



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0208PA-1 for Bradford Area School District

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>This section scores in the high range because it explains how it will implement each of the four core educational assurance areas with a vision linked to the ideas of : Achievement (transforming traditional approaches of teaching and learning to personalized education for all students); Belonging (building relationships with students to assure they value the education process); and Collaboration (students, teachers, parents, and community become equal partners in supporting emotional and academic needs of students). This approach is supported by the Districts as they have moved to focus on rigorous, relevant, and relationships/partnerships in the educational process. The use of data is key to the planning and implementation of the vision. Professional development is a key component to support teacher training in differentiated teaching strategies. Each of the four core assurances has been identified with specific program information tied to it as the vision for the RTTD plan is presented. The RTTD plan will be focused on implementing key projects to ensure success of the plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implementing a student-centered Personalized Learning Model focused on individual student needs: implementation of personalized learning plans, e portfolios containing individual student learning information; a data management system that allows use by professional learning communities to discuss student learning at the site level and district wide; digital badge builder for use by students in and out of school to certify accomplishments; differentiated supervision plan to provide teachers with opportunities to make decisions about their professional growth 2. Design 21st century learning environments that allow equitable access to learning where all students receive relevant, real-world content: technology will be a learning component in every classroom (SMART Boards, ipads, laptops, kindles, learning labs). In order for the technology to be used to its fullest capability professional development in using technology as a teaching tool will be enhanced. 3. Offering multiple pathways of personalized learning to include a district Cyber program for non-traditional learners, and Alternative Learning Program, and Flip classrooms. Each of these is designed to meet the needs of students who may need an educational setting other than a traditional classroom. 4. Career Pathways: Use of the 21st century framework to focus on CTE programs that provide skills for students who will graduate and move to the workforce and to be college and career ready. This element will combine the academic skills and CTE program skills into integrated programs meeting the needs of graduates to be college and career ready. 5. College Pathways: RTTD funds will be used to enhance the Advance Placement program in core content areas. Online courses (MOOC) will be available to increase course offerings. Junior Achievement will be offered through a partnership with district, community, and volunteers for the K-12 grade levels; mentoring program will follow students beyond graduation and assist students as they work to put their career objectives in place. 6. To implement and expand STEM initiatives to personalize learning for all students: enhance STEM labs in the science areas; expand the number of students who attend the Challenger Learning Center program 7. Implement a school-based behavioral/mental health program that supports all students: designed to meet social/emotional needs of students that current programs may not be able to address. <p>Classroom experiences will be tied to the activities in support of STEM and CTE courses which apply the goals students select for their personalized learning plans. Traditional teacher in front of the class, project based learning, community mentors in job skill areas will assist CTE students, technology will allow students to conduct research and communicate with sources outside of the school. The plan supports providing learning opportunities that will meet the needs of all students so they will graduate college and/or career ready.</p>		

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Districts selected all schools in each District as participants, so all the RTTD plan will be for all K-12 students in each. Each District has provided a list of schools with grade levels, number of students enrolled, and poverty level at each site.</p> <p>The total number of students to be served is 3297 at 100% participation rate. Low-income families represent 49.59% and high needs students represent 59.39%. 275 educators will participate in the plan implementation.</p> <p>This section is scored in the high range because requested information is provided in a clear, understandable, and useable format.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section is scored in the high range because it meets the requirement to provide a high-quality plan designed to address learning needs of all students included. The plan design follows the essential elements identified for innovative personalized learning: flexibility, redefine the role of the teacher, provide project bases/authentic learning experiences, student driven learning paths, and mastery.competency based/progression/pace for learning. The personalized learning process identified for all students will meet the required criteria stated for high-quality plans.</p> <p>The theory of change addresses ways to increase student outcomes with a comprehensive approach built on multiple initiatives to provide the necessary tools for all stakeholders..</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section is scored in the high range because it clearly outlines the process in place for performance and summative assessments. A safe learning environment is a key student success. As students establish career goals with an educational plan it allows them to understand what they need to know and enhances learning.</p> <p>The blended learning proposal will provide access for all students and allow them to receive curriculum in preferred learning formats. Professional development will focus on assisting teachers in learning how to plan and implement such environments.</p> <p>Multiple pathways for learning will also impact growth of graduation rates. In house Cyber learning opportunities, Alternative Learning Program, and regular classroom will provide learning in blended formats. Summer school programs are designed for remediation. Technology will provide options for learning outside of the classroom. The availability of multiple ways for students to demonstrate their proficiency will serve to decreasing achievement gaps, because students will be able to utilized what is best suited to their learning style and personalized learning plan.</p> <p>College enrollment is a concern because of the large number of educationally disadvantaged student which impacts their ability to graduate college and career ready. Professional development in this area will focus on helping teachers understand student coming from such backgrounds learn will assist in programs designed to enhance student success. Parent and community partnerships will provide additional support to all students.</p> <p>The Tables: Applicants Approach to Implementation and complete and list each district with schools identified and includes all required cells filled. Tables: LEA wide goals for improved student outcomes are filled with cells for all students, special education, and economically disadvantaged students complete with both baseline and annual growth goals for the duration of the plan and beyond. Tables for graduation rate and college enrollment are both complete with all information included.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	10

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section is scored in the middle range because all documentation of demonstrated District success is not included as required for each. Both Districts have made "ATP" under State guidelines. Current data for the 2012-13 school year was not yet available from the State and is not included. Bradford scores at higher performance level in all subject areas (math, reading, science, and writing) than State averages. Otto-Eldred SD has achieved AYP status each year since 2003, they have also exceeded AYP expectations in meeting graduation and attendance rates each year. Both Districts have been ranked at the mid-level by the Pittsburg Business Times (Bradford 193 and Otto-Eldred at 282).

Points were deducted from the total available because: there was no specific student achievement data provided (growth of graduation rate, PSS scores over time) and there was no detail provided about how performance data is made available to students, parents, and families. The narrative stated that all had been met, however supporting documentation (student scores over time, etc were not provided for either participating school.)

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4
---	----------	----------

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section scores in the high range because required information about personnel salaries and expenditures are available to the public through the District websites, yearly budgets, if the requestor fills out a Right-to-Know request. This information is also filed with the US Census Bureau. Both Districts also receive an annual audit related to expenditures and budget which are shared with the Board and community.

All of the total points available were not awarded because it is unclear if the salary and expenditure information is available at the school level or are general amounts included in the annual budget.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The Cyper learning program, CTE, and Alternate Learning programs operated by Bradford currently meet all State (PDE) guidelines.

Common Core Standards have been adopted by the State and both Districts and are fully aligned into the curriculum K-12.

All teachers meet the criteria of "highly qualified" under NCLB regulations in all core content areas.

Both Districts have teacher, principal, and superintendent evaluations meeting State requirements (provided in attachments). The evaluation systems are both formative and summative and the Quality Improvement Plans provide options for planning and developing professional development. Evaluations are implementing new components related to student achievement to demonstrate teacher effectiveness.

The RTTD plan proposes to increase course offering in STEM classes, provide easy data access for students, teachers, and parents, provide professional development in support of the RTTD plan goals, and develop alternative learning approaches to meet the needs of all students.

This section scores in the high range because the components to increase student achievement are present in the Districts and in the RTTD proposal. Students will be able to plan and implement personalized learning plans because of the training/information components included in the plan to ensure that students, parents, and teachers understand the process and how to access the information necessary to develop each plan. There are provisions in place that allow 24/7 access to the software used to follow their plan and make adjustments as required.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	13
--	-----------	-----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

This section is scored in the high range because the process used to identify participating schools and learning goals is clearly presented. The Superintendents, Assistant Superintendent, District Curriculum/Assessment Coordinator, and Federal Programs Director met to review the grant application and identify needs. Both Boards were notified with information about the RTTD proposal. A signed, formal MOU is included outlining participation and responsibilities of each District.

The Superintendent arrange meetings with the principals to present the grant and identified needs. The counselors and CTE Director was also notified.

Parent input came from parent involvement committees at each school site, surveys, and P-T conferences.

No other information on community outreach/participation in the planning process was included. Surveys were not found in the attachments.

Students were involved in the planning process as it pertains to their understanding of literacy. Their input was included in the plan.

There are letters of support from the city, county, and State, as well as the local teachers association president. Letters from community members, teachers, and parents are included.

Not all points in this section were awarded because the process used did not gather information from stakeholder groups, and not all stakeholder groups were at the table as the plan needs and goals were identified as the proposal moved forward.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	20
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>This section is scored in the high range because it clearly defines an approach to learning that is directly tied to personalized learning plans/environments for all students. Student learning plans are developed to ensure that students take an active role in their learning. Parents and students are taught how to access and use student learning data to develop their learning plan. Expansion of CTE programs and enhancement of STEM courses provide additional sources for students to implement into their learning plans. There are multiple learning options available to the students as the work toward successful implementation of their individualized learning plan, as well as assistance from parents, teachers, and the counselor as needed.</p> <p>The implementing of multiple pathways for learning will provide students viable options to meet their learning needs. These methods allow for personalization of the learning environment as well as implementation of student learning plans. At-risk students are provided with the support systems that are critical to their achieving academic success. Multiple pathways that will be available to students include: blended learning, Cyper options, Alternative Learning Program, Flipped Classroom. Each of these methods is in place to assist students master the college and career ready skills necessary for graduation, utilizing a process that best meets their learning style and need. Students, teachers and parents will have access to real time data to determine their mastery.</p> <p>Learning plans will become part of each student's eportfolio which both students and parents can access. The plan sets 2014-15 as the target year for each student to have an eportfolio in place. The individualized learning plans will increase levels of student independent and self-sufficient learning. In addition to classroom learning, students will have access to technology to support the skills included in their plans, Service Learning, Junior Achievement, and Year Around Educational Enrichment activities, the Badge Program and Smart Lab curriculum all promote independent learning. Teachers will present information to students after they have received training. Each student will also meet with a teacher, counselor, or mentor to receive support on their eportfolio. A learning video will be posted on district websites to assist in learning the process. This eportfolio will further allow each student to become responsible for their own learning.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	20

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section is scored in the high range because of the clear focus presented on preparing the teachers to implement data driven teaching models that are based on 21st century learning goals. Professional development has been provided in the areas of using data to plan instruction, literacy content training, implementation of Professional Learning Communities at the school sites, the use of instructional coaches to assist as teachers implement new teaching strategies. Modeling is used as an instructional strategy and there is a formal procedure for "learning walks" by both teachers and principals between buildings to build cohesiveness. These strategies all work together to improve instruction and increase support for students as they implement their individualize learning plans that are aligned with college and career ready standards. The teachers are prepared with with the training/knowledge required to support multiple learning platforms from traditional classroom roles, to project based learning, to meeting the needs of students who need additional support through educational accommodations or alternative learning settings. This training is aligned with methodologies teachers need to know and be able to implement in support of personalized learning for all students.

Districts have established data analysis systems that are used by instructional coaches to lead discussion during the PLC

meetings. The system is used to study trends in student growth, identify standard specific areas of need based on Terra Nova and PSSA and also identify individual student learning needs. Accesses to current student learning data is a critical component of implementation of individualized learning plans and has been recognized as such by the RTTD plan.

The adopted evaluation plan is based on the Danielson "Framework for Teaching"(Attachment 4f). Building level and district level learning walks occur to foster collaboration between teachers. All RTTD participating teachers meet the HQ designation as defined by PDE. Individual professional development plans are also a part of the process and are developed as a result of the evaluation process.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The District committee will continue to operate as the overall guidance system for the RTTD plan. Both Districts support a collaborative environment and support working with all stakeholders. The Districts have signed formal MOU's that outline the organizational structure and responsibilities of each going forward.

Professional Learning Communities have been identified as key elements for dialog and planning at all buildings and all teachers are expected to participate. Meetings are held bi-monthly at the building level to discuss instructional strategies, curriculum, assessments, and develop systemic changes. Lead teachers are chosen at each site to work with the teachers and the principals in the planning process.

The Districts have identified "mastery" rather than proficiency as the level of expectation for all students. Common assessments are utilized at all grade levels to measure student mastery of learning targets in reading, math, and all other secondary content areas. Students must score 80% on an assessment to meet Mastery requirements. Re-teaching occurs on skills not met. Students may also complete project based assessments to meet Mastery. Although there is no specific referral to ESL learners, the plan has a detailed process in place to meet the learning needs of all students through the implementation of individualized learning plans, alternative learning settings, multiple ways to demonstrate mastery, and ongoing meetings in PLCs to discuss student data and learning so meeting the needs of the ESL subgroup can be assumed because of the processes in place.

Students with special needs are provided services to assist them in their learning process. RTI is implemented in the primary and intermediate elementary buildings. Intervention teams have been trained at each building to collect, analyze, and use data to drive instruction. A variety of data is utilized in this process. Inter-disciplinary and co-teaching models are in place to provide students their education in the Least Restrictive Environment. The Read 180 program is implemented in the Bradford district as support in reading skills.

The Districts participate in the PA Verbal Behavioral Project at primary and intermediate buildings. The Autism Initiative was begun in 2002-03 and is used in classrooms to provide appropriate programs to students who fit this category of learning needs. Assistive technology devices are also used as necessary by students to meet their learning needs.

This section scores in the high range because of the comprehensive program described/implemented to meet the learning needs of all students. The steps taken to recognize mastery at a higher level is evidence of high expectation for all students. The plan provides a reasonable list of interventions to meet the learning needs of all students by allowing alternate methods for students to demonstrate mastery (project based learning for example). The RTTD plan recognizes that all students do learn the same way and demonstrate their learning in the same way and has identified feasible approaches for all students to demonstrate their success.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section is scored in the high range because of the multiple measures available to students, parents, and educators to receive and use information and data as needed to plan for student learning and achievement. There is a focus to make sure that parents are informed, trained, and have access to data and technology as needed.

Technology is available in the form of eSchoolbook (grading tool); Student Resource Center; District webpage; Teacher webpage (127 teachers have their own at this time); Teacher You Tube to host instructional videos; Blended Schools Network for instructional videos; local TV channel for information. Students and parents have anywhere/anytime access to

eportfolio and personalized learning plans. Technology devices will be available for check out by students because of the large number of low economic category students whose families may not have devices in the home. Cyber learning content is available online. Career Centers have extended hours beyond the school day and weekends to accommodate all parents and ensure equitable access.

Students will receive ongoing training from teachers in how to use/utilize the various methods of instruction and tools available to support their academic success. Parents will be invited to technical support trainings on various topics throughout the school year.

The RTTD proposal includes enhancement of the OnHands School data management system. The enhancement will provide eportfolios for every student. All data will be downloaded in an open format that allows use from multiple sources.

Both Districts use data systems that are interoperable and provide for customization.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section is scored in the middle range because it does not clearly define how the RTTD plan will be monitored, measured, and publicly shared.</p> <p>There is a process in place for meetings at both the school site and District level which is focused on examination of student learning data with the same occurring at monthly District level meetings. None of these meetings were identified as being utilized to examine the RTTD process and implementation. No evaluation specific of the RTTD plan is presented in this section. The data examination is crucial to this process but it unclear how this will be transferred to the grant implementation. A process for measuring and monitoring the RTTD goals as they relate to students is planned. It is unclear who is in charge of implementing/monitoring this process.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan has identified how communication with parents, educators, and community allow for varied methods to receive information, participate in discussion, and monitor program implementation has been included in the RTTD plan. Regular meetings will occur within grade levels to summarize data. PLCs will meet bi-weekly at the building level to share instructional strategies. Administrators will conduct walk-throughs and meet monthly to discuss learning data and collaborate on strategies. Monthly board meetings will provide ongoing communication about student progress and determine budget direction. Parents and students are not included in any of these meetings to discuss concerns or share information about what is working and what may need to be adjusted.</p> <p>There is no information provided about who/what will be done with information that may flow to the Districts regarding plan implementation from any of the sites, parents or students. The direction of communications appears to be focused on top down movement for both monitoring success and implementing suggested changes. There is no person or grant committee identified for direct communication needs. This section is scored in the middle range for these reasons.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section is scored in the high range because performance measures are listed with all students, special education, and economically disadvantaged subgroups for all performance measure listed on the required table. Required information about the numbers and percentages of students in all identified groups is provided by both participating Districts. Data to be followed is both academic(math and reading scores and socio economic(counselor referrals). Required informaton about the number of effective and highly effective principal and teachers is provided. The rationale for the selection for each group identified in the Performance Measure Tables is posted in the narrative box at the beginning of each table. The data provided supports the selection information provided. The tables include baseline and annual target growth for the duration of the grant and post grant. The total points were not awarded because the expected growth for students with IEP's/Sped is less than 50% over the time of the grant.</p>		

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section is scored in the middle range. The Districts will make use of multiple data measure that are in place to monitor the implementation and success of the learning goals. Ongoing data analysis will support the plan goals at the student, building, and district levels. The Board, Superintendent, HR Director, and fiscal department will work together to develop an annual budget that will support the goals outlined in the RTTD plan. The Federal Programs Director will monitor all RTTD expenditures to assure compliance. She will also submit all required reports. The Superintendent and/or Principal for Curriculum and Assessment will oversee the RTTD project implementation. The total points were not awarded because the plan does not include provision for an internal or external evaluator that will evaluate all of the components of the RTTD plan. The items listed as being monitored are focused on budget and do not discuss a process to evaluate professional development or technology upgrades.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The budget worksheets presented are completed as required with all information present. The budget as presented meets the needs to support implementatin of personalized learning for all studnets. Each project that will be implemented has a separate budget worksheet. There is information provided about which expenditures will be one time purchases in comparison to ongoing expenditures throughout the plan implementation: funds for AP exams will be 1 time only, no funds required for Service Learning, STEM costs are 1 time cost. The expenditures listed support the documentation found throughout the RTTD proposal. The funding proposal is sufficient to support the implementation of the RTTD plan. The District plan was designed to make planned use of all available District funds which will enhance the sustainability of the project for forward beyond the grant years.</p> <p>The total points were not awarded because the funds from other sources (line 12, budget pages) states funds from other sources, but none of the others sources are identified by name.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Districts have a clear plan in place to sustain RTTD progress at the grants end. Signed letters of support are provided from the mayor and State Department of Education, they received information about the RTTD plan within the 10 day required deadline and returned signed documentation to that effect. Many of the proposed expenditures are one-time purchases with support provided through other District funding sources as they are implemented. The steps to ensure continuation for each of the 7 grant projects is described in a understandable way the explains how it will continue at the grants end. The descriptions are focused on careful planning and use of District budgets, application for future grants (school based behavioral health).</p> <p>This section is scored in the high range with not all points given because even though evidence about the sustainability of the RTTD plan is presented it does not present a clearly stated budget for three years going forward. There is also no plan provided for ongoing evaluation and how adjustments will be made to the plan as it goes forward.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>None presented.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

This proposed RTTD plan has met the criteria as listed to be approved with no reservations. The RTTD plan clearly explains how each of the four educational assurances will be planned for and implemented for all students. There was special emphasis on the implementation of personalized learning environments for all students. Performance measures for all students, K-12 and identified subgroups, are provided in the required information with benchmark data and measurable target goals measuring growth each year of the grant. Students have the opportunity to participate in multiple ways to demonstrate their learning: traditional exams, project based learning, Cyber School, Alternative Learning Center. There is a focus on providing access to information and data for students, parents, educators embedded in the plan. A part of the access to the data is a clearly presented plan for professional development for teachers and principals in how to use the data to plan for instruction and assist students and parents in the development of personalized learning plans. There is ongoing training for parents in how to use the software and access their child's information. All curriculum is aligned to the Common Core with K-12 curriculum aligned to them, which will prepare all students to be college and career ready upon graduation. There is a focus on making sure that opportunities to learn are provided in a variety of ways so the learning needs of all students can be met (traditional and non-traditional), this will allow students to graduate college and career ready. Students who have and IEP/SPED receive support in meeting their goals and becoming successful through working with their teachers and participating in special programs that the District is part of. The professional development supports the goals of RTTD and is guided by the educator evaluation plans for all level. The plan includes methods and programs to decrease the achievement gaps that were identified at the onset of the planning process and to increase graduation rates. The budget presented is both reasonable and sufficient to support the RTTD plan as presented. The plan to sustain the program, including individual learning plans, upon the end of the grant is provided along with the funding sources that will be utilized going forward.

Total	210	180
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0208PA-2 for Bradford Area School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Bradford Area School District and the Otto Eldred School District have partnered to submit a thoroughly described plan to provide authentic learning opportunities for students in Pennsylvania. The consortium has provided clear and specific goals that are aligned with the four core educational assurance areas defined in the RTTT-D notice.

The LEAs are committed to differentiating instruction for all learners and desire to improve what is currently offered to students in school by increasing the access to data, utilizing more technology in the classroom, and providing relevant professional development to staff members. The grant applicants have considered a myriad of projects to increase student achievement. Below are the following goals the school districts desire to implement with RTTT-D funding:

- Provide parents and students access to personalized learning plans that follows students as they matriculate

through school

- Provide students with opportunities to create electronic learning portfolios
- Enhance data management systems
- Allow students to goal set and earn digital badges
- Increase the avenues in which employees can obtain professional development
- Ensure that students have access to quality 21st century learning with multiple pathways to complete educational requirements
- Expand Advanced Placement Course offerings in both school districts.
- Redesign STEM labs
- Provide additional behavior/mental support for students

The approach to meeting the project goals is understood. Each project is specific and with grant funding, can aide with increasing student achievement. The consortium has included provisions to make learning personalized for students. With the implementation of eleven career pathway programs, advanced course offerings, and non-traditional learning programs, the districts have demonstrated the importance to provide students with learning opportunities that are based on their academic needs and interest.

The consortium descriptions of classroom experiences are acceptable. They currently provide technology classroom experiences and non-traditional learning approaches and desire to enhance these programs. The professional development plan for teachers is clear. It is apparent that the school district desires to provide relevant learning opportunities for all stakeholders.

The applicants have fully addressed criteria A(1). Full points have been assigned.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

It is understood that all students will participate in the districts’ reform efforts. The grant applicants have provided several plans and timelines that describe the desire to increase student achievement . A total of 3,297 students will benefit from the proposed project. The LEAs have provided a list of schools that will be served in the project. This grant application provides appropriate descriptions of the total number of students served at each campus and also lists each school’s poverty level.

According to the school districts application, 49.59% of students are from low income families and a total of 59.39% of all students are considered high needs. The total number of educators participating in the plan is 275. The grant applicants have scored in the high range. Full points have been assigned.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

There are several quality plans within the grant application that includes overarching goals and deliverables. This grant application will serve all students and does not require scale-up efforts. It is clear that each project will enhance student learning outcomes. The districts have included a logic model that incorporates the concept that all can achieve with relationship building and collaboration (ABC) amongst all stakeholders. The seven projects within this grant application are justified. The districts have provided convincing evidence of a need and it is reasonable to believe that the goals in the application will improve student achievement. The applicants have scored high. Full points have been assigned.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Both school districts have provided relevant information on past performance on the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA), Keystone Exams, Group reading and Diagnostic Evaluation, DIBELS Next assessment, and Industry Standards-Based Competency Assessments. The data provided addresses past, current, and desired performance trends. The goals set by both school districts are ambitious and achievable. For example, during the 2011- 2012 school year, Bedford reported that special education students passing percentage on the reading PSSA was 23.7%. The school district desires to set the passing rate at 75% for the 2017 – 2018 school year. In addition, overall passing goals for all students combined for each test has been set to 90%. The goals for Otto-Eldred School District are similar to Bedford’s. It also desires to have 90% overall passing standards and in some areas, goals for special education and economically disadvantage students are expected to increase by more than 30 percentage points.

Efforts to close the achievement gaps in both school districts are sound. Data and logical methodology was used to determine how the district will strive to close achievement gaps.

Both school districts currently have ideal graduation rates. For the 2012 – 2013 school year Bedford's graduation rate for all students was 91.28% and for economically disadvantaged students it was 84.62%. For the 2017 – 2018 school year, the school district desires to have an overall graduation rate of 95% and has set an ambitious goal to have at least 90% of economically disadvantaged students graduate within four school years. Otto-Eldred School District's graduation rate for all students were 95% and for economically disadvantaged students it was 86%. For the 2017 – 2018 school year, the school district desires to have an overall graduation rate of 100% and has set an ambitious goal to have all (100%) of economically disadvantaged students to graduate within four school years.

Goals set for college enrollment are sound. Upon completion of the grant cycle the grant applicants desires to increase college enrollment by at least ten percentage points.

It is clear that both school districts desires to increase student performance. With the establishment of career goals aligned with student interest, increased opportunities to obtain credits beyond the traditional classroom setting, sound professional development, and collaborative efforts to strength communication and mental health services, the applicants' projects can be accomplished. The applicants have clearly outlined how all goals will improve student outcomes. Full points have been assigned.

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	11
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>Both school districts have provided some evidence of clear track record of success in the form of written description. The grant applicants lack specific evidence of advancing student learning in equity of teaching for the past four years as defined in this notice. Bradford notes that it has consistently met AYP status for the seventh year. The school district states that it has also outperformed the state in all subjects on the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment but does not indicate how many years it has outperformed the state. Bradford states that it has steadily increased the total number of students graduating since the 2001 – 2002 school year and that the AYP attendance rate has exceeded the Pennsylvania attendance rate for the past four school years. The Otto-Eldred evidence of a clear track record of success is sparse. The school district notes that it has made AYP each year since 2003 and that it has also exceeded graduation rates.</p> <p>The school district s do not clearly provide raw data on how it has closed achievement gaps and increased college enrollment for the past four years. Although there are no low-achieving schools in the school districts, there is no compelling evidence on how the school districts provided assistance to those schools that did not score as high as other schools nor did it addressed efforts to improve instruction for relevant IEP and ED subgroups.</p> <p>Throughout other sections of this grant application it is clear that applicants provide parents, students, and educators access to data systems and the data is used consistently to improve participation, instruction, and services.</p> <p>The applicants has scored in the mid-range. Eleven points have been assigned.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The consortium states that school expenditures including personnel salaries are reportable but there is a lack of evidence on how this information is reported. There is no evidence within the grant application of how each district reports non-personnel expenditures.</p> <p>The districts provide information on budgets are distributed at monthly school board meetings. This information is also posted on district websites. In addition, yearly audits are shared with the Board of Directors and community at school board meetings.</p> <p>Information about transparency in each LEA's process, practices, and investments is vague. The applicants have scored in the mid-range due to a lack of clear evidence on how school level is reported . Three points have been assigned.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	7

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Each school district has established autonomy with the creation of Cyber and Career and Technical Education Program but an explanation on how the autonomy was created was not provided by the school districts. The district also states that it has the freedom to personalize learning for all students. It is impressive that the school districts provide feedback to all teachers on the state teacher evaluation tool, regardless of ratings. The school districts do not provide clear evidence on how each school district has freedom from the State in creating school schedules or conducts hiring practices. The applicant lacks specific evidence on criteria B(3). Seven points have been assigned.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	7
--	-----------	----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Within this grant application is a brief description of the engagement efforts of all stakeholders to create the RTTT-D application. Both school districts state that key central staff personnel met to review the grant guidance and requirements.

This applicant is in a collective bargaining state and has the signature of the local representative. The applicants state that meetings and outreach efforts were held at the campus level to present the grant and to identify personalized learning gaps to instructional staff and community members. The applicant does not provide details on direct teacher engagement in creating the application.

Parent engagement in grant efforts was noted through meetings, surveys, and conferences. The applicants do not state the purpose of the surveys in reference to creating the grant. The application lack evidence of how parents and students were actively involved in creating the grant application.

Strong written support has been included in the grant application. The applicants have support for community organizations, the University of Pittsburgh Bradford, the Parent Teacher Organization, fifteen educators within the school districts, and five parents.

The applicant has scored in the mid-range. Seven points have been assigned.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

There are several plans and timelines included in this grant application with some aspects that are considered high-quality. It is apparent that the school districts have a desire to increase opportunities to have all stakeholders provide input how to address student achievement. Part of the goals of the consortium is to implement personalized learning plans.

Collaboration efforts are sound and the goal to have parents and students take part in ensuring that student interest and goals are the first priority in increasing student academic performance is reasonable. With implementation of EPortfolios, it is clear that the decision making processes held on school campuses will be made with the inclusion of real time data.

The LEAs desire to implement STEM labs. Authentic learning experiences in science, technology, engineering, math, and art are well described in the application. The districts' desire to ensure that the labs are developed with consideration of student's personalized interest is clear.

The Blended, cyber and alternative learning programs also are designed to assist students with achieving personalized goals. It is clear that students will have opportunities to be self advocates in selecting classes and school programs that will meet their needs. A copy of the personalized learning plan has been included in the grant application. It is evident that adults in this community desire to utilize the plan to assist all students become successful from elementary through graduation. The student voice section of the plan allows students to select three academic, career, and personal goals. Also included in the plan is a section where student are required address what they will do after high school completion. The school districts state that common core standards have been implemented at all school campuses. All plans are appropriately aligned with college and career goals as defined in the grant notice.

The consortium currently provides students with alternatives to attend school beyond the traditional school setting. The LEAs also offer expanded learning opportunities through enrichment and leadership activities. Implementation of school academies is justified. Students will engage in deep learning and it is evident that the LEAs appropriately address how teachers will design interventions to assist struggling learners.

The applicants' inclusion of how they plans to exposure students to different cultures is not described in the grant application. Information on diversity is only mentioned in the appendix on a HEAT alignment teacher walkthrough form as an expectation for what is to be observed. How the applicants will introduce multiple perspectives to deepen learning is lacking from the grant application.

All projects have included an aspect of mentoring, collaboration, teamwork, creativity, and problem solving. School projects are designed to be equitable, will provide appropriate interventions for struggling learners, include aspects of technology, have provisions to address multiple contents/courses in one setting, and provide students with leadership opportunities.

As sated above, parents and students will be actively engaged in deciding what courses and goals students will take. It is ambitious of the LEAs to introduce personalized plans in elementary and keep the same plan through completion of high school.

The approach to learning is unique. Students have multiple opportunities to be successful in both traditional and not traditional settings. Online learning classes are offered in both school districts to a limited number of students but the LEAs are committed to expanding its current program in alignment with the needs of students.

According to the LEAs, parents, teachers, and students meet to discuss student progress. How parents participate in conferences has been appropriately described. It is sound that the districts discuss student data and goal setting progress on multiple occasions throughout the school year.

Throughout the application the grant applicants discusses ED and students with IEPs as the two subgroups of students that are the lowest performing. The grant applicants lack a specific plan on how it will provide accommodations and offer high-quality instruction to help ensure that they are on track to meet college and career readiness standards.

A description provided on how students will be able to monitor student data is sound. Students will learn how to read data during homeroom classes. It is appropriate that during homeroom students will also have opportunities to receive advice and mentoring to ensure that they understand how to manage their own learning.

This application lacks a timeline and deliverables and annual targets. The applicants do however, have a timeline of project implementation and responsible parties but the timelines do not describe how implementation will take place on each campus. The applicant has scored in the mid-range. Fifteen points have been assigned.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	15
--	-----------	-----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The literacy plan submitted by the school districts is extensive. Within the plan is a concise list of professional development goals for teachers. Teachers are required to attend curriculum planning meetings by grade levels, attend professional development on literacy and writing that is taught in conjunction with the Teacher's College in New York, and training is provided on how to implement child centered instruction. The school districts meet regularly with students during homeroom to review personalized plans. The concept to observe teachers on how they monitor student engagement is sound. The school districts have included their walkthrough observation tool called HEAT (Higher order thinking, Engaged learning, Authenticity technology). This tool appropriately holds teachers accountable for student achievement.

The instructional plans in this application include strategies on how students will be engaged in learning. The school districts provided small group instruction, blended learning labs, flipped video classes, and cyber classes for courses not taught in the rural area. The leadership and team building opportunities described in the application are unique. The concept that students will earn digital badges is creative and foster a since of responsibility and student accountability.

Data meetings are held to guide instruction. In addition to state assessments, the school districts appropriately administer common assessment to monitor student progress. The goal to introduce multiple learning styles to students, displays the vested interest the districts have in individualizing learning. The goal to require all high school to complete a graduation project and the concept of expecting all to progress monitors student achievement and goal setting using career cruising programs twice a year is realistic. The LEAs state that local teacher and principal evaluations include a data component and require student learning objectives to be a measure of effectiveness. Also, the intent to provide all teachers feedback on observations displays a mindset that all can improve and perfect best practices.

Although there are plans to provide content specific to student academic needs and interests, this application lacks clear evidence on what actionable information is available that helps educators identify optimal learning approaches. The applicants do state that students that perform below level on benchmark exams are match with a specific teacher based on their needs. The grant applicants utilize a number assessments to measure and monitor student progress. Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA), Keystone Exams, Group reading and Diagnostic Evaluation, DIBELS Next assessment, and Industry Standards-Based Competency Assessments are given to students in addition to benchmarks and common assessments. The resources described are of high quality and are aligned with college and career standards.

Feedback is given to students as they meet to review learning profiles.

The applicants fail to address how special education and limited English students are given accommodations inside and outside the traditional classroom setting.

The LEAs have included the evaluation tool used with principals, teachers, and the superintendent. All forms appropriately address student achievement and progress. The idea the districts have to discuss data four times a year as a district is ambitious and provides an understanding of the goal to provide training and continuous improvement to all stakeholders. Teachers receive ongoing professional development on blended learning environments. There is a lack of specificity on how teachers are trained to close achievement gaps.

Both districts state that all teachers are highly effective as defined by the state's department of education.

The applicant has scored in the mid-range. Fifteen points have been assigned.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	7
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicants do not clearly state how each LEA's central office provides support to participating schools. There is limited information in the plan that assigns key goals, deliverables, and responsible parties that will ensure project implementation. The school districts do note that they have Board of Directors, Superintendents, Human Resource Directors, and fiscal departments that review resources and staffing. It is not clear how all these stakeholders provide direct leadership at the campus level.</p> <p>Each school district's campuses require that teachers participate in professional learning communities. It is sound that the teachers collaborate weekly to analyze data and share instructional practices. This grant application lacks evidence of how each school has flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars nor does it address if campuses have flexibility in creating school budgets.</p> <p>Students are given diverse opportunities within the school districts to earn credit. It is impressive that the rural communities provide opportunities outside the surrounding area for students to earn credit virtually.</p> <p>The idea to allow students to complete projects to demonstrate mastery is sound. Students also are able to demonstrate what they have learned through common assessments.</p> <p>There is some evidence within the grant application on how each LEA provides services to students with disabilities only during the school day. Sufficient evidence on inclusion and utilization of the Read 180 program has been appropriately described. The applicants lacks evidence of how it meets the needs of limited English learners.</p> <p>The applicants have scored in the mid-range. Seven points have been assigned.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>How the school districts provide access to resources outside the school are appropriately described. It is impressive that low income students are given the opportunity to check out technology for the entire school year to complete assignments. It is also impressive that the school districts work with the community to provide internet access to those who cannot afford personal at home connections. The districts' states that they post online tutorials on how to access and read EPortfolios. The school districts outreach efforts to establish relationships with parents are unique. They provide parents with training support during the evenings and weekends to accommodate working schedules. Also, parents and students have access to ESchoolbook, a site provides confidential access to parents to monitor student grades, attendance, and more. Providing this access is opening the lines of communication with all stakeholders.</p> <p>There is a clear description of the Interoperable systems used to access personnel files, attendance, child accounting, fund accounting and payroll. A different system is used to access data. The applicants note that they would like to enhance current systems with RTTT-D funding. The applicants have fully addressed this criteria and full points have been assigned.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There are several plans in this application that address project goals. These plans lack evidence of how timely feedback will be provided and plans also lacks specific details on types of deliverables that will be shared with the public. The plan included does not ensuring communication can be given to responsible parties. The applicants do state that information will be shared with students and parents utilizing learning profiles and that a RTTT-D website will be created to report accomplishments obstacles, and reporting of revenue and expenditures. This criteria has been partially met. Five points have been assigned.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This application has extensive plans to communicate with parents and community members. There is a lack of evidence of responsible parties and a clear timeline on how these tasks will be accomplished. It is clear that district desires to communicate with parents and students throughout the school year. A description of the forms of communication with parents is sound. Evidence has been provided that parents will hear information at PTA meetings, through newsletters and on the school website. It is not clear in the plan provided who will be responsible for updating this information.</p> <p>The LEAs will meet with educators on a bi-weekly basis. The idea that principals will share RTTT-D information weekly is sound.</p> <p>The form of communication with the community is confusing. It is not clear which administrator with provide RTTT-D progress.</p> <p>The applicants have partially met this criteria. Three points have been assigned.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicants state in a previous section that all educators are highly effective but there is a lack of evidence supporting this in the table provided in E(3). This grant application list several performance measures and some are not ambitious. Also, there is limited information on the rationale for selecting each measure. Currently, the school district notes that four percent of students with IEPs complete a FAFSA. Upon completion of the grant cycle, the districts only desire to have this increase by six percentage points. There is a lack of information in the grant application of the review process that will be used to measure project effectiveness.</p> <p>Goals to ensure that students are on track to college and career readiness are appropriate. Upon completion of the grant cycle the district desire to have ninety percent of all students on target as defined in this measure.</p> <p>The applicant s have scored in the mid range. Three points have been assigned.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The description of funding for professional development to improve instruction is realistic. The literacy plans outlined in this grant application are created to provide quality instruction to students. Efforts to monitor attendance and student behavior are sound. It is notable that the district will work with public libraries to promote a love of reading. This effort will increase collaborative efforts and raise student achievement. The application describes it will monitor administrator and principal effectiveness but there is no evidence describe how feedback on the project will be received from students, parents, and teachers.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A budget table is included in the grant application that appropriately describes funds that decrease year of the grant cycle. All expenditures described are reasonable and realistic. The applicant clearly states which expenditures are onetime costs. Earlier in the grant application the applicants note that the director of federal funds will oversee the RTTT-D grant initiatives. In the budget section there is a description of a RTTT-D grant coordinator. It is not clear if the personal described in the budget section is the same person described above. If this is the case, it is not understood why additional funding allocated for this position. The applicants have scored in the mid-range. Seven points have been assigned.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Most of the projects that will be implemented in the school district require training that will be fully implemented and funded by year three of the grant cycle. Most investment also focus specifically on college and career readiness and are considered one time investments. The description of each project and how each project will be funded upon completion of the grant cycle is sound. Funding for science labs is stated to be supported from science department budgets and the challenger learning center will be funded by donated funds. Full points have been assigned.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This application lacks specific evidence of this priority. No points have been assigned.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Bradford Area School District and the Otto Eldred School District have partnered to submit a thoroughly described plan to provide authentic learning opportunities for students in Pennsylvania. There are several goals included in the application. The approach to meeting the project goals is understood. Each project is specific and with grant funding, can aide with increasing student achievement. The consortium has included provisions to make learning personalized for students. With the implementation of eleven career pathway programs, advanced course offerings, and non-traditional learning programs, the districts have demonstrated the importance to provide students with learning opportunities that are based on their academic needs and interest.</p> <p>According to the school districts application, 49.59% of students are from low income families and a total of 59.39% of all students are considered high needs. The total number of educators participating in the plan is 275.</p> <p>It is clear that the school districts desires to increase student performance. With the establishment of career goals aligned with student interest, increased opportunities to obtain credits beyond the traditional classroom setting, sound professional development, and collaborative efforts to strength communication and mental health services, the applicants' projects can be accomplished. The Blended, cyber and alternative learning programs also are designed to assist students with achieving personalized goals. It is clear that students will have opportunities to be self advocates in selecting classes and school programs that will meet their needs. A copy of the personalized learning plan has been included in the grant application. It is evident that adults in this community desire to utilize the plan to assist all students become successful from elementary through graduation. The student voice section of the plan allows students to select three academic, career, and personal goals. Also included in the plan is a section where student are required address what they will do after high school completion. The school districts state that common core standards have been implemented at all school campuses. All plans are appropriately aligned with college and career goals as defined in the grant notice.</p>		

Throughout sections of this grant application it is clear that applicants provide parents, students, and educators access to data systems and the data is used consistently to improve participation, instruction, and services.

The LEAs have included the exultation tool used with principals, teachers, and the superintendent. All forms appropriately address student achievement and progress. The idea the districts have to discuss data four times a year as a district is ambitious and provides an understanding of the goal to provide training and continuous improvement to all stakeholders. Teachers receive ongoing professional development on blended learning environments.

The goals set by the consortium to increase student achievement are ambitious. Projects were created with the goal to prepare students for high school and for college and careers. The applicant has addressed absolute priority one.

Total	210	152
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0208PA-3 for Bradford Area School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(A)(1) The proposal developed by the consortium (Bradford and Otto-Eldred school districts) presents a comprehensive and coherent vision that (a) Builds on its work in RTT-D's four core educational assurance areas; (b) Articulates a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests; and (c) Describes what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments. Its vision for personalizing education is guided by the underlying belief that "all students - no matter the diversity - should have the opportunity to achieve their 'American Dream'." The proposal's ABC vision comprises three elements: (A) Achievement: to transform traditional approaches of teaching and learning to personalize education for all students, ensuring individual success toward academic, social, emotional and physical goals; (B) Belonging: to build relationships with students to assure they identify with and value the education process resulting in positive student outcomes; and (C) Collaboration: students, teachers, parents, and the community become equal partners in supporting the emotional and academic needs of students. To accomplish this, the consortium would pursue four goals:

- 1) Transform traditional approaches to teaching and learning to personalize education for all students.
- 2) Increase leadership capacity to build district-wide systems of time and support for students and families.
- 3) Eliminate the barriers that cause the Opportunity/Achievement gaps.
- 4) Mitigate the effects of impoverished rural communities.

To pursue these goals, the proposal enumerates seven Projects:

1. Implement a student-centered Personalized Learning Model that will focus on individual student needs.
2. Design 21st Century learning environments that allow equitable access to learning and where students experience relevant, real-world content.
3. Offer multiple pathways of personalized learning to include a district Cyber program for non-traditional learners, an

Alternative Learning Program, and Flip classrooms.

4. Career Pathways

5. College Pathways

6. To implement and expand STEM initiatives to personalize learning for all students by building background knowledge and providing access to activities of personalized interest.

7. Implement a school-based behavioral/mental health program that supports students.

The descriptions of the goals and projects are well developed, linked to the districts' strengths and needs, and aligned with RTT-D foci.

(SCORE: HIGH - 10)

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

10

10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(A)(2) The proposal lays out a logical, manageable implementation approach. Guided by the belief that to impact student achievement through personalized education, it is necessary to target all grades to provide a continuum of learning experiences, the consortium will serve all its schools (4 in Bradford and 2 in Otto-Eldred) and all 3,297 students in these schools. Low-income families represent 49.59 % and high needs students represent 59.39% of participating students. Overall, 275 educators will participate in the project. The proposal provides detailed data on each school. (SCORE: HIGH - 10)

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

10

8

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

(A)(3) The elements of a high quality plan for meaningful consortium-wide transformation are evident throughout the proposal. From the beginning, the proposed grant initiative would engage all students in the consortium's two districts ; therefore, a district-wide scale-up plan is not applicable. The project manifests a clear theory of action (as reflected in narrative for (A)(1) as well as a flow diagram in that section, and brief discussion in the present section). In its discussion of its "roll-out plan," the proposal refers to an appendix, Dissemination of Race to the Top Plan. This appendix provides a plan for disseminating the proposed project to all stakeholders. This planning information relates more to communications than to overall project implementation that should include the time line for each of the seven major projects -- hence the reduction in points. (SCORE: HIGH - 8).

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

10

8

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(A)(4)

Overall, the proposal does an excellent job of setting ambitious yet achievable annual performance targets. However, in a few instances there appear to be slight inconsistencies, and the college-going goals for special education students seem potentially overly ambitious.

(A)(4)(a) Separate annual performance targets are set for the consortium's two districts: Bradford and Otto-Eldred. Goals for performance on summative assessments (state assessments, keystone exams, Group Reading Assessment and Diagnostic Evaluation, DIBELS Next, and industry standards-based assessment) are provided by subject (reading, math, science, writing), grade level groupings, subgroups (special education, economically disadvantaged), by year. The goals seem ambitious yet achievable, especially in light of the relatively high but unsteady baseline figures.

(A)(4)(b) Targets for reducing achievement gaps were apparently derived by comparing the projected performance of the two subgroups (special education or IEP and Economically Disadvantaged) against the district-wide projections. The numbers are generally consistent, except that some entries for the Bradford district for 2017-18 seem inconsistent with the assessment performance targets for that district.

(A)(4)(c) The high school graduation rates for the consortium districts are very high, and the projections are for small annual increases in this rate. Note, however, that one district set more ambitious graduation targets than the other.

(A)(4)(d) One consortium district's annual college enrollment goals are consistent with its state assessment goals.

However, the other district's college enrollment experience and goals for economically disadvantaged students seem inconsistent with the assessment data and goals. Only one of the two districts set goals for special education (IEP) students; these seem potentially overly ambitious and could have benefited from explanation.

(A)(4)(e) Neither of the consortium's districts has access to data on postsecondary degree attainment.

(SCORE: HIGH - 8)

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	15
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(B)(1) Relative to other districts in the state, both of the consortium's districts have performed at high levels over the last decade.</p> <p>Most of the discussion in this section applies to Bradford. In 2012, Bradford made "Made AYP" status for the seventh consecutive year. Bradford collectively outperformed the state in all subject areas including Mathematics, Reading, Science, and Writing. Moreover, each of Bradford's four schools has met AYP. For grades 4 - 8, The District Value Added Reports indicated that Bradford exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth in both math and reading. Bradford's graduation rate has grown continually from 77% in 2001-02 to 92.5% in 2012. The district attributes this improvement to interventions such as credit recovery, and online learning solutions. Bradford's attendance rate of 94.5% exceeded the state target of 90%.</p> <p>While the proposal does not present college enrollment data, the proposal notes that the district was honored by the College Board with a place on the 2nd Annual AP Honor Roll for simultaneously increasing access to AP coursework and increasing the percentage of students earning scores of 3 or higher on AP exams. Since 2009, the Bradford Area High School increased the number of students participating in AP from 77 to 100 while improving the percentage of students earning AP Exam scores of 3 or higher from 31% in 2009 to 54% in 2011.</p> <p>Bradford's partner, the Otto-Eldred School District, has made AYP status each year since 2003. Moreover the district has exceeded the AYP minimum graduation and attendance rates every year.</p> <p>The proposal does not discuss the extent to which either district achieved ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools or in its low-performing schools. However, all schools in both districts have shown adequate annual progress over time.</p> <p>(SCORE: HIGH - 15)</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(B)(2)</p> <p>A high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments entails, at minimum, a description of the extent to which the applicant already makes available the following four categories of school-level expenditures from State and local funds: (a) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff; (b) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only; (c) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only; and (d) Actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level (if available). The proposal states, "The districts provide unlimited access to all fiscal matters through the Pennsylvania Right to Know Act. Any person or entity has the right to file a Right to Know request with a 5 day mandated response time from the district. All school level expenditures including personnel salaries and expenditures are reportable." The implication is that detailed financial data are not readily available to the public. The use of Right to Know requests constitutes a very low level of transparency. A high level of transparency would involve making such salary and expenditure data readily available by school, for example, on the district's website. (SCORE: LOW - 1)</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

(B)(3) The proposal notes that its key proposed actions are consistent with state policies and practices. Actions that would be undertaken to personalize education for all students are already in place to a limited degree in both districts and have, accordingly, been approved by the state. The state has adopted the Common Core Standards and the consortium district's curriculum is aligned with these standards. As required by NCLB, all consortium teachers are "highly qualified" (but not using the RTT-D definition). Beginning 2013, both districts will use the state's new teacher-evaluation system, which is aligned with RTTT.

Moreover, the initiatives described in the consortium's proposal meet the criteria set forth in the state's RTTT initiative:

- 1) Expand student and teacher access to quality courses and instructional resources to improve student achievement including STEM.
- 2) Provide easy access to meaningful student, school and district data for parents, educators and the general public to improve decision making.
- 3) Provide professional development to improve teacher and principal effectiveness.
- 4) Develop opportunities for alternative approaches to schooling to meet the changing needs of students and their families.

(SCORE: HIGH - 10)

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	13
--	-----------	-----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(B)(4) The consortium employed practical strategies for meaningfully engaging various stakeholders in the development process. In anticipation of the grant release the superintendents of both districts along with other key central office staff met to explore the feasibility of applying for the grant. The superintendents arranged meetings with school principals to present the vision for the grant and to identify personalized learning gaps at each site. Likewise, administrative staff reached out to guidance counselors, Career and Technical Education staff, teachers, and community members. Parent input was acquired through various meetings, surveys, and parent-teacher conferences. Of the 30 letters of support in the appendix, most are from educators in the Bradford district, and a few parents from both districts. All letters were positive and seemingly independent. Two points were deducted for the following reasons: (1) None of the letters of support were from educators from the Otto-Eldred district, thus it is not clear of the degree to which teachers from this district had input into the development of the proposal; and (2) While the teacher representatives of each district signed off on the proposal, no letters of support from the teacher organizations were included, which raises questions about the level of support from teachers. (SCORE: HIGH - 13)

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(C)(1) The proposal sketches an excellent plan for employing personalization of learning as a key approach to engaging and empowering all learners, in particular high-need students. Major tools for facilitating personalization include Personalized Learning Plans, ePortfolios, multiple pathways, mentoring, behavior/mental health component.

A Personalized (or Personal) Learning Plan will be completed by the student, parent or guardian, and their teacher. The Plan will identify a (1) Academic goal, (2) Career goal, and (3) Personal goal. The Personal Learning Plan for elementary school students will incorporate student academic results, attendance, and behavior. The goals will be reviewed at each parent and teacher meeting to monitor progress and revise over the year if necessary. The plan will follow each student to each grade level with an updated career path as he/she proceed through 12th grade.

ePortfolios will contain a purposeful collection of student work that will demonstrate learning outcomes, skills, and competencies. Students and parents will have access from home. Each student would have an ePortfolio at the start of 2014-15. Students would receive training during homeroom and/or from other teachers, the guidance counselor, or mentor on how to use ePortfolio data to monitor and manage their learning. Both districts will post a video on how to make effective use of various personalization tools.

Another key personalization strategy that the consortium would employ is multiple learning pathways. Examples include

blended learning, Cyber options, Alternative Program, and flipped classroom.

Using these personalization tools with the support of parents and educators, all students would (i) Understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals; (ii) Identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards, understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goals; (iii) be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest; and v) Master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving; The proposal does not discuss the extent to which use of these personalization tools would have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning.

With the support of parents and educators, the effective development and use of these personalization tools would provide each student access to (i) A personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals and ensure he or she can graduate on time and college- and career-ready; (ii) A variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments (i.e., multiple learning pathway) ; (iii) High-quality content aligned with college- and career-ready standards; (iv) Ongoing and regular personalized feedback regarding student progress and learning recommendations.

The proposal's personalization strategies also accommodate the needs of high-need students to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards. One approach is the multiple pathways mentioned above. In addition, high need students receive one-to-one support through the project's mentoring and behavioral/mental health components.

(SCORE: HIGH - 20)

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	17
--	-----------	-----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(C)(2) The proposal presents a high-quality plan for improving teaching and leading that helps educators to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards by enabling the full implementation of personalized learning and teaching for all students, in particular high-need students. The proposal's plan for improving teaching and leading builds on sound existing initiatives underway in both of the consortium's districts over the past five years.

All participating educators would engage in training, and in professional teams or communities, that supports their individual and collective capacity to implement personalized learning environments and strategies that address students' individual needs, interests, and learning approaches. Shifting the paradigm to a student-centered classroom has proved challenging, requiring substantial investments in technological resources, ongoing, sustained professional development for differentiated approaches to teaching, and data management for data driven decision making. Learning targets, assessments, and teacher effectiveness are now common language with high expectations for all staff and all students. The districts' current approach to professional development includes attendance at PDE conferences, teachers meeting in professional learning communities before and after school, job embedded support through instructional coaches, and attendance at summer institutes. All teachers participating in the proposed project would continue to participate in these professional development venues. Moreover, RTT-D funds would be used to aid teachers and principals: (1) define their roles in a student-centered learning model; and (2) identify the tools and resources available to create personalized learning environments.

All participating educators would have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements. All participating teachers would receive support in analyzing and using data to improve their practices. The consortium's districts have also used a variety of software designed to facilitate data analysis and teacher growth.

All participating school leaders and school leadership have training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and accelerates student progress. The consortium districts will be engaged in the state's transition to a new state-of-the-art system for evaluating the effectiveness of principals and teachers. (Value-added) teacher evaluation data will become available beginning 2015-16 for ascertaining the number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, whose teacher of record and principal are a highly effective teacher and a highly effective principal. In addition, the consortium districts use classroom modeling across all grade levels and disciplines. District funds support substitute teachers to provide coverage for teachers so they can observe other teachers that are successfully implementing strategies to differentiate instruction for both struggling and accelerated students. "Learning Walks" are conducted by teachers and administrators from other buildings to help build cohesive practices throughout the district.

The applicant has a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals including in hard-to-staff schools, in subjects (such as mathematics and science), and specialty areas (such as special education). All participating teachers are Highly Qualified as defined by the Pennsylvania Dept. of Education (PDE). The state's newly adopted Teacher Evaluation and Differentiated Supervision Plan will use multiple data sources to identify teachers' strengths and weaknesses. Individualized professional development plans will assure each teacher receives the support and education required to become highly effective.

While the proposed actions for improving teaching and leading are comprehensive and coherent, the proposal would have benefited from clearer specification of the time table for implementing the various professional development and related initiatives. (SCORE: HIGH 17)

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	13

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(D)(1) (a) The proposal is developed by two small districts to serve all their students. Thus, the superintendents of these districts were instrumental in designing the proposals and insuring they were aligned with District and state policy. The smallness of the consortium's school districts facilitates real-time, organic support from the central offices (e.g., leadership, technology, and human resources).

(b) In both districts, teachers at each school are required to participate in grade-level professional learning communities one day per week to gather, analyze and summarize student data and to share instructional strategies. Moreover, each school must convene bi-monthly "whole group meetings" where teachers of all grade levels come together collectively to discuss instructional strategies, curriculum, assessments, and make changes as necessary. Lead teachers (characterized by excellent teaching and leadership skills) are appointed at each building. They work with administrators to offer "direction" in curriculum and materials, professional development and educational resources, and research-based teaching strategies. This input yields building and grade-level decisions regarding staffing needs and school-level budget expenditures. Thus, while both districts require schools to implement practices such as school leadership teams, it is not clear how much flexibility individual schools have in creating or designing such practices. Moreover, it is not clear what level of autonomy individual schools have in making human-resource decisions.

(c) and (d) In 2010, both districts instituted mastery as the goal of all students. Mastery is gauged using Common Assessments at all grade levels. At the classroom level, students may also complete project-based assignments which could be used as basis for evaluating mastery in lieu of traditional tests. Students are accorded weekly opportunities to show mastery.

(e) The districts offer an array of learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities. (No mention is made of English Learners or students in poverty.) Examples include: Response to Instruction and Intervention teams at each school, operation of pre-K classrooms (6 in one district and 2 in the other), multi-sensory approach to reading (Read 180), school wide positive behavior and support (SWPBIS), participation in the state's Verbal Behavior Project (for students with autism), and the use of assistance technology devices (e. g., Smart Boards and iPads).

(SCORE: HIGH – 13)

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	9
---	-----------	----------

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(D)(2) The proposal has a high-quality implementation plan in which the two districts and their related infrastructures strongly support efforts to fully engage students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders in personalized learning. The districts already have many tools in place to ensure that students, parents, and educators have ready access to the resources they need to achieve their educational goals. Some RTT-D funding would be used to expand or improve this support.

(a) To ensure students and parents have adequate and equitable access to instructional resources, the districts already have in place the following: eSchoolbook (used by teachers to enter and maintain student grades, assignments, attendance, etc.), Student Resource Center, District web page, online instructional videos (Teacher Tube, Blended Schools Network). The proposed project would expand efforts to close the opportunity gap by providing students and parents

anywhere/anytime access to their online ePortfolios and Personalized Learning Plans. Students and parents will receive support on how to use these tools through online videos and on-site district information trainings. Because over 50% of students are low-income, technology devices will be available for students and families to sign out for the school year. The districts will partner with local organizations to ensure internet accessible locations are available after school hours to low-income students that may not have connections in their home. Career Centers will have extended hours beyond the school day and on weekends to accommodate all parents. The districts will also provide transportation per request for students and parents to use the Career Centers.

(b) The districts will provide all students with the technical resources and support to effectively participate in learning activities. Support will be provided in areas such as: accessing blended learning coursework, accessing and using ePortfolios. Support will be provided through various means, including online tutorials and mentors.

Throughout the school year, parents will be invited to technical support trainings covering various topics. Trainings will be offered during evenings and on weekends. If requested, the districts will provide transportation for the weekend trainings. Parents will be able to request one-to-one support. Online tutorials will provide unlimited training access for all parents. The Career Center will have extended hours.

(c) The OnHand Schools data management program would be enhanced to provide ePortfolios for every student containing multiple sources of purposeful data pulled from existing databases. All data will be downloaded in an open format. Parents and students' current use of the eSchoolbook system will help ease transition to the more comprehensive data system.

(d) Both districts currently use interoperable data systems that include a customized database system for Personnel, Attendance, Child Accounting, Fund Accounting, and Payroll along with multiple Pennsylvania databases of student assessment data. Among other things, these systems facilitate reporting to the state as well as grant development.

While the plan presented in this section of the proposal does an excellent job of describing actions, the time table and responsibilities for implementing various actions are not always apparent. To determine if timelines were described elsewhere in the proposal, the reviewer searched the proposal for planning information regarding one of the program components described above: mentoring program. During the first year of implementation of the mentoring program, three mentors would be contracted to establish and implement the program. Once the program is established, oversight would be provided by the district and the community. District administrative interns will provide oversight as part of their internship at no cost. Funds initially would be used for startup cost for program development and staff training. At close of the grant, the consortium intends to transfer ownership of the program to the community Alumni Association to sustain with local funding.

(SCORE: HIGH – 9)

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>(E)(1) The proposal describes a high-quality plan for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. The consortium (both districts) will use extant means associated with its continuous learning model to provide timely feedback on project progress to key stakeholders. These include: grade level and school-level learning communities, monthly district level meetings where administrators jointly perform district-learning walks and instructional data, and monthly school board meetings. With RTT-D funds, both districts would create an access app on their webpage where parents, students, and community members could get up-to-date RTT-D progress and management reports (accomplishments, obstacles, revenue and expenditures). An appendix includes a detailed plan for disseminating information to stakeholders that includes 14 objectives and a specification of the target population, timeline, and persons responsible for each objective. As an example, one objective is for District instructional coaches to present to building and district administrators, teachers, and instructional coaches, on an ongoing basis, evidence regarding the impact of RTTT.</p> <p>(SCORE: HIGH - 15)</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:		

(E)(2) The proposal presents a high-quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. To this end, the consortium would use a variety of methods. Parents would receive information about the project through standard school events (e.g., Open House, parent/teacher conferences), PTA meetings, district-wide Parent Involvement Committee, newsletters, webpage, and parent committees. Educators would be kept abreast of project developments through weekly grade level and bi-weekly building level meetings. Principals would also include RTT-D updates in their weekly meetings. Central office administrators would include an RTT-D update on the monthly board agenda. A RTT-D chat room will be formed to facilitate the collaboration of staff from both districts. The broader community would obtain project information through attendance at school board meetings or the consortium's (districts') website. An appendix includes a detailed plan for disseminating information to stakeholders that includes 14 objectives and a specification of the target population, timeline, and persons responsible for each objective. As an example, one objective is for the principal for Curriculum and Assessment along with OE Coaches to share the goals and objectives of RTTT proposal with building and district administrators and instructional coaches. This would be done first in July 2014 at the district annual data retreat and would be done each summer thereafter.

(SCORE: HIGH - 5)

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

5

3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

(E)(3) In general, the proposal presents ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures. However, in a few cases goals were either not presented or seemed inconsistent. Examples follow.

Because of the state's transition to a new state-of-the-art system for evaluating the effectiveness of principals and teachers, data will not be available until 2015-16 for ascertaining the number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, whose teacher of record and principal are a highly effective teacher and a highly effective principal. As a result, the consortium did not create performance goals for this measure. However, given that the consortium districts are participating in the state pilot, despite the unavailability of baseline data, presumably the districts know enough about the new system to set preliminary/provisional goals regarding the number and percentage of effective and highly effective principals and teachers.

In some tables, some of the text is incomplete (i. e., cut off at the bottom of table). Therefore, parts of the section could not be reviewed.

In Otto-Eldred School District, some data tables indicate that, in some cases, economically disadvantaged (ED) students perform at a higher level than All students. As a result, oddly the district's performance goals which are set to close the performance gaps between All students and ED students may be interpreted as getting the rest of the district up to the level of ED students.

In Otto-Eldred, some of the entries for grades 4-8 seem inconsistent. For science, the baseline percent of students scoring proficient on PSSA is about the same for economically disadvantaged and the district as a whole. However, going forward, higher annual goals are set for ED students than for the District as a whole. For 5th and 8th grade writing, baseline gap in percent proficient for ED and All students is 8 percentage points. However, the target for the subsequent year (SY 2013-14) would widen the gap.

Regarding the setting of goals for the percent of students who complete and submit the FAFSA form, given that Bradford's performance goals (if achieved) would close the achievement gap, it is not clear why the FAFSA form completion goal for the ED subgroup is lower than that for all students.

For Bradford's targets for percent of 9-12 grade participating students who meet or exceed proficiency standards in literature, oddly the SY 2014-15 goal for ED students is the same as the goal set for the prior year, while the goals for other groups (All students, Spec Ed) project growth of about 5 percentage points.

In some cases, the rationales for applicant-proposed measures are provided in the proposal (e.g., Increase percentage of students in Grades 4 through 8 performing proficient or advanced on the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment in Reading). In some cases, the rationales for applicant-proposed measures (e.g., Social –Emotional Leading Indicator for grades 4 -8 = Decrease the number of incidents associated with misconducts as measured by the Pennsylvania Safe Schools ACS and School Profile by 10% each year.) seem implicit.

The proposal does not explicitly discuss how the various measures will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern. Nor does the proposal describe how the consortium will review and, as necessary, improve performance measures over time.

(SCORE: MED - 3)

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

5

1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(E)(4) The proposal does not present a high-quality plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of RTT-D funded activities. The proposal indicates that data in the consortium's student information/assessment systems would be used to link multiple measures of student progress in areas of academics, attendance, and behavior to activities funded with RTT-D money. However, the section does not provide a plan that enumerates specific questions regarding the evaluation of the effectiveness of the consortium's RTT-D initiative, what methods/procedures would be used to pursue answers to these questions, who would conduct the evaluation, and the time table for implementing the evaluation. (SCORE - LOW - 1)

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>(F)(1) In general, the budget pages are well-structured and coherent. Together with the project budget narratives in section (F)(2), the documentation provides thorough detail on the overall budget and the budget for each of the projects (7 in the narrative, 7 + 1 in the budget) for each of the project years. The budget details all funds, including large levels of funding from other sources. The budget seems reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal. Moreover, the budget provides clear, thoughtful rationales for investments and priorities.</p> <p>However, in a few instances budget entries were inconsistent or unclear. Some examples follow: (1) According to the project overview in Section (F)(2), the first year budget includes dollars for teacher extra service to help insure all students will have a Personal Learning Plan and Career Portfolio by May 30, 2014. However, the actual budget includes no first-year funding for this purpose. According to the budget, funding for teacher extra pay begins in Year 2; and (2) the narrative in (F)(2) states that 3 SmartLabs will be purchased. However, the budget indicates that 5 SmartLabs will be purchased. Overall, these inconsistencies, though small in number, resulted in a 2-point reduction.</p> <p>(SCORE: HIGH - 8)</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	10
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>(F)(2) The proposal provides a very good plan for sustaining the project's goals after the RTT-D grant ends. The section provides an excellent discussion of the purpose, rationale governing the use of RTT-D resources to fund each of the seven core projects over the life of the initiative and, as applicable, plans for sustaining each of the projects. The discussion of sustainability begins with the key guiding premise that the proposed project was designed to build upon the participating districts' current infrastructure without adding new components that could not be sustained at the close of the grant. Some projects would be sustained through district funds (e.g., ongoing professional development regarding personal learning plans). Some projects would be sustained through federal dollars such as Title 1 (e.g., retain 1 of the 5 technology coaches to provide PD and technical support for the initiative to design 21st Century learning environments that allow equitable access to learning and where students experience relevant, real-world content.) Some projects required one-time funding only and thus do not require additional resources to be sustained once the grant ends (e.g., Junior Achievement Program).</p> <p>The plan does not explicitly discuss how the consortium will evaluate the effectiveness of each of the seven projects and then use this information to inform the sustainability plan. Note that because the project's plan for evaluating the effectiveness of project investments was covered in section (E)(4), the quality of this plan was not accorded significant weight in the reviewer's evaluation of the proposal's sustainability plan.</p> <p>(SCORE: HIGH - 10)</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

--	--	--

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY (SCORE: 0) Proposal does not include a response to the Competitive Preference Priority.		

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: ABSOLUTE PRIORITY 1 <p>The proposal coherently and comprehensively addresses 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; accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student; increase the effectiveness of educators; expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.</p> <p>A key element of the consortium's ABC vision is the goal of transforming traditional approaches of teaching and learning to personalize education for all students, ensuring individual success toward academic, social, emotional and physical goals. Each of the proposal's seven projects would help the two districts pursue this goal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement a student-centered Personalized Learning Model that will focus on individual student needs. 2. Design 21st Century learning environments that allow equitable access to learning and where students experience relevant, real-world content. 3. Offer multiple pathways of personalized learning to include a district Cyber program for non-traditional learners, an Alternative Learning Program, and Flip classrooms. 4. Career Pathways 5. College Pathways 6. To implement and expand STEM initiatives to personalize learning for all students by building background knowledge and providing access to activities of personalized interest. 7. Implement a school-based behavioral/mental health program that supports students. (SCORE: MET)		

Total	210	176
--------------	------------	------------