



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0388KS-3 for Unified School District 501 Shawnee County

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>Implementing an individual career plan for ALL students 8-12 which is a strength of this criteria</p> <p>Career and Academic Advising and Career classes offered as well as all grade levels accounted for in the program strengthen this answer</p> <p>Individualized programs for all students and recommendations for evaluating teachers strengthens this response because it builds on the four core areas</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>All schools will be involved which shows support for this plan and is a strong point of this response</p> <p>All school data is given which gives this response a strong score</p> <p>Student data is given and well covered. Each student is broken down by number and percentages which supports a high score</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Plan is in place with no timeline and no discussion of scaling up and supporting district wide change which shows a lack of well thought out response and is responsible for a low score</p> <p>There is an outline in place with vague details of implementation which supports a low score</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Goals are listed with implementation dates and data which is a strong</p> <p>There are specific goals for improvement and increasing graduation rates are noted which is asked for in the prompt and makes this response strong</p>		

Goals are very specific with percentages listed which shows a well thought out plan
 Strategic plan is strong and timeline is well thought out which adds to the strong score
 Vision is strong and clearly stated which makes this response high scoring

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	8
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: Data shows improved learning in specific areas. Across time there were categories that were improving. All data was broken down into sub groups which indicates transparency in all areas. Data shows some growth but not meeting standard which indicates there is not a strong record of success The improvement plan in place for low scores where the district is not meeting standards shows a committment to improving which strengthens this score to a medium		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: The personnel salaries at the school level is available and supplied as well as the the salaries for the instructional staff, teachers and non-personnel expenditures which speaks to the criteria of this section.		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	6
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: Legislation in place to implement the plan Integrating CCSS has been implemented Infrastructure is in place to show that implenting is supported and ready		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	10
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments: Letters of support for community and various groups are present showing support of plan Table of supporters shows that groups are participating in various ways which shows a well thought out plan		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1
(B)(5) Reviewer Comments: The logic and implentation is suggested but not followed through. The identified needs and gaps are not expressed in the paragraphs provided which weakens this score. Lack of specifics and regarding the personalized learning and logic results in this low score		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Plan for implementation and time line are strongly supported with how documentation is going to be done and how all the work aligns with all the players from students to state officials</p> <p>Clear outline of each goal is present</p> <p>Key pieces were missing that connected to the criteria</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	14
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The goals are broken down and put in a timeline with a clear understanding of each goal. Also, each goal has a plan for implementation as well as a goal for assessment and who exactly is responsible</p> <p>Plan for implementation and time line are strongly supported with how documentation is going to be done and how all the work aligns with all the players from students to state officials</p> <p>Clear outline of each goal is present</p> <p>Key pieces were missing that connected to the criteria</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	15
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Roles of district office refined, showing that support is present to all schools with some adjusting of these offices and money being spent to form two new offices</p> <p>Specific goals and implementation for school leaders</p> <p>Students, families and community mentioned in the plan shows a well thought out plan for every member to participate in multiple ways</p> <p>Responsible parties for each step of the plan are not only mentioned but their specific goals are in place</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Specific tools for each of the above are mentioned and clear as to what will be provided (web sites with specific tools, councils, reports, working groups) and each of these has been given a specific targeted outcome</p> <p>Personalized learning plans are part of the goals</p> <p>PLP is broken down into the four main areas which shows the implementation has been thought out. Academic Domain; Career</p>		

Domain: Personal/Social Domain; Learning Strategies; transition planning

Dashboards which have federal and state policies are present

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: Research data is being used in order to show the strength of this strategy All levels of participants (principal, teacher, etc.) are mentioned specifically in the plan and that they will be informed, however, specific and clear ideas are not present...it is more like information which weakens this specific response		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: Bi-weekly leadership team with the superintendent is mentioned and expanded which makes this response strong There is a goal for pod-casting, website, news releases, with appendices on each of these with clear expectations which make this response strong and the expectations clear The communication is vague and not specific which weakens the response		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: Plan uses student data to drive changes to the plan Measurement criteria is specific All sub groups are accounted for in the proposal Measurement over time, Rationale for Selecting Measure, Measurement Criteria and Review are all in place for each subgroup, which strengthens this application		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments: Clear plan to evaluate. The step by step explanation makes this a quality response. Appendices shows clear breakdown of each measurable goal. Each goal is broken down in detail This talks about measurement tools but does not implement community or any type of specific modification which is why the score is not strong		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: Budget pieces are in place and clear and speak to the specific goals which is a strength of this application		

Justifies what money will be spent and for what and each category is associated to a specific piece of the program plan which makes this application strong

Also specifically talks about checking on funding allocation and assessing it's usefulness. This chart is a strength of the application with specific data

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

10

9

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strong letters of support for sustainability of the program

Budget is sustainable in the appropriate way

Stakeholders are listed and participation anticipated

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Tables and letters of support indicate a strong community support and a specific goal for each community partner

Specific groups are targeted with specific outcomes

Goals are ambitious and achievable

Alignment of participating students with community members is mentioned but not specific as to how this will happen

Various ways to identify needs of education and family are mentioned

Routine assessment is mentioned as yearly and possibly needed more

partnerships are mentioned and strongly supportive

Targets of groups are in place with a specific plan to implement a steady process of improvement

Budget is shown that matches target goals

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Application clearly shows specific ways to build on core educational assurance and create learning environments to improved student learning. It is a strength of this application that all grade levels are included at all schools in the district. College and career ready standards are a strong component of this application and each piece of the criteria is spoken to.

Total	210	164
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

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

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	9
<p>Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Determining the impact of instructional intervention strategies</p> <p>TTSS - prototype intervention model which allows staff to analyze evidence-based interventional and strategies used in Tier 2 and Tier 3</p> <p>PD would be designed to analyze the data and make changes to insure student growth</p> <p>A program of accelerated rate would be designed for each student</p> <p>Budget is broken down by year and specifically</p>		



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0388KS-4 for Unified School District 501 Shawnee County

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant provides a comprehensive and coherent vision statement and vision plan for education reforms providing four tiers of support and aligning with the four Assurances underlying the Race to the Top (RT) competitions. Applicant will redesign its schools, provide for the development of visionary educational leaders and effective educators, integrate academic and career/technical education standards, and continue to improve teaching/learning opportunities from preK through 20 by adopting a set of initiatives that will engage stakeholders at all levels in efforts to create innovative, personalized learning opportunities for all its students.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant's narrative and appendices demonstrate that each element of this criteria has been fully met.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Using the Transformational Model, the district will work with communities to transform schools. A 5-point Reform Action Plan is provided, with four key strategies to promote college- and career-readiness and degree completion, but a coherent and detailed plan is not included that covers all the elements of a high-quality plan (as defined in the notice). The narrative for this section does not focus on how reforms will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide changes, and does not address how the applicant will use a detailed plan to reach its outcome goals. Other parts of this application are quite strong, but the applicant seems not to have understood what was being requested by this element.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

Applicant provides ambitious and achievable annual goals for areas (a) through (c). The state does not currently break down the statistics for college enrollment (area (d)) by subgroup, only by overall district. The most recent data available was from 2009, but no baseline or grant year 1-4 goals were provided for college enrollment.

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	2
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant demonstrates that, despite the district being underperforming, it has developed pockets of excellence in select schools and also is completing the transformational reform of a high school that less than 10 years ago was the sixth-lowest performing high school in the state. Subject matter assessments have shown percentile rank increases since fall 2010 across multiple academic content areas. Evidence related to high school graduation rates and college enrollment are not provided.</p> <p>The narrative for (B)(1)(b) is prospective. It does not detail a clear record of success in the past four years in persistently lowest-achievement or low-performing schools.</p> <p>Criteria (B)(1)(c) is not covered in the application.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant demonstrates this element fully by providing the data described under (a)-(d) in tables in the Appendices.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>New law (Senate Bill 155) provides the applicant with the ability to implement specific reform efforts included in this application. Recent completion of the initial planning and development of the infrastructure mandated by the State Plan for Integrated and Common Core standards has permitted the applicant to have the policy and system infrastructure, capacity, and culture to enable teachers and school leaders to constantly focus on improving individual student mastery. The Superintendent has the authority to reconstitute schools that fail to meet adequate yearly progress (AYP) benchmarks under federal law. Taken together, the applicant has demonstrated evidence that there are reasonably successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under law and regulations to implement the reforms in this applicant.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant outlines how the superintendent put together a proposal leadership team and sought advice and recommendations from numerous community and state agencies or individuals. Weekly, and sometimes daily, meetings resulted in the design of a draft proposal that was widely disseminated to key staff and administrators as well as a parent group, advisory groups, the teacher's union, the Chamber of Commerce, the school board, and other entities. A extensive collection of letters of support is provided representing a wide range of key stakeholders.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	0
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant broadly claims that extensive analysis was completed to determine the needs and gaps that exist with the applicant's current system. Both Strategic Planning and Reform Action Plans were developed, with the applicant stating that goals, activities, timelines, and measurements were established to address these needs. Evidence of a high-quality plan, with all the elements as defined in the notice, and of identified needs and gaps are not provided in the application.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant provides a highly detailed and high-quality action plan for college-and career-readiness, that focuses on four key strategies and several goals under each strategy. Each goal is broken down into specific actions, with expected outcomes, completion dates, positions responsible, and impact measures to be achieved. The plan is not organized in ways that easily track to all the specific subelements of (a), (b) and (c), however. No clear delineation is made between how (C)(1) Learning and (C)(2) Teaching and Leading is addressed in the plan, making it very difficult to track against all the specific subelements of this subsection.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	14
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant provides a highly detailed and high-quality action plan for college-and career-readiness, that focuses on four key strategies and several goals under each strategy. Each goal is broken down into specific actions, with expected outcomes, completion dates, positions responsible, and impact measures to be achieved. The plan is not organized in ways that easily track to all the specific subelements of (a), (b), (c), and (d), however. No clear delineation is made between how (C)(1) Learning and (C)(2) Teaching and Leading is addressed in the plan, making it very difficult to track against all the specific subelements of this subsection.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	3
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant sets forth clear goals for the organizational refinement of the district, including the newly formed Office of School and Careers and the realignment of responsibilities found within the Offices of Operations, Operations/Technology and Teaching and Leading. In addition, a new Office of Strategic Reform will be establish and staffed under the proposal, with the executive director reporting directly to the Superintendent and responsible for project management oversight of strategic initiatives. Several advisory groups to the Superintendent will be set up.</p> <p>The application does not appear to address subelements (D)(1)(b) through (e) in its narrative for (D)(1) nor elsewhere in the proposal. The summary states that the narrative under (D) does cover this material, but this reviewer had difficulty finding where such discussion had actually been provided.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant provides a highly detailed explanation of how personalized learning plans (PLPs) will be used as the student-specific strategy of education/learning that takes into consideration a student's strengths and weaknesses. The discussion, however, is not organized by subelements (a) to (d) and, as a result, hits some of the requested information on how the LEA and school infrastructure supports personalized learning but not all of it. For example, this reviewer could not location where a discussion on ensuring that LEA and school use interoperable data systems. This section of the proposal, in particular, not not seem tailored to specifically address this criterion's multiple subelements.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score

(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district outlines in detail how it will employ a variety of research-based strategies for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback toward targeted goals. Implementing these strategies will allow staff opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. The applicant sets forth seven key guiding principles for its school improvement plan's continuous improvement process. The applicant addresses how it will seek ongoing input from the community, linking partners and district personnel through the establishment of an Evaluation Planning Team and by sharing data and collaborating with a number of institutes of higher education. The narrative did not address very clearly how the strategies will result in publicly shared information on the quality of the district's RTT investments. The criteria was scored in the lower end of the high range.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant details plans for a comprehensive communications campaign that includes a student pledge program, multi-media public awareness and action campaign, more than 65 business partners, colleges, and employer-related incentives for earning the rigorous board of education Recognition Diploma. Market research will also be conducted, in partnership with the state department of education, to identify the information and incentives for potential teacher candidates with an interest in social sector jobs as well as math or science. The district will partner with institutions of higher education to employ communication and recruitment strategies to increase the pipeline of math and science teachers. The superintendent will establish a community affairs unit bringing together communications, community partnership, advisory groups, and business liaison function to facilitate communications with and to leverage partnerships with the community. The superintendent will also convene bi-weekly district leadership team meetings and utilize numerous other communications efforts.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides very clear and detailed descriptions of its 12 performance measures, including the rationale for selecting the measure, the measurement criteria, and how the measures will be reviewed or improved over time.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's proposed program will be evaluated through the thorough and methodical use of the latest scientifically supported and evidence-based methods of measurement, analysis, and documentation. The project will systematically target and monitor progress against the evaluation criteria. Applicant details both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the evaluation project and details the use of multiple measures of evaluation evidence to determine the extent to which the district's RTT efforts will have made substantial progress towards meeting its goals and costs, and whether the efforts were cost effective. A Discrepancy Evaluation Model will be used to compare actual performance to a designated standard. The evaluation discussion is scored in the high range.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's budget is complete and detailed and meets all the subelements of this criterion. In the appendices, district funding sources are identified for sustainability of the project through all seven years of the project (four years under a federal grant and three years funded primarily by large increases in district general fund outlays).</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The appendices include documentation of how the district's general funds will be used to provide nearly \$10 million over 7</p>		

years to this project, including \$1.5 million to \$2 million a year in years 5-7 when the district assumes full responsibility for the sustaining and maintenance of logistical support, technology, data base operations, student tracking systems, technical professional development, and continued upgrading of software and support of central office staff.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	4

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provides population-level desired results under the competitive preference priority. The narrative provides an unfocused description of the various partnerships with parents, community, and business representatives it has established over the years. The narrative says that through these existing collaborations and by building upon the previous successful work found with each of them, it will achieve subelements (5)(a)-(e) and element (6), but no details are provided. The discussion on existing partnerships is very vague in terms of how they would fit together as part of a coherent, strategic plan for achieving the population-level desired results.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

This application is of mixed quality, although clearly high-level strategic and budget work went into its creation. The application does, however, coherently and comprehensively address how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create personalized learning environments.

Total	210	142
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	9

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provides two optional budgets, one for an Intervention Services Study, and one for Professional Development/Training of all its stakeholders. Both clearly provide the rationale of each project and provide a reasonably high-quality plan for how the applicant would carry out the activity, although in neither case do either optional budget proposals seem to involve one or more other districts, as required by subelement (2) of this criterion. The actual budget supplements are well designed and rich in detail and adequate to support the development and implementation of the proposed activities. A score in the medium range is provided, given that no partnering districts seem to be involved in either budget supplement's plans.

Race to the Top - District



Technical Review Form

Application #0388KS-5 for Unified School District 501 Shawnee County

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant provides a clear vision that is aligned to it's overall district vision. The applicant's vision is comprehensive and provides a detailed and comprehensive plan to address each of the four core educational assurance areas. The plan includes specific goals and strategies associated with each core assurance area. This is a strength of this section. The plan clearly addresses accelerating student achievement, increasing instructional effectiveness and increasing equity. The plan does not specifically address individual tasks and personalized learning for each student. This is a weakness of this section. This section provides a well-rounded and thorough vision and plan to address this selection criteria. The section warrants a high score, with a loss of a point for the lack of detail in addressing deepening and personalizing learning. 		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	2
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant fails to describe a process used to select schools to participate. This is a weakness of this section. The tables included in the appendices list schools within the LEA as well as number of teachers and students participating from each school. The tables also provide a clear breakdown of the number of participating students who are high need. This is a strength of this section. The applicant provides basic information addressing this selection criteria. However, due to the lack of rationale and detail in the narrative associated with this section, the overall score for this section is low. 		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	9
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant indicates that the reform efforts proposed in RTTD will be utilized in all district schools. The applicant clearly identifies a theory of change - "Transformational Model" and specifically describes how the model will address the four educational assurance areas. This is a strength of this section. The applicant's description is brief, but effective in describing how the plan will allow the district to achieve its goals. It is also effective in meeting this selection criteria. The section warrants a high score. 		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
(A)(4) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant provides a lot of information in this section, including fourteen research-based principles that the district believes will support the RTTD project. However, this section lacks focus and attention to the specific criteria. The areas outlined in the selection criteria are briefly addressed in the applicant's description of the TEA. Due to the lack of focus and clarity in this section, the section warrants a low score. 		

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	1
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant indicates that the district has implemented reform efforts and seen growth over the previous several years. However, the data do not show consistent growth that should be associated with reform efforts. In fact, some data show a lack of progress or decline in overall performance (for example, AYP data from 2008 - 2012 by both content area and subgroup). • The applicant notes achievements, however, the actual information provided is concerning. For example, subgroups listed as exceeding the annual target in science include American Indian, Multi-racial, white, full-priced meal, general ed students, gifted students and males. These would not (for the most part) be considered high need subgroups. • The applicant repeats information provided in earlier sections but fails to address the availability of performance data and does not make a case that reform efforts are ambitious, significant or effective. • This section warrants a low score. 		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant provides a description of what data is provided to stakeholders and how the data is accessible. • Evidence of actual personnel salaries and non-personnel expenditures is included in the appendices. • The applicant does a good job of addressing B2 a - d. • The description of transparent practices is brief, but sufficient. As a result, this section warrants a high score. 		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	1
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In this section, the applicant seems to address ESEA/NCLB/AYP related plans and authority of each district to address specific issues, within the district, associated with deficiencies related to the NCLB act rather than provided a description of the state context for implementation and reform. • The applicant provides some information that implies conditions and sufficient level of autonomy and support exist, but there is little, or no, tie to implementing the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal. • As a result, this section warrants a low score. 		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	9
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant provides an adequate description of the process used to develop the proposal and gather input from stakeholders. Given the amount of time to develop a proposal, it is clear that the district made an effort to include many different stakeholders in a meaningful way. • A letter of support from the district's bargaining representation does not appear to be included, however the applicant indicates that the association was supportive. • Many letters of support are included, from a variety of different stakeholders. This is a strength in the overall proposal. • This section warrants a high score due to the evidence of significant support provided. 		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	0
(B)(5) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section B5 provides a description of how the district plans to address needs and gaps identified. The applicant states that a needs analysis has been conducted, however, there is no description of, or evidence of, either a plan for an analysis of the current status or a logic model used to analyze the gaps. • As a result of failure to address the selection criteria, this section warrants a low score. 		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	3
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant provides a list of goals, strategies, outcomes, completion dates, etc. that is fairly extensive. The unified strategies included should address ensuring students are college and career ready. However, it is not clear how, specifically, all learners will be engaged and empowered. • Again, the plan seems to focus on district strategic goals and not, necessarily, personalized learning, parent and student input, etc. • CI(b) is addressed, to some extent, by considering the possible impact of the proposed strategies. It is not explicitly addressed. • Mechanisms to ensure students understand how to use tools are not addressed. • This section warrants a low score due to the lack of attention to the specific selection criteria. 		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	4
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant provides a general description of how the district will address all of the items in C2. The description, again, focuses more on stating that the plan will do the things described in the selection criteria instead of describing what the applicant will do. However, some of the strategies identified in the previous tables address educator training and access to data. • A plan to specifically target leadership teams (C2c) and a plan to increase the number of students receiving instruction by effective and highly effective teachers are not included. (Goals are included but a specific plan is not described). • This section also warrants a low score due to lack of focus on the selection criteria. 		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	15
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant starts out by describing the current district-level structure, and then, describes the plan to make changes in support of its RTTD plan. This plan is thorough and is clearly tied to the specific goals and strategies. • This section is a strength of the entire proposal. The applicant addresses (D)(1) a through e and provides a compelling plan that would allow the district to effectively implement reform plans. • This section is well-written and warrants a high score. 		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	9
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In this section, the applicant also addresses each specific element under the selection criteria. The applicant includes descriptions of specific strategies that support personalized learning. • The technology infrastructure described has some limitations, however the district adequately addresses providing infrastructure that makes data available to stakeholders. • This section is also well-written and a strong section, warranting a high score. 		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	14
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant provides specific detail regarding how a variety of stakeholders (superintendent, administrators, teachers, students, parents and community members) will be involved in providing input and data to allow the district to monitor progress and continually improve. • The applicant includes professional development plans to ensure stakeholders are trained to analyze data and make adjustments in the proposed plan. • In addition, the applicant includes performance measures within the evaluation process/model to assess whether teachers and administrators are effectively analyzing data and using it to guide their practices. • This section is strong and warrants a high rating. 		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant briefly describes communication efforts that will be implemented. • This section is brief, but does address the basic requirement for communication with stakeholders. • A method of evaluating communication efforts and strategies to reach specific stakeholders would have strengthened this section. • This section warrants a medium rating. 		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant seems to have included performance measures for each of the age groups within the overall population. Performance measures have a rationale for selection, measurement criteria and plan for review and improvement included with each. The descriptions are detailed and seem likely to allow the applicant to monitor progress in achieving the desired results. • This section warrants a high rating. 		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant provides a comprehensive, extensive evaluation plan for all aspects of the proposed project. This section is thorough and includes a high level of detail. • The section warrants a high score. 		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant notes that no additional funds (from other sources) will be used to support this project. • The proposed costs for the overall project, each budget category, and line item costs associated with each project seem reasonable. • The applicant seems to provide a rationale for the investments and priorities, however, it is somewhat unclear how the specific projects, goals and costs support the overall goals of RTTD. • This section warrants a high rating. 		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	3

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- The applicant notes that efforts will be made to create sustainable practices that are based on the proposed reform efforts. In addition, the applicant describes the many stakeholders that support its efforts. The applicant provides a description and evidence that many community members and other stakeholders will support the project and hope the effort is sustainable.
- The applicant does not provide a plan for financial sustainability. As a result, the section warrants a low score.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	5

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

- The applicant describes many partnerships with community organizations. These partnerships seem to support many of the RTTD project goals. The applicant does a good job of ensuring that partnerships address many types and aspects of student and educator needs.
- The applicant does a good job identifying desired results for the competitive priority preference.
- The applicant does not address items 3, 4 and 5 in the competitive priority preference.
- This section warrants a medium score due to addressing some, but not all, criteria.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

- The applicant describes a coherent and comprehensive plan to create district-wide reform. The plan includes elements that address all core educational assurance areas, with the personalized learning element addressed somewhat briefly and generally and other elements described in more detail.
- The applicant meets absolute priority 1.

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

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	13

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

- The applicant proposes a plan to evaluate the effectiveness of intervention strategies/model. The plan is comprehensive and high quality. The budget is reasonable and would support the proposed plan. These are strengths in this section.
- It is unclear whether the applicant has provided rationale and a plan that addresses difficult to measure traits or support for high need students.
- The proposed evaluation plan would be an added strength of the proposal - not required, but definitely something that would provide beneficial data and information to the district.
- This section warrants a high rating.

