



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0215MO-1 for Blue Springs R-IV School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	1
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>The applicant addressed a reform vision.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>The reform vision was vague and did not contain the detail needed to determine if the project will build on the four core educational assurances as defined in the notice. A clear and credible approach to the goals of the project was not evident or detailed. It was unclear what the classroom experience would be for students or teachers.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <p>A list of participating schools was provided. The data requested regarding students and educators was populated in the charts.</p> <p>Weaknesses</p> <p>Process to select schools was not addressed. It was unclear why some schools with minimal poverty indicators were included.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	1
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <p>A theory of change was discussed in the narrative.</p> <p>Weaknesses</p> <p>The plan provided did not meet the minimum requirements for a high quality plan. Sufficient details were not provided regarding what the actual plan was and how it would support district wide change or help the applicant reach outcome goals. A logic model was not included. It was unclear how the theory of change discussed related</p>		

to improving student learning outcomes.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths

The applicant addressed this section of the application and provided assessment data.

Weaknesses

a) The data offered in the charts regarding student growth was inconsistent and unclear. Percentages were provided for baseline years then the numbers 0-10 were included for goals. It is unclear what this information means. It was unclear what the ESEA targets were or if the LEA's would meet or exceed them. Subgroups were unclear. The applicant indicted comparison groups as only State of Missouri subgroups.

b) From the data provided, it is unclear if achievement gaps will be decreased. It is unclear what the proposal will do to decrease subgroup gaps.

c), d) It was unclear from the data provided what the graduate rate and college enrollment rate goals are. It was unclear what the applicant would do to increase graduation rates and college enrollment rates.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	4

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths

The applicant detailed previous projects and awards for districts in the consortium.

Multiple venues for communicating with parents and community members were detailed.

Weaknesses

It was unclear how the previous activities demonstrated a clear record of success for advancing student learning. Student achievement was not the focus of many of the past activities. Equity in learning and teaching was not addressed.

It was unclear if any of the districts had persistently low-achieving schools and whether significant reforms have been made.

The plan appears to be in the needs assessment phase, and no clear decisions have been made regarding what activities might be implemented and how data will inform and improve instruction.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant detailed the current transparency practices however they did not specifically reference this project or actual personnel salaries. No points were awarded since the application did not meet the minimum requirements regarding the four categories of school-level expenditures from State and local funds. Personnel amounts were included as a total.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	1
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <p>The applicant reference state laws that allow for virtual learning.</p> <p>Weaknesses</p> <p>Since it is unclear what the project activities will be, it is unclear if the state allows sufficient autonomy. The state regulations detailed in this section do not align with program activities referenced in the plan.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	1
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The stakeholder committee met and achieved school district support and obtained multiple letters regarding applying for the grant, however a plan was not designed for a high quality proposal to share with the public. This project describes a plan to develop a high quality plan rather than the high quality plan required. It was unclear if parents, teachers, and students were involved in the planning. Evidence was not provided to document that 70% of participating teachers support the proposal. Letters of support did not include parent or student organizations.</p> <p>One point was awarded for addressing this section.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	2
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <p>Students will develop a personalized learning plan portfolio. The plans will include career awareness and goal setting.</p> <p>Weaknesses</p> <p>The plan is heavily dependent on online learning. The applicant has already indicated that the areas have a lack of internet access. It is unclear how students will develop the PLP's and who will assist them. The instructional content was not clearly articulated. The proposed plan for regular feedback did not include progress toward mastery of college level standards. Instructional approaches were discussed in general but it is unclear what instructional approaches will be used. Research was included but not a plan to address the issues discussed. The applicant indicated that feedback is essential however the plan is unclear regarding the use of student data and the frequency of contacts.</p> <p>Mechanisms were not detailed to provide student training on the tools and resources provided.</p>		

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	2
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <p>A teacher evaluation system is in place with growth guides and a professional continuum.</p> <p>Weaknesses</p> <p>The application discusses unspecific professional development and seems to focus on professional development that is already in place. Information is provided on existing programs however a proposed plan is unclear for this grant. The information provided did not relate to a high quality plan as defined in this application. Existing career exploration activities and existing evaluation systems were discussed however these discussions did not address any plans for improvement under this project. The application did not detail how or what data educators have access to. It is unclear what the actual plan is to personalize learning and how teachers will prepare to implement it. A plan to staff hard-to-staff schools and subjects was not included. Staffing needs for special education and other specialty areas were not discussed.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	1
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <p>A project leadership team will meet monthly.</p> <p>Weaknesses</p> <p>It is unclear if the proposed monthly meetings for a small group represents a high quality consortium governance structure. More information is needed about this structure. It is unclear how much flexibility and autonomy school leadership teams will have. The timeline is general and does not provide further details regarding what the actual plan will be for the grant.</p> <p>It is unclear if students can progress based on mastery. It is unclear what learning resources and instructional practice will be adaptable and accessible for student. Special needs students and ELL student needs were not clearly articulated.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	1
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant addressed this section however the plan was very vague and mainly indicated that access would be provided without sufficient details to determine feasibility.</p>		

A plan does not appear to be in place.

It is unclear how the divisions data systems are interoperable. Sufficient details were not included in the application.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	1
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant addressed this section. The plan was very vague, thus it is unclear how improvements might be made. Specific plans for regular feedback were not provided. Specific goals and objectives to improve upon were not detailed. How the applicant will share public information is not detailed.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>Strengths:</p> <p>A detailed data collection and measurement system was described.</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p> <p>The plan for the project is unclear and needs substantial revisions in order to be effective. The application needs a more detailed evaluation plan. For example the applicant indicates that they will develop an evaluation system for teachers, principals and superintendents, but this was a minimum requirement for the grant. The applicant proposes to hire an external evaluator however the qualifications of this evaluator are not detailed.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant did not provide at least 12 performance measures.</p> <p>Rationals were not provided for each measure. The applicant addressed this section, thus one point was awarded.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>A logic model for evaluation was included in the application. The logic model did not include plans to assess, measure, and improve progress on student performance measures. The evaluation model was unclear due to the lack of detail in the project plan. One point was awarded since the applicant addressed this section.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	1
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: The plan for the grant was unclear, thus the budget seems disconnected and appears to include expenditures that were not discussed in the plan. Large expenses were included that were not included in the plan for the grant. These expenses do not appear to reflect a personalized learning plan. One time- vs ongoing expenses were not apparent. One point was awarded as the applicant addressed this section.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	1
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant addressed sustainability, however the plan lacked details. It was unclear what the project would be or how it would be sustained.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	1
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: This section was included, however most of the information provided did not relate to the grant application. Partnerships addressed under employment, not academic achievement. Health programs unrelated to academic goals were included. It was unclear if partnerships existed or if the developer would try to form partnerships. The population desired results did not strongly relate to the grant's broader goals. The partnerships appear to be programs and organizations unrelated to the project. For example Fitness Gram is an assessment tool, not a partner. It is unclear if partners are also vendors. Fitness, not academic goals appears to be the main theme for the partnership component.		

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: Sufficient detail regarding a high quality plan was not provided to address how the applicant will build on the core assurance areas to create a personalized learning environment that would improve teaching and learning. The applicant would apparently use grant funding to do a needs assessment and develop a plan.		

Total	210	31
--------------	------------	-----------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0215MO-2 for Blue Springs R-IV School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	1
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant describes a reform vision centered on redesigning current models of instruction into ones that are student centered and customized to prepare students who are college or career ready. The four cored assurance areas are not addressed specifically within this section but limited evidence is found in other sections.</p> <p>Core Assurance 1</p> <p>Adoption of Common Core State Standards</p> <p>Core Assurance 2</p> <p>Proposes to build data systems that will measure student growth and success in an effort to improve instruction</p> <p>Core Assurance 3</p> <p>This is not addressed.</p> <p>Core Assurance 4</p> <p>Very limited evidence in other portions of the proposal that the lowest performing schools have been turned around. No identification of the reform measures used is provided</p> <p>There is no evidence of a clear and credible approach described which will accelerate or deepen student learning.</p> <p>There is limited evidence in other sections of what the classroom experience will be like in the development of personalized learning environments.</p> <p>Articulated vision is very limited and is not consistent throughout all sections of the proposal.</p> <p>This criterion is awarded a low score for the lack of a comprehensive and coherent vision and the lack of evidence for the sub criteria.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Learning Alliance Consortium (LAC) articulates with a limited description the process used in selecting the participating schools. Schools were selected based upon the eligibility requirement of at least 40% of the student population represented low income families though this narrative statement is inconsistent with data provided in charts. The selected schools vary in composition and a rationale is not provided for the evidenced wide varying demographics of the selected schools. Four school districts serving over 20,000 students in kindergarten through grade 12 have been identified for participation. Individual schools within each of the four districts of the consortium are identified and supporting data is fully reported in the accompanying charts and tables with the required criteria clearly identified.</p> <p>This scores in the medium range though a more thorough and consistent description of the selection process and selected schools would have strengthened this criteria.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provides a limited description of a plan focused on the key goal of improving learning outcomes for all students through personalized learning termed "Pyramid of Personalization." This is described as the foundation upon which the reform will be scaled to include all students across all four districts of the consortium. Key steps are identified in this process:

- Formulate a comprehensive School Improvement Plan
- Analyzing data
- Identification of current instructional practice which were insufficient for meeting needs of students

An additional component to scale up the reform included use of a "Train the Trainer" model was identified though it is unclear how this process would be used, a timeline, deliverables, or activities encompassed.

In section (A)(4)(d), the applicant outlines and describes each of the components of its high-quality plan:

ACTIVITIES (Examples of evidence)

- Provide Common Core State Standards-based curriculum
- Incorporate elements of universal design, co-teaching, and digital learning
- Provide short-term intervention/enrichment

TIMELINE (Examples of evidence)

- Blue Springs and Center School District will target Grades K-12 over the course of the grant
 - Year 1: Grades 2, 5, 6, 8, 9
 - Year 2: Grades 1, 3, 7, 10, 11
 - Year 3: Grades K, 4
- Hickman Mills and Grandview School District will address grades 6-12 at implementation

RESPONSIBLE PARTIES (Examples of evidence)

LAC Steering Committee will have direct responsibility and oversight of project. Two additional positions (Data Specialist and Instructional Technology Facilitator) will be added to assist with the implementation of the proposal in managing the data and supporting the integration of digital media.

DELIVERABLES (Examples of evidence)

- Plan of study based on college and career ready standards
- Personalized Learning Plan for all students
- Professional Development plan integrating Pyramid of Personalization and digital media
- Digital learning materials and resources

This scores in the medium range as the applicant adequately describes components of a high quality plan though it is not focused and detailed in all aspects and clear logic model is not evidenced.

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

10

2

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant has included what appears to be ambitious future data on their tables and within the narrative for (A)(4)(a, b, c, d, and e) that is likely to improve student learning and performance and increase equity as defined for each LEA.

The applicant does not note the State ESEA targets for LEAs. They did, however, set their goals to achieve nearly 100% at the proficient or higher level which while ambitious is unrealistic.

While goals are certainly ambitious, they appear in several instances to be unrealistic for the targeted population, schools, or subgroups. It is also noted that while the goals are set for college enrollment rates to be at 100% by conclusion of funding, postsecondary degree attainment is set at 50%. This appears contradictory to the overall goals of this proposal.

Overall, this places the applicant in the low range of points for lack of clarity or consistency.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	5

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The consortium describes successes within each of the participating LEA's as follows:

Blue Springs District

- Recognition for improvement in ACT scores
- Honors for its job-embedded professional development program
- Scores on state science test in grade 5 have exceeded state average gains from 2008 through 2012

Center School District

- Turned around Improvement status in 2006 to meeting standards in 2010, 2011, 2012
- Named a Missouri Gold Star School for AYP in 2012
- Named a Blue Ribbon School in 2012

Grandview School District

- Communication Arts gains of 22.7% within past three years
- Mathematics gains of 26.2% within past three years
- 73% of students participate in the ACT testing

Hickman Mills School District

- Increased parent involvement by 76% after hiring parent involvement coordinator
- Recognition from National Academy Foundation for its Academy of Engineering in 2011

Applicant briefly describes a proposal to create working committees to present to stakeholder groups and increase participation. Parents will be involved through the use of direct contact, newsletters, website postings, email, and social media. Additional innovative measures to be implemented to share information will include webinars and videos provided in an on-demand format.

It is unclear if the information being presented to the stakeholders and parents is student performance data. Descriptions are centered on the implementation of the proposal and not student performance. How information is presented to students and the engagement of educators are not adequately addressed.

There are some limited examples for evidence of turning around low achieving schools but not a description to identify the reforms which improved these schools.

There is very limited evidence to show that student learning outcomes have been improved. There is no supporting evidence of closing achievement gaps or increasing graduation or college enrollment rates

Overall this scores in the medium range as not all criteria were adequately addressed.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not present evidence of a high level of transparency. An inclusion of a snapshot of school finance data is provided in the appendix that lists the required categories of school expenditures for each of the participating LEA's. There is not substantiated evidence that practices are clearly in place that makes processes, practices, and investments public detailed by school.

This scores in the low range for insufficient evidence of the criteria.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	2
--	-----------	----------

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Consortium indicates that their aligning of goals and strategies are in full compliance and are required under:

- Missouri School Improvement Plan, Version 5 requires collection of proficiency scores and technical skills assessments for vocational plans
- CSR-20-100.220 supports the use of virtual learning and the granting of credit from virtual learning
- CSR-20-100.110 allows for reimbursement of enrollment fees for AP and Dual Credit Courses
- CSR-20-100.190 provides that with DESE approval, if students demonstrates mastery of specified competencies of a course, the district may grant credit through an alternative method

This demonstrates that the applicant has acknowledged guidelines for the implementation of strategies to improve achievement however, it is unclear how these guidelines align with the limited description of the goals of the proposal. Therefore, the applicant will receive points in the low range due to lack of evidence fully addressing the criteria within the context of this proposal.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)

15

3

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant has provided a description of how a cooperative team composed of representatives from each of the LEA's developed the goals and plans of this proposal. Upon the completion of this work, stakeholder meetings were held to present the plan to a larger audience to communicate the need for, and support of this proposal.

While there is evidence of support for this proposal from numerous letters including:

- Mayors of local LEA's
- Legislators
- Presidents of the local teacher associations
- Parents
- Businesses

It is not evident how these members were meaningfully engaged in the development of the proposal. The involvement of students is not addressed. The involvement of teachers (either by collective bargaining agreement or a 70% or greater support) is not evidenced. How the proposal was revised based on feedback, or even if feedback was sought, is not addressed.

This scores in the low range because the criteria are not fully and adequately addressed.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	2

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The consortium's overall goal for their application is to create a personalized learning environment for all students.

The plan describes improvement of learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college and career ready as evident in the following:

- Creation of an Personalized Learning Plan (PLP) that includes an e-Portfolio beginning in Kindergarten and revised and developed throughout elementary and secondary grades
- Components of PLP will include 1) career awareness, 2) goals, and 3) steps for taking responsibility for learning through the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model
- Use of on-line learning and implementation through the Learning Orientations Model
- Blended digital instructional approaches including rotation, flex, self-blend, and remote learning

Overall this scores in the low range because it is not a high quality plan because it does not contain clearly described activities and the rationale for the activities, a timeline, deliverables, or parties responsible. The criteria are described from a theoretical or conceptual overview with little or no specifics for each of the criteria or sub criteria.

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

20

3

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant proves to have a plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college and career ready as evident in:

- All educators participate in comprehensive professional development to address improving instruction, differentiated instruction, and support of professional learning communities.
- Educators participate in vertically aligned teams facilitated by instructional coaches to implement Common Core Standards.
- Individualized instructional environments are offered to students including project based programs, before and after school and weekend tutoring, theme based summer program, courses, and camps, advanced track cores, and career and technical course offerings.
- Development of career paths and career explorations through teachers and counselors. Progress is measured through teacher made assessments and standardized assessments. Teachers meet on designated professional development days to review data.
- Teacher evaluation system is inclusive of informal walk-throughs and formal observations which include both formative and summative assessment based on content knowledge, delivery/practice, skill in personalized learning, and management. Instructional coaches are used to facilitate improvement in these areas as warranted.
- Use of gaming simulations to increase student interest and motivation.
- Use of open websites to post data to build student profiles, develop class action and personalized learning plans, and discuss results.
- Student interest inventories, career plans, and concept mastery will be used within each district's learning system to target distinct "knowledge routes" according to the individual learner.
- Enhancement and expansion of digital learning technology to allow students to search based on their individual learning objectives. Teachers will also have access to assign the content and objectives specific to the student to stretch their learning.
- Teacher evaluation will include professional practices as well as student performance data. If a teacher is underperforming, professional development and coaching will be provided.

Collectively, the applicant proposes some best practices that will form and focus on high quality practices that will translate into increased student performance levels to ensure all students at all schools are college and career ready. The goal is to switch from a delivery centered model to a learner centered model of instruction by assisting in the transition with quality and targeted professional development. However, the plan is very weakly developed and goals are disjointed.

While the applicant does describe a plan to improve learning and teaching through the personalization of the learning environment, it is clearly evident that it does not meet the standards of a high quality plan. The plan fails to include specific and appropriate descriptions or an actionable timeline identifying responsible parties. Overall this scores in the low range because while criteria are addressed, the descriptions and evidence is lacking and insufficient.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has developed the following practices, policies, and rules to facilitate personalized learning:

- Creation of the Leadership Committee to include principals, CFO's superintendents, Board members, technology employees, outside consultant, Human Resources, and instructional coaches. Committee will meet monthly to provide guidance for the implementation of the proposal and reflect the needs and resources of each individual LEA of the consortium.
- Creation of the Advisory Team to include additional key stakeholders, parents, community members, businesses, colleges and careers centers. The role of this team is not defined.

Flexibility and autonomy are not addressed.

Progression of students based on mastery and not time on topic is not addressed within this section. The governmental guidelines for progression based on mastery are mentioned within another section of proposal.

Demonstration of standards at multiple times and in multiple ways is not addressed.

Providing resources and practices that are adaptable and fully accessible is not addressed.

This scores in the low range because there is not sufficient evidence of a high quality plan and four of the subcriteria are not addressed.

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

10

2

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The consortium has a limited plan that will focus on making impactful, data driven decisions and adjustments based on multiple factors to support project implementation. Evidence in the plan includes:

- Local schools will develop Leadership Teams facilitate implementation and provide feedback.
- Use of technical assistance through mentoring, peer tutoring, on-line support, customization of software to learning styles.
- Lead LEA has a mobilized learning lab facilitated by a certified teacher used by students and their families on weekends, summers and breaks.

While there is a description of the district pursuing a system that provides data in an open format, there is no evidence to support the statement nor is there evidence the data could be used in other electronic learning systems.

The use of interoperable data systems is not addressed.

Overall this scores in the low range because it is not evident that a high quality plan is structured to support implementation of the proposal and several criteria are not addressed or are addressed in a very limited manner.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	2

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The consortium describes a process by which to evaluate the implementation process which includes:

- Hiring of an independent outside consultant/organization
- Assessment data to include degree of growth and progress in:
 - Increase in achievement
 - Subgroup achievement gaps reduced
 - Graduation rate increase
 - Enrollment in post-secondary institution increase

The applicant does not clearly demonstrate the presence of a high quality plan for this criteria. Identification of timelines, timely and regular feedback, monitoring, measurement, and sharing of information and quality of investments are not addressed. Therefore, this scores in the low category.

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

5

1

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The consortium's plan for ongoing communication and engagement of internal and external stakeholders is evident in the following:

- Annual evaluation report provided by outside contractor.
- Quasi-experimental approach with a comparison group will be implemented.
- A value-added design will be implemented to assess effect on instructional practices.

This scores in the low range because the criteria does not evidence all components of a high quality plan. The only form of communication addressed is an annual report. The applicant has not described how this report will be delivered. Engagement of internal and external stakeholders is not addressed.

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

5

4

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The consortium presents a plan and approach to continuously improve as evident in:

- Assessments selected to monitor student performance were selected because that can be used to effectively measure student progress.
- State level assessments will be used to determine if students are proficient or exceed state standards as well as measure success between subgroups.
- Data will be gathered electronically and used to provide timely and formative feedback. Data will also be used by stakeholders to monitor, interpret, report, and disseminate details related to annual performance and comparison to project goals.

The consortium included 12 appropriate performance measures for all grade bands (K-12) for participating students and schools. The applicant included reasonable grade-appropriate leading indicators of successful implementation as well as at least one grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicators of successful implementation of its plan.

Consortium will review measures to ensure they are progressing by comparing data from state level assessments to that of a common peer group.

At the secondary level, the applicant will use sound assessment tools to document college and career readiness through a use of a range of assessments provided by ACT.

The tables provided with student data for each LEA and subgroup for each of the performance measures is achievable and ambitious.

Therefore, this places the criteria in the high range of points.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1
--	----------	----------

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant proposes that with funds from RTT-D, it will contract with an outside agency to evaluate the use effectiveness of the funded activities as they pertain to student achievement. The Advisory Board for the proposal will seek input from key partners and personnel to further refine the scope and details of the evaluation plan. The outside contractor and Advisory Board will work together to use data for continuous improvement. Data to include: observations, interviews, surveys, participation counts, testing and assessment data, graduation rates, and post-secondary enrollment rates.

Responsibilities assigned specifically to the outside contractor to monitor for effectiveness include:

- Development and revision of measurement instruments
- Collection of data, observations, and interviews
- Conduct statistical data analysis
- Preparation of annual evaluation report for project activities

While the applicant provides a valid, conceptual description of a method for evaluating effectiveness of RTT-D funds, the plan lacks many components of a high quality plan. Specifics on measurements, activities, and deliverables are ambiguous and lacking in description. Overall this scores in the low range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has a budget proposed for all funds requested from the project.

(a) Funds requested for the application include \$7.8 million to cover the cost of additional personnel which includes instructional technology coaches, college/career readiness coaches, data analysis coach. An additional \$2 million is requested to cover benefits for the additional staffing.

(b) The proposed budget is reasonable as evident in the specific breakdown of the line items and the portions allotted to each participating district in the consortium. Items to be purchased (laptops, iPads, stylus, etc.) are reasonable amounts. The salaries associated with the additional hiring of employees to implement the grant are appropriate. The general

supplies, instructional materials, professional development, stipends, and software are reasonable. It is noted that one personnel position (Health Coordinator) is included in budget but not described within the scope of this proposal. Additional line items are included that are not addressed elsewhere within the proposal.

(c) Funds are not clearly identified that are one-time purchases. The funds for on-going operational costs are not clearly identified. Long-term sustainability is not addressed.

Overall this scores in the low range as not all criteria are fully and adequately addressed.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	1
---	-----------	----------

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant did not address this criteria fully with a high quality plan. A description is provided that addresses actions to occur after the awarding of the grant but does not address the sustainability of this grant. A high quality plan is not evident.

This scores in the low range because the criteria is not fully or adequately addressed.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	1

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Applicant describes a proposal to hire a program facilitator/coordinator to coordinate a central resource in order to decrease the number of underserved students. The description is limited and does not address the criteria outlined in the Competitive Preference Priority nor are they aligned to support the limited goals described of the grant proposal.

This scores in the low range due to inadequate evidence, inconsistent and vague goals, and unclear descriptions.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has identified and acknowledged that a vast majority of its teachers are teaching for the delivery stance and not for mastery. The overall plan for the applicant is to revamp teaching practices from a teacher centered model to learner centered method of teaching. The consortium plans to begin this by engaging its faculty in a numerous professional development opportunities focused on digital learning. The addition of instructional and technology coaches are to support the migration to a student centered digital learning environment.

However, the description of the process and plans for the achievement of these goals is not comprehensive and is very disjointed. While aspects of Absolute Priority 1 are addressed, the evidence does not demonstrate that the applicant is positioned to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools and supports for teachers and students that are aligned to college and career ready standards.

Total	210	42
--------------	------------	-----------

Race to the Top - District



Technical Review Form

Application #0215MO-3 for Blue Springs R-IV School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant has presented a reform vision to heighten student performance and transform learning by redesigning current models to be more student-centered but fails to provide evidence of a comprehensive and coherent plan. The proposed plan does not address the four core educational areas: (1) adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy; (2) building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction; (3) recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and (4) turning around lowest-achieving schools.</p> <p>Applicant provides sufficient research and approaches to accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning, and increase equity but does not fully articulate how their proposed plan will accomplish their vision. It is unclear how their vision will personalize student learning grounded in common and individual tasks based on student academic interests.</p> <p>LAC does not describe what a classroom experience would be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments with their program.</p> <p>A low score is given in this area due to the lack of evidence to support their reform vision.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Learning Alliance Consortium's (LAC) is comprised of four districts in Kansas City, MO area. LAC's approach to implement its reform proposal is to include all four of these districts, but it is unclear how the applicant selected these schools to participate in the proposal. Collectively the participating schools meet the eligibility requirements and a list of schools that will participate in grant activities was provided.</p> <p>Applicant provided the total number of participating students, participating students from low-income families, participating students who are high-need, and participating educators for each of the four districts but fails to provide the total number of participating students and educators for the LAC.</p> <p>The score in this area is in the middle range due to the evidence provided for participating schools but lack of documentation for the entire program.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>LAC's plan does not reflect the characteristics of a high-quality plan because it lacks key goals, activities to be undertaken and the rationale for the activities, timelines, deliverables, and identification of responsible parties. The reform proposal includes all four schools in the LAC so scale-up to a district-wide change is not relevant. LAC proposes to scale up their program with educators participating in high quality professional development intended to close achievement gaps and assist students with meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements but fails to provide sufficient evidence of how the professional development will help them reach its outcome goals. Applicant has identified components of laying a foundation for change, redefining the role of the teacher, changing the culture of the school, technology supported environments, college and career standards, ongoing data analysis, and professional development as critical to successful implementation but fails to establish goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties for each component or fully describe how each component will personalize student learning.</p> <p>Applicant did not provide a logic model or sufficiently describe how their plan will create change to improve student</p>		

learning outcomes for all students being served, thus resulting in a low score in this area.

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

10

2

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

LAC's vision is not likely to result in improved student learning and performance or increase equity based:

- Annual goals are not clear and therefore it is difficult to determine if they are ambitious yet achievable.
- State ESEA targets were not provided and there was no comparison between applicant's goals to State targets.
- Performance on summative assessments was provided for baseline data for each of the four schools but the proposed increases each year for the project goals are unclear, i.e., baseline is 85.5%, SY 2013-14 is 2.4.
- Achievement gaps have been identified but it is unclear how the gaps will be decreased and what the identified annual goals represent.
- Graduation rates, college enrollment, and postsecondary degree attainment data were provided for baseline but it is unclear what participating schools and students make up the cohort group to be included in the annual goals.

A low score reflects the lack of sufficient documentation on the applicant's plan to increase student learning and performance.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	4

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant has provided documentation of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement in all participating schools within LAC but fails to provide charts or graphs, raw student data, or other evidence that demonstrates how the LEA has increased equity in learning and teaching. Multiple examples of how each participating school has implemented professional development initiatives was included in the proposal but no supporting evidence was provided to support how these initiatives specifically impacted student learning and achievement.

Outcomes from initiatives (partnership with PREP-KC and College For Every Student) at the Center School District indicated positive changes for school improvement, ACT scores, and in Pre-Algebra and Algebra scores in recent years but fails to provide sufficient evidence on what the scores were prior to implementing the initiatives or how they addressed achievement gaps. Other schools listed improvements in similar areas but there was no data provided on high school graduation rates or college enrollment increases over the past four years.

Applicant references some of the participating schools have been on school improvement lists but fails to provide evidence of these schools being low-performing or the lowest-achieving schools or data to support how improvements were made in these schools.

Applicant's proposal indicates that student performance data will be available to students, educators, and parents through various formats (direct contact, newsletters, website postings, email messages, and various social media formats) but fails to provide evidence on how this data will be used to inform and improve participation, instruction, and services.

The low to mid-range score reflects the applicant's lack of evidence to support how their success over the past four years has contributed to improved student learning outcomes.

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

5

2

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

LAC has demonstrated a high level of transparency in all three of the participating schools' processes, practices, and investments with substantial public documentation but due to the lack of evidence of a high-quality plan, there's no evidence to support how transparency will be increased by this proposal. School level expenditures for instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration were provided in an appendix in the proposal. All school-level expenditures from State, local, and private funds are accessible to the public through annual and audit reports and will be posted on their website but applicant fails to provide evidence of how making the data available will support their proposal. Applicant included personnel salaries for all instructional support and support staff at the school level. These salaries were documented for instructional staff, teachers, and non-personnel expenditures.

The low score reflects the lack of thoroughness in providing all the supporting evidence to increase transparency with the proposed plan.

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

10

2

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

LAC abides by The Missouri School Improvement Program's (MSIP) framework and procedural guidelines and works under the State laws and regulations for public schools. MSIP grants a high degree of autonomy: LAC states that they will take advantage of this by creating an environment for each school to meet state performance measures but allows them to independently create their own path to meet the needs of their school. Due to the lack of clarity of the proposed plan, it's difficult to determine if each participating school has sufficient autonomy to implement a personalized learning environment. Teachers will have a wide variety of flexible options to remediate and enrich achievement to address the learning needs of all students but applicant fails to provide evidence of how schools will have successful conditions and sufficient autonomy to implement the activities..

A low score depicts applicant's lack of evidence to support the evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy in each participating school.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)

15

2

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provided evidence that teachers and other school staff were engaged throughout the development of the proposal but failed to sufficiently explain how students and families were engaged and whether they provided feedback on the proposal. Applicant does provide information on whether the LEAs participating have collective bargaining representation or evidence that at least 70% of teachers from participating schools support the proposal.

Letters of support were provided from local civic organizations, higher-level institutions, and local businesses but there were no letters of support from parents or parent or student organizations.

Applicant's score is in the low range due to the lack of evidence of engagement of students, parents, and teachers in developing the proposal.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	3

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provides a plan to implement a personalized learning plan with three components: career awareness, goals, and steps for taking responsibility, but fails to provide a high-quality plan that includes key goals, activities to be undertaken and the rationale for the activities, timelines, deliverables, and parties responsible for implementing the activities. The ePortfolios will start in kindergarten but it is unclear if or how other grade levels will utilize ePortfolios. There is no evidence to support the applicant's approach to implement instructional strategies for all participating students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-standards.

LAC's proposal focuses on students developing career awareness, goal setting, and responsibility for their own learning through professional development with teachers but the proposal lacks evidence to support how students will build an understanding of what they are learning is key to accomplishing their goals or how they determine if they're making progress in meeting their goals. It is unclear how this approach will improve graduation rates or how progress will be measured to determine if goals are being met.

Applicant provides a research-based model for deep and productive academic experiences aligned with students' needs and interests with different learning types but it is unclear how the participating students will be paired with a learning type and there is not sufficient evidence to support how that learning type will involve students in deep learning experiences.

Applicant does provide sufficient evidence that participating students will have access and be exposed to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives to motivate learning. LAC's plan to expand professional development does not sufficiently support students mastering critical academic content and developing skills in goal-setting, teamwork, critical thinking, problem solving, and creativity.

Access to digital learning tools and applications will be made available to participating students but there is no evidence to support how the applicant's plan will provide each student with access to a personalized sequence of instructional content, skill development, a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments, or high-quality content that will prepare them for college and career.

Applicant provided research-based methodology on the effectiveness of ongoing feedback but it is unclear how they will utilize feedback to ensure students are mastering college- and career- ready standards and are on the path to graduate on time. It is unclear what accommodations and high-quality strategies will be implemented for high-need students.

Applicant states that mechanisms are in place to assist students in utilizing tools and resources but fails to fully explain specifically what the mechanisms entail and how the district will ensure students understand how to use the mechanisms to track and manage their learning.

There is no evidence to support how parents and educators will support student learning with their proposed program.

The low score reflects the lack of a high-quality plan to address the criteria in this area.

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

20

3

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

LAC's proposal does not have a high-quality plan that includes key goals, activities to be undertaken and the rationale for the activities, timelines, deliverables, and parties responsible for implementing the activities for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment. No evidence in the proposal exists to describe how the instructional strategies being implemented enable students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned with college-and career-ready standards, increase graduation rates, or accelerate learning based on the students' needs.

Applicant's approach to help educators improve instruction and increase capacity to support student progress includes providing professional development to improve instruction in core/essential skills, differentiate instructions to meet individual student needs, and support students' efforts to meet college- and career-ready standards to support and guide teachers to move toward a personalized learning environment but fails to provide sufficient evidence of how these trainings will bring about desired outcomes. It is unclear how the reform efforts identified in the area of professional development is directly related to their RTTD proposal versus what is already being implemented district-wide.

Applicant references multiple tools and instructional formats that are currently offered in the districts to meet academic needs of students but fails to provide documentation of what specific activities are included in their plan and how these activities will be utilized to accelerate student growth. Evidence to support utilizing data to inform and accelerate student progress is weak because multiple data sources and systems are referenced but it's unclear which ones are currently being used in the district and which ones are part of their proposed plan.

LAC has a performance-based teacher evaluation system consisting of administrator observation and walk-through visits with resources provided for teachers needing improvement. There is no evidence provided on how teacher effectiveness is evaluated or how feedback is used to improve teacher and principal practices.

Applicant does not provide sufficient evidence that all participating school leaders and school leadership teams have training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure effective learning environments that meet students' academic needs based on:

- Educators will be provided with tools and training but no documentation on the data sources or processes that will help them assess and take steps to improve school culture and climate for continuous school improvement.
- A digital learning system for data collection will be used but it's unclear how data will be used to structure an effective learning environment.
- No evidence was presented on how the training systems and practices will be used to identify the achievement gaps and analyze student performance.
- A high-quality plan was not presented for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective or high-effective teachers and principals. Certifying teachers in content areas and having them meet high quality guidelines, which were not clearly defined, does not meet the criteria in this area.

A low score is given in this area due to the applicant not providing sufficient evidence to support their proposal in this area.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	2
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A high-quality plan to support project implementation was not provided based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of comprehensive policies and infrastructures that provide every student, educator, classroom, and school with the support and resources they need was not provided in the application. • Leadership was identified for the district but it was unclear how the leadership team will support the RTTD implementation for all participating schools. • Applicant did not address how the leadership will have sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules, calendars, personnel decisions, and budgets at the school level. • Individual student learning plans and timely assessments does not meet the criteria of giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic. • Applicant does not fully describe how students will have opportunities to demonstrate mastery of standards in multiple comparable ways and at multiple times. • Applicant does not address how they will accommodate students with disabilities and English learners with the learning resources and instructional practices being implemented in the RTTD program. <p>The score is low in this area due to the lack of evidenced provided to support the criteria.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	2
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant does not have a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructures for every student, educator, classroom, and school based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant states that all participating students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders will have access to content, tools, and other learning resources to support implementation and provides examples of tools and resources but fails to provide evidence of how these tools and resources will support implementation of the program. • Technical assistance (mentoring and tutoring) will be made available but these activities fail to addresses how all participants will have appropriate technical support. • Applicant states information technology will allow parents and students to export information in an open data format which does not provide sufficient evidence to support this criteria. They do not address how data will be used in other electronic learning systems. • Applicant does not address the use of inter operable data systems. <p>A low score is given based on the applicant not providing evidence of a high-quality plan to support project implementation.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>LAC's strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process implies that timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during the term of the grant but fails to provide a detailed explanation of how the plan will be executed. Continuous and ongoing feedback will be provided through formative and summative evaluation through a contractor but the plan has not been developed fully with specific timetables, goals, targets, and deliverables. The plan does not sufficiently address how LAC will monitor, measure, and publicly share information of the quality of its investments funded by RTT-D in professional development, technology, or staff.</p> <p>The lack of evidence in meeting the criteria in this area resulted in the low score.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant's plan to provide ongoing communications and engagement with internal and external stakeholders will be to have a contractor prepare annual evaluation reports of activities conducted during each school year and subsequent summer term but fails to address how these reports will be made available to all stakeholders. The plan also includes a data analysis component that lacks clarity on details of how the analysis will be utilized to improve its plan and fails to identify timelines, activities with the rationale behind the activities, goals, deliverables, and responsible parties.

Applicant does not meet the criteria in this section and receives a low score.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
---	----------	----------

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant's proposal includes performance measures for multiple grades at each of the participating districts and for different subgroups with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures but fails to provide evidence that these measures are ambitious and achievable because it does not address the rationale for selecting the measures, how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information, or how it will review and improve the measures over time. Targets for students with effective and highly-effective teachers and principals seems unrealistic at 100% by year four when baseline data is as low as 18% in some schools.

The applicant has not provided documentation to support the elements of this area and receives a low score.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
--	----------	----------

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant does not present a high-quality plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of RTTD funded activities based on:

- Evaluation will be contracted to an outside organization with elements of the evaluation design included in the proposal but there's no evidence to support how LAC will ensure there are timelines, activities with associated rationale, goals, deliverables, and responsible parties are identified and implemented.
- Responsibility for communication among partnering districts will be fostered by the contractor but fails to indicate how LAC will continue to improve the plan and evaluate effectiveness.
- Evaluation will include determining the effectiveness of professional development and activities that employ technology but there's no indicators provided on how effectiveness will be determined for these activities.

The score for this area is low due to the applicant not thoroughly addressing all components.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The proposed budget identifies funds to support the project with RTTD grant funds and funds provided by the district. The narrative references district funds will be utilized for development and implementation of a robust data management system to provide on-going analysis but there are also line items in the budget for RTTD grant funds for data management systems. Applicant fails to distinguish how both funding sources will be allocated to support these systems. There was no evidence that identified funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs incurred during and after the grant period. Funds were allocated to support personnel and resources for before and after school and summer programs but these activities were not fully described in the narrative as activities within the proposed program.

A low score has been given in this area due to the lack of evidence to support the detailed budget and narrative supporting this proposal.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant's plan for sustainability of project goals is to lay a foundation, create a framework, and provide the direction to

expand and sustain but fails to provide evidence of a high-quality plan for sustainability after the term of the grant based on:

- LAC's narrative indicates they have laid a foundation and created a framework for sustainability but they will develop a direction for expansion and sustainability after funding which does not meet the criteria for this area.
- There was no evidence of how the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use this data to inform future investments.

Applicant has included letter of support from State and local government leaders.

Sufficient evidence was not provided to describe the sustainability of the project and low score was given.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	1

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

LAC does not meet the competitive preference priority based on:

- Partner is identified as The CARE Program but there is no letter of support and it is unclear how this existing program will support the proposed plan.
- Population-level desired results for participating students with low SES (free and reduced lunch), Section 504, and ELL are unclear due to grade level and identification of participating schools and number of students that will be included in measurable indicators of access to care, health services referral rates, graduation rates, and ELL scores.
- It is unclear how the project will measure results and track indicators at the aggregate level for all students and at the student level for participating students.
- There is no evidence how data will be collected and used to develop materials and lessons to address identified challenges.
- Applicant did not present a strategy to scale the model beyond participating students.
- No evidence was provided on how the partnership with The Care Program would integrate education with health indicators.
- Applicant does not indicate how the partnership would build capacity of staff in participating schools with tools and support to assess the needs and assets of participating students, identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community, create a decision-making process, engage parents and families, or how they would routinely assess progress in implementing its plan.
- Applicant does not provides evidence of annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population-level of students (low SES, Section 504, ELL) and does not sufficiently describe desired results for participating students.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Applicant does not meet Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments due to the lack of evidence to support how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards. As stated in other sections, LAC failed to comprehensively address how it will accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student and fails to provide sufficient evidence that their plan will positively effect student learning and insure goals under this proposal are met. The applicant does not meet the Absolute Priority 1.



Total	210	44
-------	-----	----