despite not providing a high quality plan, the narrative did address many components of the criterion.

- The narrative discusses the flexibility and strength of the Central Office and the ability and willingness to be flexible in staffing to best meet the individual needs of particular schools.

- The plan clearly addresses school autonomy and flexibility in implementing the plan. The plan discusses scheduling, calendars, and curriculum delivery as evidence of such flexibility.
- The narrative discussed the district's acknowledgement that credit based on mastery not time is worth investigating. No concrete plans or proposals were discussed, however.
- The applicant did not provide any substantive comments or plans regarding allowing multiple opportunities for student success or providing easily adaptable learning resources.

Overall, this criterion scores in the high end of the low category. No plan existed to demonstrate the infrastructure and polices necessary for successful reform was in place.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	4
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Many aspects of a high quality plan were not-existent in the narrative for Criterion (D)(2). Despite clear activities, timelines, and responsible parties not being identified, the concepts discussed throughout the narrative did address many of the components of this criterion.

- The narrative discussed the desire to use community partnerships and seek outside financial support to ensure all stakeholders have access to learning tools outside of school. There was no direct mention as to whether these partnerships and outside resources were necessary pending a RTT district-level award.
- The narrative discussed the need for appropriate professional development and training, but again did not mention anything specific about the need for students to be trained.
- The applicant did not discuss how technology systems, inclusive of electronic tutors, could provide tools and/or recommendations for student support.
- The district did reference and provide support regarding the interoperability of the data system and how that continues to evolve as the district progresses.

Overall, this section scores in the low end of middle. No plan was presented despite the discussion of many goals and activities being articulated.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	8

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has in place a comprehensive program evaluation system that allows for specific and useful evaluation of all programs and initiatives that take place within the district. The narrative explains that the district plans to continue to use this protocol to provide a continuous improvement model with the RTT grant.

- The narrative explains that all programs receive annual review and programs that are more directly tied to student achievement are reviewed as often as quarterly. The application stated that all components of the grant would undergo this process, but did not specifically state which elements would be evaluated annually and which components would undergo a more frequent evaluation.
- One of the major components to the continuous improvement model presented by the district is titled, 'What are the next steps?' This segment of the model provides for direct opportunity to make mid-course corrections while implementing the grant.
- Since this is the adopted model used by the district for all initiatives, it is to be assumed that the initiatives commenced during the time of the grant that continue past the term of the grant would continue to be reviewed in this manner. There was no explicit description of this process, however.
- One of the questions in the improvement model asks if a program could sustain if funds were cut. Thorough analysis of this during the term of the grant will help sustain improvement efforts.

- The plan indirectly mentions communicating progress openly to the board, but did not specifically address communicating with any other public entity in any other fashion. There was additionally no mention of communication how RTT monies were spent or conducting an analysis of the impact of spending.

Overall, this criterion will score in the middle of the middle range. The continuous improvement model in place throughout the district appears thorough and comprehensive, but many components of the criterion went unaddressed or under-addressed.

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

5

2

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders were one-sided in nature. The strategy was to communicate progress not engage them in review for continuous improvement.

- Strategies for communication were posting of initiative evaluations on the district website, the availability of BOE information via Sunshine laws and quarterly meetings of the Superintendent Citizen's Advisory Council.
- All three strategies mentioned above were to inform, not to engage.

This criterion will be scored in the middle range of scores. The applicant showed strategies for communication, but did not demonstrate any desire to truly engage stakeholders in the continuous improvement process.

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

5

5

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did a comprehensive and thorough job of creating ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup.

- The performance measures exceeded the minimum amount and each measure broke down the goal by subgroup, annual target, and provided the rationale as to why it was a target.
- The narrative portion of the criterion also explained why the measure and method of measurement was selected.
- The applicant was also honest in areas where measurement needed to be improved over time or more data needed to be collected to measure all appropriate subgroups. One example in particular involved breaking down data regarding FAFSA by subgroup.
- While not mentioned directly in this narrative, it can be assumed that these performance measures would undergo the examination of the continuous improvement model explained in Criterion (E)(1).

This criterion receives maximum points for providing evidence for all components of this criterion.

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

5

0

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant in no manner addressed how they plan on evaluating the effectiveness of money spent through the RTT grant in the areas of:

- Professional Development
- Technology
- Creating a learner-centered system
- Other resources to improve results
- Compensation reform
- Modified school structures (From food service, to SIP, to BLTs)

The applicant will receive zero points for this criterion for failure to address the issues as outlined in the application.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application provides a thorough explanation of how all funds will be used through the RTT grant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The narrative and tables provided for this criterion indicate that local and monies will be expended to support this reform initiative. <p>The current budget provides reasonable estimates and sufficient budgetary expenditures to complete their plan for reform.</p> <p>The applicant provides rationale for investments and provides insight into the long-term planning of the district and their understanding that this reform initiative will have ongoing costs beyond the term of the grant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant is knowledgeable and realistic in identifying one-time costs (such as wireless routers) compared to ongoing operational costs such as infrastructure management and security. The applicant also is aware and prepared for a short 'shelf-life' of mobile devices for students and teachers – and that replacement and renewal budgeting must exist in order for the reform to be sustainable. <p>The applicant also met the criteria set forth by providing an overall budget and then a more detailed project-by-project budget.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant will receive maximum points for this criterion as a result of providing sufficient evidence to satisfactorily address each component.</p>		

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

<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A high quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant was not provided in the narrative for this criterion. There was no mention of deliverables, measurable goals, people responsible for monitoring and completing the goals, detailed activities to take, or a timeline.</p> <p>The narrative, did however, provide an overview of the district understanding of the costs to sustain their reform plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant demonstrated understanding of equipment and software maintenance and renewals. <p>The narrative also expressed interest in forming state and governmental partnerships to continue the reform efforts after the term of the grant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant said it will 'strive' to form such relationships, but no concrete plan was discussed. <p>The applicant provided a very loose budget for training in years to come after the term of the grant. Again, no concrete information or plan was included.</p> <p>Overall, this criterion scores in the low range. There was no evidence of a plan being in place in order to ensure sustainability of the project's commenced with receipt of the grant.</p> <p>I.</p>		
---	--	--

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant makes an attempt to describe a partnership that will be made with unnamed government agencies and officials to support social, emotional, and behavioral needs. The entire premise of the applicant's is to create public hotspots for internet connectivity. The belief is that this will correlate to more engaged students that better understand how to be a productive citizen in a global environment. This does not meet the intent of the criterion established for the competitive</p>		
--	--	--

preference priority.

- The applicant provides no firm plan or desired entity to partner with.
- There are no formal curricula proposed or substantive claims that hotspots will help the communities and family address social-emotional issues in students.
- The proposal does align to the rest of the applicant's plan and to the absolute priority.

The narrative does not propose a coherent and sustainable partnership. There was no direct mention of a partner or partners and how their partnership would directly benefit the social-emotional needs of students.

The narrative and tables do not identify ten population level results that align with the applicant's broader proposal.

- The applicant provided two goals, each reaching two subgroups.

There was no an ample description of how the partnership would track indicators and place emphasis on high need families and locations.

There was no mention of how the partnership would integrate educational and non-educational programs or how it would assist in building staff capacity in the future of identifying student needs and engaging in creative-decision making to support students.

This criteria failed to meet the established components and thus will receive zero points.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The Absolute Priority has been a theme throughout and if funded this grant would support the applicant to provide personalized learning environments for students.

- The creation of Personalized Learning Plans for all students aligns directly with the Absolute Priority.
- The desire to create a wireless network and public hotspots to create a 21st century learning environment in addition to providing students with 24/7 access to resources by providing them laptops, tablets, or other internet ready devices absolutely satisfies the Absolute Priority.

Total	210	105
-------	-----	-----