



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0126KY-2 for Fayette County Public Schools

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>FCPS has instituted and proposed interventions that are in alignment with each of the four core educational assurances.</p> <p>1) Students are instructed and evaluated via curriculum that is aligned with Common Core State Standards;</p> <p>2) The district uses a tiered system of assessments that include student-level data analysis that measure student growth. The state launched a new assessment and accountability system in 2011-2012 which holds the district accountable for 5 areas 1) Achievement, 2) Gap, 3) Growth, 4) College/Career Readiness, 5) Graduation Rate;</p> <p>3) The district has a clear set of policies and practices in place to recruit and retain educators and administrators. These practices include mentoring, an aspiring leaders program, and individualized professional learning.</p> <p>4) FCPS has prepared a proposal that demonstrates that the district can impact their ability to turn around the lowest achieving schools. The district has restructured the central office, now organizes schools by cohort rather than level, and those most in need are assigned one director whose area of expertise is in supporting and developing low achieving schools.</p> <p>FCPS has articulated a clear and credible approach to accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity. The FCPS approach includes two intentional structures to meet the needs of personalized student support: Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) and Innovation Zone. MTSS incorporates Response to Intervention (RtI) and Positive Intervention and Supports (PBIS). Innovation Zone brings together diverse groups of stakeholders to develop new relevant and effective learning structures.</p> <p>Students take ownership of learning by developing Individual Learning Plans (ILPs) with the assistance of parents, mentors, coaches, and teachers. The plan is continuously evaluated by the student through the use of a dashboard. The ILPs have been in place for 6-12 grade students for 10 years. The proposal brings the ILPs to the elementary level. In meeting the ILP, teachers can design individualized lessons, develop innovative activities (such as the Genius Hour, where students use time to study areas of interest), students can engage in Quest-based learning (earning points and achievements by completing challenges), students develop personal learning networks, and have the opportunity for dual credit or online class participation.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>FCPS will begin the project with Cohort 1 schools. Cohort 1 schools consist of 11 elementary, middle and high schools. These schools were deliberately selected based on identified needs, innovative programs/strategies currently being piloted and implemented, and sustainability. The proposal discussed the selection criteria for participating schools, but the selection process was not clear. Additional schools will be added such that by year 4 all district schools will be included. More than 40% (44.5%) of participating students across the Cohort 1 schools are from low-income families.</p> <p>The demographics table includes each of the 11 schools.</p> <p>The School Demographics table includes the number of participating educators and number of participating students in each of the demographic categories.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The FCPS plan (A Vision for Success) includes 5 project areas: 1) Student Achievement, 2) Student Engagement and Safety, 3) Staff Development, 4) Parent/Family Engagement, 5) Business/Community Engagement. Initiatives within each project include Multi-Tiered System of Supports for each student, PBIS, blended learning, ILPs, the Leader in Me program, the Life Support program, and Kentucky's new Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES). The proposal references a preliminary MTSS implementation plan in the appendices, but the plan was not included in the appendix.

Building on the 5 project areas, the district has developed a specific goal, series of objectives, deliverables, and outcomes. Each of these elements can be found in narrative form. The proposal also includes a Project Management Plan Table. The table includes activities, deliverables, responsible party and year of implementation.

While the proposal absolutely reflects a high quality plan that can be scaled and translated into meaningful reform district wide, the timeline could have been presented more clearly. For example, several areas include training, but it is unclear as to when those training events will be conducted other than each year.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

FCPS identified the Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress (KPREP) in Reading, Math, and Science as its summative assessment. Status is determined by the percent proficient or distinguished, growth is measured by the growth in that number.

FCPS has committed to decreasing achievement gaps, in each instance (Reading, Math, Science) all subgroups are compared to the majority (white) group.

FCPS reports an overall graduation rate of 82.7% with slight variability in rates by subgroup with the exception of SpEd (52 point gap). The district has proposed significant, ambitious and achievable targets. For each of the subgroups the district will attempt to increase the graduation rate by 2-3 pts, with the exception of the Special Education group (7 points).

FCPS includes college enrollment rates that are ambitious and achievable. College enrollment rates are already relatively high (with the exception of Bryan Station HS). Rates are expected to increase no more than 2 to 5 pts each year.

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	9

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The percentage of district scoring at or above the proficient level on state core content assessments have steadily increased, the dropout rate has decreased and the graduation rate has increased. Additionally, the percentage of students meeting ACT college readiness benchmarks has increased. While there is some evidence of improvement the majority of district schools are in the Needs Improvement category of school classification, proficiency rates are relatively low and significant gaps exist.

The proposal indicates that the district provides targeted support to low performing schools through support teams. The proposal does not indicate which schools received this support, specifically what the support entails, and the impact.

Student performance data is available through the district student database, student ILPs, and CIITS. The district also recently added a new web-based data reporting system that increases access. The district is now in the process of developing dashboards which are updated almost daily with data from the student database. Parents and students who do not have internet access or who do not speak English, may not be able to access the data or use it in a way that informs and improves participation, instruction, and services.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) included a package of reforms that include each of the required grant compliance elements. These elements include standardized budgeting, accounting, auditing, and publishing of annual school and district level reports. These reports include budget allocations for personnel and non-personnel expenditures. Additionally, all district employee salaries are housed in a searchable database on the website of the local newspaper.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The KERA legislation also mandates parent involvement in schools via School Based Decision Making Councils. These councils consist of principals, teachers, employees, and parents. The Councils have authority over many school-level decisions including budgets and hiring. Additionally, Kentucky recently passed SB1 (referred to as KERA 2.0). SB1 adopted the Common Core, overhauled the state assessment system, and implemented a waiver process for districts for regulations that stand in the way of innovation.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	10
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The vision for the proposal was developed by community volunteers and district personnel. The proposal was written by central office personnel, principals, and teachers. The district used a survey to assess teacher support for the project. At each individual school more than 70% of the teachers voted to support, the majority of schools (7/11) gave 100% support. The survey did not appear to include teachers from schools that will be phased in at a later time, only the Cohort 1 Schools were included.</p> <p>There was little evidence that students and families were engaged in the development of the process. There was no evidence presented that schools who will join the process later were involved in the development or are supportive of the process/project.</p> <p>The Kentucky Department of Education included recommendations, however it is not clear that the district incorporated those suggestions into the final proposal.</p> <p>Letters of support were submitted by key stakeholders including principals, teachers, students, parents, and community partners.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The proposal identifies 2 key initiatives at all schools (Multi-Tiered System of Supports and Individual Learning Plans) and several other initiatives at participating schools as appropriate (the Leader in Me, Life Support Program, Blended Learning, and IB). Specific activities include the Delivery to Diploma initiative, deliverables include Born Learning Academies and Kindergarten camps. This initiative is the result of collaborative activity between the school, parents, students, and 13 local community organizations. The proposed approach to learning via the MTSS is one that engages both students and teachers. This is a 3 tiered approach whereby additional support is provided as required by students. The ILP tool assists in providing students with the needed assistance to become self-sufficient. Universal screeners are used for diagnostic purposes so that students can monitor their own data to determine if they are meeting college/career standards.</p> <p>The MTSS framework helps align resources and student personal learning needs. Students who exhibit skill deficits in learning will be paired with effective interventions. Progress is monitored using specific tools (including AIMSweb). Additionally, teachers use the CIITS to create lessons, documents, and resources to facilitate student learning. Student data is collected over a period of eight to twelve weeks and analyzed and reviewed before an instructional decision making team recommends interventions.</p> <p>It is not clear how students are provided training and support that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources.</p> <p>The proposal does represent a high quality plan in that it consists of the vast majority of components. The proposal identified key goals and activities, deliverables, and responsible parties. What is less clear, however, is the specific timeline to implementation and how students will be trained and supported.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	16
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:		

FCPS will provide extensive professional learning and support across the entire district by year 4 of the project. Nine MTSS coaches will be employed by the grant to assist with training and implementation. Professional learning will be linked to teacher effectiveness and folded into the Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES). Teachers will utilize CIITS to analyze student data and adapt instruction as needed. Additionally, teachers will work in Collegial Learning Teams to develop strategies for content, engagement and behavior. Teachers will also conduct peer observations for formative feedback. Instructional support teams will meet monthly to engage in problem solving and review student data. Student progress will be measured using a universal screener, progress monitoring tools, monitor growth in the ELL population, and College and Career Readiness. Teacher and principal effectiveness will be improved with the PGES, which is composed of multiple measures of effectiveness including observation, student growth, student voice, and professional growth.

The proposal will utilize faculty from the University of Kentucky College of Education to assist in professional learning opportunities as well as a database of instructional resources for teachers. MTSS coordinators and coaches will work with teachers to ensure appropriate interventions are being selected and funds will be allocated to develop “toolboxes” of interventions.

Leadership teams will also be trained in instructional practices and use of the tools to ensure fidelity. A summer conference will be held on the MTSS framework to help teachers address student performance and the district will expand its partnership with the University of Kentucky for professional learning/coaching.

The applicant does have a plan that meets the majority of the high quality components. There are key goals, activities, deliverables, and responsible parties. Again, however, the timelines for implementation of each of the specific elements is not clear.

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>In an effort to provide support to the lowest achieving schools FCPS restructured the central office, employed a Chief Academic Officer, and modified how schools are organized and classified (Foundation, Focus, or Future-Based). Each school has a School Based Decision Making Council, which has authority over personnel, staffing, budget and curriculum matters. The district has begun work on performance-based learning, which will take approximately 5 years before full implementation. Therefore, currently it does not appear that students have the opportunity to master standards at multiple ways and at multiple times. Additionally, although the Multi-Tiered System of Supports is referenced, it is not clear that learning resources and instructional practices are accessible to all students, including those with disabilities and English learners. The proposal lacks a high quality plan to support project implementation. While key goals, activities, and deliverables are included (development of a performance based system, recognition and credit for accomplishment, markers for student progress, etc) the timeline and specific responsible parties are not identified.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The district attempts to provide all students with access to necessary content, tools, and other resources in various ways. Some schools allocate funds for teachers to work with students outside of school hours, libraries are open in the summer and evening, and the proposal includes funding for student devices to provide increased accessibility. The district provides technology support to teachers and students through a central office department and technology resource teachers, but it is not clear that parents receive the same support. Students and parents have access to student information in the ILPs and student database, but at this time the systems do not allow the data to be exported in an open format. The district does use interoperable systems and through iDashboard the information is available to the public. The proposal does not indicate how low income, English language learners, or parents will have access to the system. The proposal does not include a high quality plan to extend support or ensure that all participants will have access to the learning resources. The proposal includes some goals and activities (providing digital devices and training) but lacks some important goals (providing access to all). The proposal fails to mention any specific deliverables, timelines, or responsible parties.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>FCPS will utilize an evaluation team composed of external evaluators, the project coordinator, school/district representatives, and project partners/stakeholders. Data will be reviewed by the evaluation team quarterly, the project coordinator will meet with the project administrator monthly, and project staff will meet with principals informally. It is expected that changes or mid-course corrections will be made as needed. The proposed process lacks some of the central elements of a high quality plan. Responsible parties, goals, and deliverables are clearly articulated, but specifics with regard specific activities and timelines are not clear.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district communicates with stakeholders via the district website and school websites. The superintendent distributes an electronic newsletter and the district utilizes its own local cable-based television station. While the district has various ways to communicate with stakeholders, it did not present a formal plan for information distribution. This would not be considered a high quality plan because it lacks key goals, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>FCPS included the following performance measures in the narrative section of the proposal: 1) Teacher and Principal Professional Growth and Effectiveness System, 2) Kindergarten Screener, 3) K-PREP – Reading, Math, Science, 4) College and Career Readiness – PLAN, EXPLORE, ACT, 5) End of Course Assessments – English II, Algebra II, US History, Biology, 6) Number of in-school suspensions. The proposal included several rationales for the use of measures including 1) Evidence of success of A Vision of Success, 2) Most are quantitative and specific to Kentucky required assessments, 3) Relevant to various key initiatives. It is unclear if these key initiatives are related to this proposal or other district projects.</p> <p>Data was not available for the PGES, it will not be implemented until 2014 – 2015. Data was not available for the Kindergarten Screener. There are several other instances where data is not available or the school does not administer the assessment such as the Opportunity Middle College and the PLAN – Reading or The Learning Center and the ACT.</p> <p>The proposal does not provide a sufficient plan for how the measures will be evaluated and improved over time. The proposal cited that project personnel will work with external evaluators to ensure performance measures provide measures of the theory of action and project goals.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>FCPS provided most of the elements of a high quality plan in their description on how they will evaluate the effectiveness of investments. They have identified the need to select an external evaluator who will work with district staff (responsible parties), questions to be addressed including logic model, goals, performance measures (key goals) using a mixed-methods approach, and the development of annual evaluation reports (deliverables). Where the proposal falls short is in a specific description as to how these groups will work together to further define the process and the timeline of implementation for each of the specific activities.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposed budget identified all funds that will support the project including district and external sources. The line item budgets presented are reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the project. The</p>		

proposal includes an appropriate rationale for the investments. These investments have been classified as one-time investment, capacity-building investment, or ongoing investments. On-going investments are incurred at the school level and each school will be responsible for future staffing.

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

10

5

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

To sustain the intervention, the district relies heavily on external funding, including an application to the Kentucky Department of Education for a grant. The majority of costs are classified as either one-time or capacity-building so the program can be sustained at a much lower cost than the initial investment. The proposal does not provide concrete evidence that it is sustainable, ongoing costs are shifted to individual schools and some costs are either mis-identified or not accounted for. For example, there is no discussion of how technology upgrade, damage, or replacement costs are factored in, as technology is identified as one-time, but should be on-going. The proposal does not include a high quality plan for project sustainability. The only identified goal is the acquisition of external funding. There are no specific activities, timelines, deliverables, or responsible parties identified.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	3

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

FCPS identified a number of established partnerships focused on student achievement. The district developed a Community Partners Leadership Team, which organizes, guides and monitors the work of the partnerships. The leadership team includes 30 different organizations and looks to develop High Performance Partnerships. These partnerships include 1) I DO initiative, 2) Born Learning Academies, and 3) Countdown to Kindergarten.

The proposal identified 4 population groups and desired results. However, the results are not described in a measurable way and there is no discussion as to how they will be measured.

The proposal does not describe the manner in which selected indicators will be measured. There is a statement that community partners will work with the external evaluator to collect data.

The proposal does not indicate how the project would integrate education and other services that address socio-emotion and behavioral needs since specific measures and outcomes are not identified. The proposal does state that the partnership activities fit into the overall 5 project areas and specifically the Student Engagement and Safety initiatives.

There is no indication that FCPS will build the capacity of their staff to assess the needs of students in the program, identify the needs and assets of the school and community, create a decision-making process, engage parents and families, or routinely assess applicant's progress.

FCPS did not identify ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the population.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

FCPS has instituted and proposed interventions that are in alignment with each of the four core educational assurances.

- 1) Students are instructed and evaluated via curriculum that is aligned with Common Core State Standards;
- 2) The district uses a tiered system of assessments that include student-level data analysis that measure student growth. The state launched a new assessment and accountability system in 2011-2012 which holds the district accountable for 5 areas 1) Achievement, 2) Gap, 3) Growth, 4) College/Career Readiness, 5) Graduation Rate;
- 3) The district has a clear set of policies and practices in place to recruit and retain educators and administrators. These

practices include mentoring, an aspiring leaders program, and individualized professional learning.

4) FCPS has prepared a proposal that demonstrates that the district can impact their ability to turn around the lowest achieving schools. The district has restructured the central office, now organizes schools by cohort rather than level, and those most in need are assigned one director whose area of expertise is in supporting and developing low achieving schools.

FCPS has articulated a clear and credible approach to accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity. The FCPS approach includes specific includes two intentional structures to meet the needs of personalized student support: Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) and Innovation Zone. MTSS incorporates Response to Intervention (RtI) and Positive Intervention and Supports (PBIS). Innovation Zone brings together diverse groups of stakeholders to develop new relevant and effective learning structures.

Total	210	151
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0126KY-4 for Fayette County Public Schools

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) (a) The Fayette County Public School district (FCPS) presents a descriptive shared vision and includes a detailed comprehensive plan for the success of "All" students. FCPS depicts their project as "A Vision for Success" consisting of 5 project areas and goals with all stakeholders making a collaborative effort; the students and school staff, parents and community. The 5 project areas/ goals are clearly depicted by FCPS : Student Achievement, Student Engagement and Safety, Staff Development, Parent/Family Engagement, and Business/Community Engagement.

The FCPS expounded on the 5 aforementioned areas articulating 4 educational assurance areas within each project area to personalize learning environments for "All" students; adopting standards and assessments that prepare students for college and career readiness and to compete in the global economy, building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction; recruiting and continuous professional development promoting life long learners, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals; turning around lowest-achieving schools as a priority. The Turnaround Principles are being used to guide the lowest performing schools on paths of continuous improvement establishes FCPS.

(b) Other attributes clearly outlined in FCPS's proposal is the importance of student achievement; Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS), recruiting and developing a diverse staff and most importantly their Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) for all students FCPS further depict their mission and vision as: "Our mission is to create a collaborative community that ensures all students achieve at high levels and graduate prepared to excel in a global society;"

The Superintendent further articulated a plan aligning his initiatives into five categories necessary to achieve the district's mission/vision of personalized learning environments (PLE): student achievement and promoting rich diverse learning experiences ,student engagement promoting PLEs, staff engagement focusing on promoting respect and life long learning, and connecting family and their child's education. Lastly the Superintendent included the community as a means of fostering partnerships and collaborating on academic interests.

(c) Fayette County has implemented certain programs to promote a personalized learning environment for "All" of their students. FCPS articulates how their student voice and personalized learning plans are the center of "A Vision of Success" and how students will take ownership of their learning through these Individual Learning Plans (ILPs). The plans are developed collectively with the assistance of the stakeholders; parents, mentors, coaches and teachers, and most importantly assessed by each student. FCPS proved ILPs are evidence based having been operating in

grades 6-12 for more than 10 years and now implemented in the elementary schools. Other models that are presently conducted in FCPS such as Genius Hour (www.geniushour.com) allows students from k-12 to become experts on topics or spend time learning a skill they can share with others. Quest based learning (<http://3dgameplay.com/personalized-quest-based-learning/>) is another model depicts FCPS which allows teachers to turn their classroom into a game and the ability to align the curriculum with the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) . This concept allows teachers to personalize the learning environments for students as well as their learning needs. Other opportunities FCPS describes are the various college partnerships allowing students to gain college credits, as well as online classes through college and university sites.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9
--	-----------	----------

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A2 (a).The first group of schools targeted represent more than 40% of students from low income families, meeting RTTD's eligibility requirements. FCPS provides tables and graphs showing the implementation process of the plan in all 63 schools throughout the district by year four. It offers information on the profile of students,disaggregate populations and grouped by discipline and standardized assessments identifying high need students from low income families.

(b). On page 18, Table three provides a list of targeted schools in their Cohort one which will participate in grant activities the first year. Data proves to be compelling provided by the FCPS Office of Data, Research and Evaluation depicting schools in categories of Need Improvements , Proficient and Distinguished.

(c) FCPS offered additional evidence of how their MTSS will be carried out in every school by the beginning of the fourth year of the project, expanding the original cohort of schools. It will be carried out in target schools with 9,029 students participating in the first year, exceeding eligibility requirements.More concrete information needed regarding the MTSS timeline/schedule of implementation.

Other key initiatives to be carried out are described as Kindergarten Readiness,Positive Behavioral interventions such as Stephen Covey's work is featured in a program called the Leader in Me, and other programs described dealing with the whole child, not only academically but social emotionally. FCPS describes the importance of one of their programs identifying "Conation" with students and teachers making the connection with motivation, goals and success.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8
--	-----------	----------

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

FCPS provides evidence based approaches to how their reform proposal will be implemented and grow to include all 63 district schools and 40,000 students. FCPS operates a variety of schools and programs which are expanding in all schools to meet the multiple learning needs of students. Programs include centers for applied technology, the Locust Trace Agriculture Farm, and the Martin Luther King Jr. Academy for Excellence; as well as a K – 12 Spanish Immersion program, and an International Baccalaureate (IB) Diploma Program. Each of the district's five high schools are divided into smaller learning communities, including an information technology academy, a pre-engineering program, and numerous career paths as well as freshmen academies. The district also collaborates with local agencies and organizations to provide educational components in other special programs including the Family Care Center, the day treatment center and the juvenile detention center, etc. Specialized programs relevant to their goals of "A Vision for Success".

FCPS provides five Tables representing their five project areas as described in A1. In each of the five project areas are Goals and Objectives depicted clearly and concisely the path took to achieve the mission/vision of FCPS, forming the framework for their project areas and goals. The Goals and Objectives of FCPS provides indicators, milestones ,deliverables and outcomes and also provides the Project Management Plan in Table five with the activity, project start date, deliverables , responsible parties and the year implemented whether first, second, third or fourth year of implementation.The Table establishes a Project management and sustainability plan, an evaluation of data collected along with a key for the codes of responsible parties. Provided also is Table six identifying the FCPS mission/vision aligned to their proposal "A Vision for Success".

Further proposed by FCPS are resources provided by the RTTD grant, more than 7 million dollars will be spent in Professional Development for staff building highly effective teachers and leaders.

More detailed information needed in regards to the schedule/timeline of the implementation of MTSS and the IB in the elementary schools.The scheduled timeline for the Evaluation Teacher Framework implemented in all schools is not provided. Plans are submitted with the philosophy of learning detailed in each but the scheduling of turn keying and implementing these philosophies/programs are lacking.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(a)FCPS provides tables and graphs beginning on page 33: Summative assessments have been now been implemented called: Kentucky Performance Rating For Educational Progress (KPREP). This methodology for determining status is provided: Percent Proficient or Distinguished, Methodology for determining growth: Growth in Percent of students Proficient or Distinguished on the K-PREP again outlined on page 33.

Fayette has provided detailed information in Tables identifying performance status and growth provided for the next four years and a projected year post grant in desegregated sub groups; African American, Hispanic, White, low income, LEP, and Special Ed. in the discipline goal areas of reading, math and science.

b.Fayette provides Tables depicting the decrease in achievement gaps in non-white ethnic groups depicting comparisons to the majority group of white population of students. It provides baseline scores beginning in 2012-2013 and projected over the next 4 years with significant decreases in the Achievement gap in the post grant year. FCPS projects an average of approximately 5% decrease in the achievement gap in each subgroup for each year. Subgroups are depicted as; African-American, Hispanic, Low-income, LEP and Special Education.

c. Graduation rates are clearly identified beginning with the baseline and showing the projected goals for the next 4 years and the post grant year.FCPS provides desegregated scores for the Graduation rates with a baseline beginning in 2012-2013. The projected goal percentages are ambitious yet achievable looking at graduation rates of approximately 2-3 % increase in each subgroup with a dramatic projection of 7 % increase each year in Special Education.

d, College enrollment rates have also been established and desegregated by each HS in Fayette and includes the baseline in 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, projected growth over the next 4 years, including a post grant year. Noticeable and also discouraging was the large decrease in college enrollment rates in 2 highschoools Lafayette and Dunbar HS. College programs/partnerships have been initiated to combat this issue.

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	12
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>FCPS provides a clear track record of success with tables and graphs tracking from 2009 in Math, Reading and Science and the successes of Grade 8 and Grade 10 albeit the increase in deficiencies in grade 10 English are established.</p> <p>FCPS self reflects that their district is making progress in the percent of students meeting college readiness benchmarks on the EXPLORE, PLAN, and ACT, as illustrated in the following tables on page 39. FCPS further self assesses that these tables also illustrate that there are far too many students not meeting benchmarks.</p> <p>FCPS self reflection reveals an action plan on identifying the problems and creating an action plan to solve the problems outlined in their 5 Project Areas and the Goals and Objectives detailed in each category. However the track record of success is omitted in Math, Reading and Science results of desegregated student populations which could provide a baseline to inform the academic achievement gap and the closing of the gap. This in turn can also project the reforms that perhaps can take place. The data for Pre-k, information on teacher performance is missing and the schedule for implementation of various programs isn't provided. The low achieving schools are identified but the implementation of the various programs in these low achieving schools is not detailed.</p> <p>CIITS is described as a high technological program that informs students, educators and parents on students' performance data. The technological program is continuing to be revised and expanded for resources and tools in education and an informative resource for all stakeholders.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The FCPS proposal provides detailed information on the history of successful strides, practices, and investments in education . FCPS depicts how the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) was one of “the nation’s earliest systemic education reform initiatives” (Fusarelli 2004). In 1985, 66 property-poor rural school districts in Kentucky filed a lawsuit claiming that the state education finance system violated the state constitution. In response, the state Supreme Court in *Rose v. Council for Better Education* (1989), issued a final ruling declaring “Kentucky’s entire system of common schools . . . unconstitutional.” The court ordered the General Assembly to provide funding “sufficient to provide each child in

Kentucky an adequate education" and to reform the property tax system. As many other courts have done subsequently, the Kentucky court concluded that money matters and that state responsibility for public education cannot be waived in the name of local control.

FCPS informs us in their proposal that in 1990, the legislature enacted a comprehensive package of education reforms in KERA, and tied those reforms to the court-ordered funding reforms. As a result, school funding increased dramatically for most poor districts. Upon the implementation of KERA in 1991, multiple measures were enacted to create more transparency, accountability, and open interaction among schools, districts, parents, and the larger community across the state. Some of the measures which provide this infrastructure as of 2013 include:

- The creation of standardized school budgeting, accounting, auditing and personnel practices across districts.
- A state-wide budget system established for school finance reporting.
- Annual district audit requirements including public access to school district financial information.
- School districts were compelled to publish annual school and district-level report cards, detailing information on teacher quality, instruction, student achievement, safety, and *per pupil spending* among other things.
- Annual Consolidated School Improvement Plans (CSIP) and Consolidated District Improvement Plans (CDIP), detailing efforts for advancement and budgetary implications, were required state-wide and made available to the public.
- *A statutory requirement to publish school employee salary information annually in local newspapers*

Under KERA, schools have been required to form School-Based Decision Making Councils (SBDM) comprised of elected parent and teacher representatives and the school principal. SBDM councils have authority over curriculum, assignment of staff time, assignment of students, determination of school schedule and space, instructional practices, discipline, extracurricular programs and policies, parent involvement, and staff hiring at each individual school. The law governing SBDM has been updated in several sessions of the Kentucky General Assembly, but the spirit of the law remains the same, to meet students' individual needs and assist them in high academic achievement by placing important school-based decisions in the hands of those who know them best.

The district posts a myriad of data on its website, including annual tentative and working budgets; the Board approved annual salary schedules; financial balance sheets and audited financial reports; as well as free and reduced meal statistics for each school on a monthly basis. Information in the working budgets divide budgeted funds into salary and non-salary allocations.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

FCPS displays success for over two decades, as part of the Commonwealth of Kentucky as a national leader in the effort to create an appropriate policy context and internal infrastructure to support standards- based, assessment-and-accountability oriented school reform and improvement.

For over two decades, the Commonwealth of Kentucky has been a national leader in the effort to create an appropriate policy context and internal infrastructure to support standards- based, assessment-and-accountability oriented school reform and improvement. This process began in earnest in 1990 when Kentucky's General Assembly approved KERA. This legislation overhauled the entire public school system. It authorized creation of a statewide assessment, to track the progress of students, schools, and districts, a curricular framework to guide educators in preparing students to meet the new learning goals, and a (ultimately short-lived) fiscal rewards system to provide incentives for school improvement. KERA also prompted dramatic reorganization and reorientation of the state Department of Education and its governing body, the Kentucky Board of Education, so that both would strongly support the systemic reform program embedded in the law. Other governance changes included the establishment of site- based decision making Councils at each individual school, new anti-nepotism rules, new operating and auditing procedures in districts, and funds to enable districts to afford new school buildings. Teacher credentialing and education matters were placed under a new Education Professional Standards Board

On March 26, 2009, Governor Steve Beshear signed Senate Bill 1 into law – the KY College & Career Readiness Unified Plan. This significant piece of legislation led to the implementation of several education initiatives impacting college readiness and degree completion in Kentucky.

The law established erection of a statewide educational technology network, to meet hardware and software needs of schools and districts. Significant new resources were poured into the state school system to fund these changes as well as to help equalize spending across districts and schools. The recent recession saw the level of state funds allocated to education plummet in Kentucky – as well as across the nation. Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) mandated parent involvement in the schools, through the creation of School Based Decision Making Councils, consisting of the principal, teachers, employees, and parents. The School Councils have authority over many decisions at the school level, including budgets and staff employment. KPCS provides significant autonomy in which to implement the proposed program.

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

15

13

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

FCPS begins with describing how support from a mix of LEA central office personnel, principals and teachers helped to create this overall vision with the development of 2020 Vision. This was the first initiative which was in partnership with the stakeholders which again has led to this proposal, "A Vision of Success". Letters of support for this proposal range from Principals of participating schools, students, teachers at participating schools, parents, the Superintendent Tom Clayton and community partners.

Organizations supporting the project financially are provided by FCPS in the appendices as follows:

- District funds
- The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
- Educause Next Generation Learning Challenges Wave IIIa grant
- The University of Kentucky College of Education
- The Bluegrass Community Technical College
- PNC Foundation
- United Way of the Bluegrass
- Child Care Council of Kentucky
- First Presbyterian Church

FCPS district's Survey Monkey account was used to create surveys for each participating schools for teachers to vote as to whether or not they supported the proposal and their school participating in the project. Principals discussed the project in meetings with teachers and the survey included an overview of the project. Principals sent teachers the web link to their school's survey. At each school more than the required 70% minimum of teachers voted to support the proposal and to participate in the project. Information as to how many teachers voted to support the program at each school is provided in the appendices.

Attendance sheets were not provided.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	17

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

C. (a)

i. FCPS begins by describing their vision for "A Vision for Success" features several initiatives to prepare students for college and career readiness with all stakeholders involved to created personalized education for all participating students which includes the MTSS, multi-tiered system of support for all students and the ILPS, individualized learning plan for students.

FCPS articulates in their proposal that early learning forms the foundation for all future learning and builds a strong argument on why early intervention is key to promoting a child's overall success and ability to grow. They provide strong arguments on meta cognition and detailed graphs on brain development and cognition on pages 57-60.

ii. FCPS expands on their methodology of the MTSS program which enables students to be empowered and have ownership in their learning. Other programs included with the support of parent and educators and all students include the

International Baccalaureate Program (IB) to develop lifelong learning, the Career Cruising ILLP Tool is designed to help students bring together their academic achievements, extracurricular experiences, and career and education exploration activities. This enables the student, parents or guardians, teachers and counselors to work together to develop a [personalized] course of study that meets the student's needs and goals." Another example of the steps taken is the implementation of the *Delivery to Diploma* pilot activities which will result of collaboration among agencies. For example the *Countdown to Kindergarten* project involves commitments from thirteen local organizations that have joined forces to create a community project to enhance the educational experiences of preschool children and their families.

iii. The MTSS system is described by Fayette as allowing students to deepen their knowledge and content area of interest. Students are able to have more ownership in their learning and accelerate in their areas of interest. The multi tier system includes Tier 1 differentiating instruction which encourages students to pursue their interest regardless of their learning deficits. Tier 2 and 3 provide additional individualized support.

The International Baccalaureate Full Diploma Program implemented in Fayette describes their philosophy as developing life long learners and is a world recognized college preparatory program in existence since 1968. This program allows students to assess themselves on the traits for IB such as : inquirers, knowledgeable, thinkers, communicators, etc. This program also builds on connecting classrooms to real world applications, enabling interdisciplinary learning. The IB program most importantly promotes college and career readiness allowing students to take six college level courses over their junior/senior years.

iv. The IB promotes cultural awareness for all learners to meet their standards of a world-class education. A Vision For Success promotes through IB the importance of students to understand other cultures and to come out of their comfort zone to learn about others not like themselves.

v. The MTSS framework not only provides strong academic focus but positive and proactive behavior student focusing on the development of the whole child academically and social emotionally. The IB program uses "Approaches to Learning" skills to develop awareness of students meta cognition, how students learn and "conation", which is connecting knowledge and behavior. *The Learning Center (TLC)* at Linlee is a specially designed program that serves students (grades 7-12) with extreme life challenges, who may thrive in a more individualized school setting that focuses on the development of talents/abilities. The Life Support Program developed at TLC believes that the responsibility is on the teacher for the success of the students but it begins with students having a voice. The students having a voice and sharing their thoughts in education and preparing for the real world was essential to this program.

Another evidence based program which produces higher academic achievement and fewer discipline problems and increased engagement amongst parents and teachers is "The Leader in Me". This program developed based on Stephen Covey's "The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People" produces a whole school transformation, improving the school culture and instilling teacher pride and engagement and most in-Importantly increasing student's confidence, building teamwork, tapping into their creative minds and promoting leadership.

More evidence needed for support of elementary schools and the schedule of implementation such as the IB program and the MTSS.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	16
--	-----------	-----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

FCPS proposes that the resources provided by the Race to the Top Districts grant, more than \$7 million dollars over the next four years will be invested into building teacher capacity and developing highly effective teachers and leaders detailed in the FCPS. The MTSS, the multi tier support system provides not only personalized learning for students but access for teachers to identify individual needs of students, trends, growths and deficits, as well as profession learning for teachers themselves. Kentucky has developed a new Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES). The goal of this system is to increase student learning by ensuring that each student is taught by an effective teacher. The system uses multiple measures including: student growth, artifacts, evidences, student voice surveys, peer observations, teacher self-reflection and classroom observations to evaluate each teacher's effectiveness and serve as a roadmap for the teacher's professional growth. Charlotte Danielson' Framework for Teacher Evaluation has been implemented as the evaluation tool for Administrators and Teachers.

The teacher framework for evaluation also includes support with Professional Learning: Professional learning is replacing professional development in Kentucky (and in the Fayette County Public School District). During the 2012-13 school year, the Kentucky Department of Education's Professional Learning Task Force (PLTF), consisting of practicing teachers, administrators, higher education and other stakeholders met several times to establish a comprehensive professional learning system for Kentucky educators. In response to the PLTF policy and guidance recommendations, the Kentucky Board of Education approved a new definition of professional learning (PL), along with new Professional Learning Standards at its June 5, 2013 meeting.

Professional development is primarily the sharing or dissemination of information, skills and strategies without the intentionality or accountability

for implementation, data-based focus or expected results expounds FCPS. The shift from professional development to professional learning in Kentucky is intended to elevate the importance of growth in educators that is driven by the need to improve student results.

Timeline is unclear for the implementation of various programs but included in the Appendices are dates of past conferences and future conferences in Professional Development; Literacy, Mathematics, the CCSS and the integration of the standards in the disciplines, etc.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	11

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- a. FCPS professes their number one priority is the restructuring of their priority schools which are their lowest achieving schools called the focus schools. The superintendent began by employing a Chief Academics Officer to lead the instructional departments. Low achieving schools were also assigned a Director for support in areas of expertise.(Focus Schools). The schools were restructured so that it was divided into cohorts of different levels and concentrated areas as opposed to grade levels. The school directors are assigned to supervise the cohorts according to their expertise.
- b. Parent involvement is mandated and encouraged in the FCPS. The Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) mandated parent involvement in the schools and through the creation of School Based Decision Making Councils, consisting of principal, teachers, employees and parents. The councils have authority over many decisions at the school level. Under KERA, schools have been required to form School-Based Decision Making Councils (SBDM) comprised of elected parent and teacher representatives and the school principal. SBDM councils have authority over curriculum, assignment of staff time, assignment of students, determination of school schedule and space, instructional practices, discipline, extracurricular programs and policies, parent involvement, and staff hiring at each individual school. The law governing SBDM has been updated in several sessions of the Kentucky General Assembly, but the spirit of the law remains the same, to meet students' individual needs and assist them in high academic achievement by placing important school-based decisions in the hands of those who know them best.
- c. A recognition system will be incorporated in all schools and provide badged based learning systems for student progress. Students will earn recognition by demonstrating knowledge and skills within a particular area of the curriculum. This recognition system should begin in 2014 but again the timeframe is not presented.
- d. In 5 years FCPS proposes performance based learning will be launched in every school as well as their "Vision for Success" The timeline for the MTSS framework was omitted.
- e. FCPS declares A Vision for Success is designed to ensure that learning resources and instructional practices are adaptable and accessible to all students including those with the highest needs. The programs such as MTSS framework and the RTI will provide teachers with the tools they need for personalized interventions and formative/diagnostic assessments for all tiers, many which will be technology based.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
---	-----------	----------

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA at FCPS supports personalized learning through their "Vision for Success" and provides equitable access to resources and materials required for the project's level personalized education for all. Several schools have provided funds for teachers to work with students outside of the school but further information is necessary.

All students and teachers will have access to computer technology and a program launched called "BYOD" (Bring Your Own Device)" which became quite successful preparing students to be college and career ready in this global technological world. The integrity of bringing your own devices to school and the security measures that will be taken for securing the devices is not provided . There will be a signed request for Acceptable Use Policy (AUP) however there is no evidence of firewall or other preventive measures for the devices.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>FCPS proposes to bring in an evaluation team comprised of the external evaluator(s), the project coordinator, school/district representatives, and project partners/stakeholders who will meet on a quarterly basis. The formative evaluation component will provide project monitoring; the external evaluator as well as project staff will collect a variety of data on an ongoing basis to determine the quality and fidelity of implementation. More of a timeframe needed for the implementation of certain programs in the district schools.</p> <p>FCPS discusses continuous improvement in regarding to developing teacher evaluation system, such as their launch of the Charlotte Danielson's Teaching Framework, an evaluation tool for principals and teachers.</p> <p>"Leaning Forward" is another organization providing standards for professional learning communities. Other key initiatives to be carried out are described as Kindergarten Readiness, Positive Behavioral interventions such as Stephen Covey's work is featured in a program called the Leader in Me described as dealing with the whole child, not only academically but social emotionally. FCPS describes the importance of one of their programs identifying "Conation" with students and teachers making the connection with motivation, goals and success.</p> <p>FCPS provides a wealth of information of the programs that have been piloted in various schools. The International Baccalaureate (IB) Full Diploma Program implemented in Fayette describes their philosophy as developing life long learners and is a world recognized college preparatory program in existence since 1968. This program allows students to assess themselves on the traits for IB such as : inquirers, knowledgeable, thinkers, communicators, etc. This program also builds on connecting classrooms to real world applications, enabling interdisciplinary learning. The IB program most importantly promotes college and career readiness allowing students to take six college level courses over their junior/senior years.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>FCPS has established from the onset the importance of all stakeholders; students, school staff, parents and community in partnership and collaboration for the academic success of all students preparing them for college and career readiness. FCPS has established many venues that allow communication and collaboration amongst all stakeholders including community meetings, radio shows, education television programs, newsletters etc. A list of past and future scheduled meeting dates of programs, committee meetings and functions of stakeholders are displayed in the appendices under Conference Proposals and Scheduled Sessions on page 255 and updated on September 30, 2013.</p> <p>There are names provided of organizations including meeting dates of the councils and past meetings reflecting ongoing communication and engagement of the all stakeholders.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>FCPS has established credible performance measures on page 98-99 and a chart detailed and desegregated by groups, disciplines, ethnicities, etc. on page 103-118. FCPS has selected several performance measures for teachers and leaders, although data isn't provided I would have liked to see what was in place prior to the projected date of this new teacher/leader evaluation system for 2014-2015. FCPS stated data was available</p>		

concerning the highly effective tool but not highly qualified which doesn't align so data's not provided. Kentucky also began its new Kindergarten screener but again data wasn't provided because the data was not ready in time. Again, data from the previous kindergarten screening would have been helpful in this proposal but they do include Grade 3 in their proposed performance measures.

(b) FCPS provided detailed evidence in the appendices that collaboration will be conducted on the proposed plan and theory of action in its implementation towards success. More information again is provided in the appendices on the charts provided for Grade 3, Grades 4-8 in K-Prep Reading , Math, Science, as well as data displaying a decrease in number of in-schools suspensions.

(C) More concrete evidence is needed for reviewing and improving the measures of assessment particularly in Grade 10 English. Although the acknowledgement of failure to decrease the achievement gap in that area was established there lacked evidence for ways of improvement in regards to that particular area of deficit.

Applicant strong performance measures, displaying a bulleted list of the performance measures for our perusal beginning on page 98-99 including a table on page 103-118 offering detailed baseline data available in the categories outlined in the chart above. The charts on page 103-108 also provides data of projected growth over the next four years showing successful implementation of the plan.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

FCPS has demonstrated the importance of technology with the implementation of it's Kentucky CIITS (Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System), a data system measuring student growth and success and informing teachers and principals to drive instruction. This was a joint effort, RTTD funded and Kentucky Department of Education (DE) collaborative effort.

FCPS provides extensive guidelines for choosing an evaluator in order to assist with the Office of Data, Research and Evaluation in collecting data to evaluate the components of the logic model, goals and performance measures, including short and long term outcomes. The FCPS plan further describes how the evaluator and school district will provide annual evaluation reports and a summative evaluation at the end of the project and meetings will occur on a regular basis to ensure feedback is continuous and improvement is occurring. The evaluator will meet with the district leadership, "Office of Data, Research and Evaluation" to finalize the evaluation plan, which will be submitted in its final state to the federal program, officers' approval. FCPS details the components of the finalized evaluation plan as including key questions to be addressed and methods for each question, performance measures reviews and revised, discussions on treatment and control or comparison groups, discussions of implementation of the project primarily on low income and diverse populations , proposed data collection measures as well as documenting the intended as well as unintended outcomes.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

FCSA has disclosed transparently the funds supporting the project provided by the following organizations respectively:

- District funds
- The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
- Educause Next Generation Learning Challenges Wave IIIa grant
- The University of Kentucky College of Education
- The Bluegrass Community Technical College
- PNC Foundation

- United Way of the Bluegrass
- Child Care Council of Kentucky
- First Presbyterian Church

Also provided by FCPS are lists of external and internal funding, funded grants, grant proposals pending, and grant proposals not funded, etc. FCPS also provides reasonable detailed information regarding the implementation of technology beginning on page 132.

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

10

8

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

FCPS has established budget plans for sustainability of the projects goals and post term of the grant. The Fayette County Public School District has also established their Next Generation Learning and to making lasting, innovative change in their schools, evidenced in part by its active participation in the Council of Chief State School Officers' (CCSSO) Innovation Lab Network. Other initiatives for sustainability include District of Innovation proposal to be presented to the Kentucky Department of Education in the next selection. An outline and item analysis of the post grant year was omitted for the Project -Level Itemized Costs.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

FCPS gives a descriptive plan on the ongoing partnerships for the Competitive Preference Priority, detailing the type of results and desired results for students, families, and community. This collaboration effort is described as developed by project staff working with school personnel and school partners. A major partnership that formed out of the 2020 Vision project of (Community Partner Work group) was the Community Partner Leadership Team (CPLT) . This team is responsible for the ongoing monitoring of school and community partnerships. There is also the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government's Partners for youth organizations to promote youth development and prevent juvenile delinquency. The main and priority focus of these organizations is student achievement and how partnerships can come together and collaborate on various projects for students that will benefit and help ensure that students graduate from high school and are college and career ready.

1. There are programs such as School Readiness/ Delivery to Diploma which has piloted activities for early learners which is a collaborative effort of school and community groups. Born Learning Academies is another model implemented in the schools for elementary students as we as Countdown to Kindergarten/

Many strong partnerships were revealed in the appendices of the proposal and the amounts of past grants and conferences. Out of school programs listed included: 21st. Century Community Learning Centers (21st.CCLC) programs, school based programs; a Boys & Girls Club; and a host of private/public/faith-based,after-school and summer programs, tutoring and recreational services.

2. Identified desired results in Math and Reading for specific groups were revealed in their tables for Kindergarten through 12 th. grade, providing a baseline and projected targeted years for 2013-2014, 2014-2015, 2015-2016, 2016-2017, and post grant for 2017-2018 respectively, Incoming Kindergarten data was not available. Dessagregated scores were unavailable for grades k-8 but were detailed by subgroups for grades 9-12.

3. a. Attendance logs of activities and events will be provided and kept by the community/school organizations. External Evaluators will work with the community partners and project personnel. Attendance logs are unavailable from present "I Do" programs already implemented. See page 198.

b. The CPLT is in charge of all high performance partnerships focused on student achievement. "I Do" is in place to work with high need neighborhood communities. More information needed on student data and how these programs are providing student support. The programs of the "I Do" Community Partners are listed on page 198 and the guidelines in determining these High Performance Partnership in FCPS are outlined on p. 196.

c. Strategies for continuing the programs are incorporated in the program design as defined by FCPS. They do provide an example of the Born Learning Academies being expanded from serving only parents to including child care providers. The Countdown to Kindergarten

program will be expanded and will recruit high need students but there is not a detailed plan. provided. The CPLT and "I Do" partnerships are expected to expand as well but no plan is provided.

d. FCPS declares that all partnerships will go through the same review process as the programs in A Vision for Success.

4. All partnership activities defined by FCPS are able to fit in the 5 project areas of A Vision of Success. FCPS promotes they are also able to incorporate these partnership activities in the MTSS framework, the RTI, and PBIS programs all dealing with behavior approaches and socio emotional needs of students.

5 a. FCPS describes authentic partnerships focused on student achievement and community partners having opportunities to provide information to the schools. Information is not included on how the communication will transpire or be communicated.

b. There lacked evidence in the proposal of identification and inventory of the needs and assets of the school and community for the goals aligned to this proposal.

c. The decision making process will be evaluated and developed by the project staff working with school personnel and community partners. Details of the plan and process were omitted.

d. The development of engaging parents and families of participating students in the decision making process will be developed by project staff working with school personnel and community partners.

e. All partnership activities will undergo the same review process as other key initiatives of A Vision Success as described by FCPS.

6. FCPS provides a chart identifying the Population Group and the type of results whether educational or family support and includes desired results. This will be revised collaboratively with the project staff, school staff and community partnerws.with the central evaluator.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

FCPS has consistently developed it's PLEs throughout it's application building on their PLEs and ILPs for "All" students and created collaboratively with all stakeholders..

Key initiatives within each project area that will be implemented at each participating school include: Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) for ALL students (including toolboxes featuring a continuum of personalized interventions and formative/diagnostic assessments for all tiers, many of which will be technology-infused); Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS); Blended learning; Individual Learning Plans (ILP) for students; Kentucky's new Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES); and using the Kentucky CIITS/student data pipeline.

Other key initiatives that will be implemented at each participating school as appropriate include: the Leader in Me program (based on the work of Stephen Covey); the Life Support Program for students and staff (developed at one of the participating schools); the Superior Customer Service Initiative; and Alternative paths to graduation which include dual credit, early/middle college, and the International Baccalaureate Programme. FCPS proved ILPs are evidence based having been operating in grades 6-12 for more than 10 years and now implemented in the elementary schools. Other models that are presently conducted in FCPS such as Genius Hour (www.geniushour.com) allows students from k-12 to become experts on topics or spend time learning a skill they can share with others. Quest based learning (<http://3dgameplay.com/personalized-quest-based-learning/>) is another model depicts FCPS which allows teachers to turn their classroom into a game and the ability to align the curriculum with the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) allowing teachers to personalize the learning environments as well as their learning needs. Other opportunities FCPS describes are the various college partnerships allowing students to gain college credits, as well as online classes through college and university sites.

There were several letters from community organizations, parents, Principals and other staff members supporting RTTD. Compelling letters from students were included in the appendices, offering statements on their appreciation for their specific learning program and their passion for learning and success.

Total	210	182
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0126KY-5 for Fayette County Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has set forth the beginning of a reform vision that builds on its work in the four core educational assurance areas.

Core Assurance Area 1: Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy.

- The applicant has adopted standards and assessments that focus on college-and career-readiness, proficiency in core content areas, closure of achievement gaps with subgroup populations and student growth, and graduation rates.

Core Assurance Area 2: Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction.

- The applicant will use the state’s new data system (CIITS) and the district’s data systems (Infinite Campus) and iDashboard to monitor data to determine student growth and achievement.

Core Assurance Area 3: Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most.

- The applicant cites multiple methods for recruiting and developing effective teachers and principals, including partnerships with community groups and institutions of higher education. It is not clear how the applicant rewards and retains effective teachers and principals.

Core Assurance Area 4: Turning around lowest-achieving schools.

- The applicant has restructured the instructional departments at the central office level and employed a Chief Academic Officer. The district’s lowest performing schools are assigned to one director with expertise in supporting turnaround efforts. Standardized techniques, schedules and structures to support high-needs subgroups, while planned, have not been established.

The applicant has not set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that articulates a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement. The applicant’s key reform initiatives to accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning are not clearly identified. Information regarding how the reform initiatives will increase equity, particularly for traditionally underserved and high-needs students is insufficient or not addressed.

The applicant adequately describes what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments.

The plan does not convincingly address how it will increase equity and provide support for traditionally underserved or high needs students, such as students eligible for Free and Reduced Meals, minority students, English Language Learners, and students receiving special education services, and minimally addresses how it will include parents in the education process.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	5
--	-----------	----------

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant described the selection criteria for participating schools, but the process of selection is not evident.

The applicant provides evidence that educators from the participating schools participated in online surveys via Survey Monkey administered at each school site.

Meeting minutes, sign-in sheets, or additional documentation was not provided.

The applicant provided a list of schools that will participate in the grant activities.

The applicant provided the total number of participating students, in the aggregate and by required subgroup, who will participate in the grant.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	4
--	-----------	----------

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's plan includes the following project areas:

1) Student Achievement; 2) Student Engagement and Safety; 3) Staff Development; 4) Parent/Family Engagement; and 5) Business/Community Engagement.

The applicant identifies key initiatives within each project to be implemented at each participating school. These included Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS); Positive Behavioral Interventions & Supports (PBIS); Blended learning; Individual Learning Plans (ILP); Kentucky's new Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGES); and using the Kentucky CIITS/student data pipeline. Additionally, the applicant cites several community collaborative partnerships that will be leveraged to support participating schools.

Consistent with Individual Learning Plans, the applicant cites additional initiatives to be implemented based on the programmatic focus of the school or at the discretion of leadership. These include the Leader in Me program (based on the work of Stephen Covey); the Life Support Program for students and staff (developed at one of the participating schools); the Superior Customer Service Initiative; and Alternative paths to graduation which include dual credit, early/middle college, and the International Baccalaureate Programme.

Proposed outcomes include increased student achievement, decreased achievement gaps, reduction of minority/poverty disproportional representation in Special Education; students performing on grade level; students meeting college/career readiness benchmarks; increased graduation rate; kids entering school ready to learn; decreased suspensions; reduction of minority/poverty disproportional representation in behavior issues, suspensions, students taking ownership of their education, increased student engagement, safe school environments, teachers and leaders have the information, tools, and supports that enable them to meet the needs of each student, substantially accelerating and deepening learning; increasing the effectiveness of educators, increased parent/family engagement, and increased business/community engagement. Measurement and monitoring of the proposed outcomes is evident for some, but not evident or insufficient for many. Some areas requiring additional information are student entering school ready to learn, students taking ownership for their education, substantially accelerating and deepening learning, and increased effectiveness of educators. It is not clear how disproportional representation in behavior issues and special education for high needs students will be measured or monitored.

MTSS plan is stated to be in appendix, but the document is not apparent.

The applicant provided a Project Management Plan that included activities, some deliverables, responsible parties, and progress. The applicant indicated that a comprehensive, preliminary MTSS implementation plan was in the appendices, however, it could not be located. Although the Project Management Plan included progress with completed items indicated by checkmark icons, multiple progress items were marked complete for all four years of planned implementation. The

Project Management Plan timeline was not specific in terms of frequency of trainings for all constituents, frequency of programmatic and student and educator data reviews, and evaluation data dissemination.

The plan does not sufficiently describe how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools (as defined in this notice), and will help the applicant reach its outcome goals.

Strategies to scale the model across the district are included in the program design. The application mentions the Born Learning Academies and Community Partners Leadership Team, but the scale up narrative does not comprehensively address all elements of the reform plan.

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

10

4

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant outlines goals and provides supporting data for performance on summative assessments, decreasing achievement gaps, increasing graduation rates, and increasing college enrollment. The application includes information regarding how student growth will be determined during the grant implementation period in the aggregate and by subgroup (Growth in Percent of students Proficient or Distinguished on the K-PREP). The applicant indicates that annual proficiency data will be used to determine growth. Individual measures or indicators of student growth are not evident. For example, the reform effort indicates that each student will have an Individual Learning Plan, but indicators determining individual student growth are not evident in the application. Data are disaggregated by subgroup for some performance areas, but not for all. For example, EXPLORE, PLAN, ACT, FASFA, college enrollment, state measure of College and Career Ready data, and In School Suspensions are presented in the aggregate and limited data are provided for kindergarten (In school suspension). Disaggregating benchmark and target data would provide convincing support of the applicant's overarching goal to improve educational outcomes for all students.

The applicant has set ambitious goals to decrease achievement gaps. For example, year one of the grant for reading (as measured by the state assessment) includes a 10.2% proficiency increase for SPED, 10.8% for LEP, 7.9% for Low Income, 8.2% for Hispanic, and 8.3% for African American students. These targets align with the goal to decrease disproportionality in special education programs. However, more specificity regarding the intentional strategies that will be used to decrease achievement gaps, ensure equity, and decrease disproportionality is needed.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant outlines successes in establishing programmatic diversity within schools and learning centers including two centers for applied technology, the Locust Trace Agriscience Farm, and the Martin Luther King Jr. Academy for Excellence; as well as a K – 12 Spanish Immersion program, and an International Baccalaureate Diploma Programme. Additionally, the district offers small learning communities in the high schools and specialized programs. The applicant collaborates with a variety of community partners, many of whom are members in the LEA's formal Community Partners Leadership Team, to provide student support and recreational services.

The SEA launched a new assessment and accountability system in SY 2011-2012, and the data provided indicate 55% (29 schools) of the LEA schools categorized as Needs Improvement, 17% (9 schools) Proficient, and 28% (15 schools) Distinguished. Historical data were not provided.

Data from EXPLORE, PLAN, and ACT (2009-2012) indicate steady improvement in the percentage of students meeting benchmarks. However, these data are not disaggregated and subgroup performance is not evident. Historical achievement data for other performance measures were not provided.

The applicant makes student performance data available to students, parents, and educators via the district student

database (Infinite Campus), student Individual Learning Plans, iDashboard, and the state reporting system (CIITS). It is unclear how students and parents without internet capability access the data or whether data are available in languages other than English. The application does not specify if/how students and parents are provided training on how to utilize or interpret the applications or ILPs. Although there are provisions for a technology lending library to increase access to hardware, training on how to operate the devices was not evident in the application.

This component of the application received a score of 5 as not all elements of the criteria were addressed.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant has provided multiple examples of how this information is made available to the public and is in compliance with the provisions of the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA).

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant provides clear and convincing evidence that State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements provide a condition for success and sufficient autonomy implement the personalized learning environments described in the proposal. These include, but are not limited to, use of the statewide data management system (CIITS), the capacity to link student demographic and performance data with educator data through the statewide evaluation system (PGES), administrative and statutory waivers for implementation as supported by state statute (Districts of Innovation). The applicant addressed all criteria for this component and received the highest score.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	5
--	-----------	----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that in 2005 the district and community collaborated to develop the 2020 Vision: Changing the Face of Education in Fayette County, a workgroup comprised of University scholars, pioneers in educational excellence and community development, community members from the arts, community agency leaders, district teachers, principals, and administrators, and parents and families. The applicant included a matrix of the Community Partners Leadership Team listing each member and affiliation. According to the applicant, the results of the 2020 Vision process led directly to the grant proposal.

The proposal was written by various LEA central office personnel, principals and teachers from individual schools, with teachers and principals responsible for development of many of the supporting programs. The proposal was provided to the Kentucky Department of Education and to the Mayor of the local government, the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government for the required 10- day period for comments. The letter of support is listed in the appendices table of contents, but the document provided indicates receipt only. The complete comments provided by the state are in the appendices. The Kentucky Department of Education made recommendations for revisions to the proposal. A cross-matching mechanism identifying state recommendations and LEA revisions was not provided, therefore it is difficult to identify all of the LEA revisions. However, there were revision opportunities identified by the state that impact the overall quality of the proposal- for example, addressing issues of equity and deeper learning, a more robust description regarding what is in place and what the grant will support, incomplete or missing data tables, etc.

The applicant provided a summary table of a Survey Monkey online survey completed by educators at each participating school site.

Letters of support were provided as follows: Higher Education-2; Community Organizations- 4; Students-13 (included 3 student letters, 6 drawings, 4 essays); Teachers-2; Parents-4; Superintendent-1; Principal/Director-8 (11 schools are to participate); Other Administrator or Central Office-3. Of the letters of community support, only two letters were from individuals listed as members of the Community Partners Leadership Team and only four (including the aforementioned) were from affiliations listed on the document.

There is no supporting documentation to evidence internal or external stakeholder meetings such as agendas, meeting minutes, or presentation to the LEA Board of Education. Although local school board president and president of the local teacher union are included on the application assurance, letters of support were not evident.

The applicant earned a score of 5 on this component, as evidence regarding the development of the proposal or how the proposal was revised based on constituent engagement and feedback was not convincing.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	6

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(C)(1)(a)(i) The applicant provides some evidence that students understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals. For example, the IB Programme Learner Profile and the Career Cruising ILLP Tool. The applicant cites the Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) as a key reform strategy, but information regarding how students will monitor their own data and understand the implications of their own learning goals and college and career choices is vague. It is unclear how the reform plan informs, supports and encourages parents as partners in the education process.

(C)(1)(a)(ii) The applicant provides some evidence that the reform strategy will enable students to identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements and understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goals. For example, the IB Program, the Career Cruising ILLP Tool, and the Life Support Program. It is unclear how this criterion will be implemented with fidelity across all grade levels, schools and programs. It is unclear how the reform plan informs, supports and encourages parents as partners in the education process.

(C)(1)(a)(iii) The applicant provides some evidence that this reform strategy will ensure that students are able to be involved in deep learning experiences of academic interest. For example, the IB program. The application does not provide convincing evidence that this criterion will be met across all grade levels, schools and programs. It is unclear how the reform plan informs, supports and encourages parents as partners in the educational process.

(C)(1)(a)(iv) The application does not provide evidence that the reform plan exposes students to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that deepen individual learning.

(C)(1)(a)(v) There is some evidence that students will master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving. For example, PBIS, The Leader in Me, MTSS, and IB. More information regarding timelines and processes for formative and summative assessments, data collection, analysis and use, performance goals, and performance monitoring is needed.

(C)(1)(b)(i) The applicant provides some evidence of personalized 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 such as Individual Learning Plans, IB program, and MTSS. The sequencing of personalized instructional content and skill development is vague. More evidence of how this will be implemented with fidelity across grade levels, schools, and programs is needed. Evidence regarding how the plan informs, supports, and encourages parents is vague.

(C)(1)(b)(ii) The reform plan includes a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments.

(C)(1)(b)(iii) There is some evidence that students will have access to high-quality content, including digital learning content as appropriate, aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements via the state's Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (CIITS) . The application also refers to additional high-quality content, including digital learning content, such as MOOCs and 3D Game Labs. The plan identifies "toolboxes" as a component of the MTSS program as emphasizing evidence-based, high quality strategies and curriculum, but specific details regarding this component is not included.

(C)(1)(b)(iv)(A) The application states that Universal Screeners are used three times annually to determine progress toward college and career readiness standards. The application states that the assessment process "should" be used routinely by teachers and "should" be aligned with learning targets for MTSS tier 1. CIITS and AIMSweb will be used for benchmark assessments. It is not clear how feedback will be shared with students and families, how often, or how personalized learning recommendations will be communicated.

(C)(1)(b)(v)(B) Accommodations for high needs students are not addressed.

(C)(1)(b)(c) Mechanisms to provide training and supports to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided is not evident across grade levels, schools, and programs

This plan does not include a convincing approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students (as defined in this notice) that enable participating students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and

career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) and college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice) and accelerate his or her learning through support of his or her needs and received a 6.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	6
--	-----------	----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's plan includes multiple opportunities for all participating educators to engage in training and professional learning. These include:

- opportunities with the University of Kentucky (P20 Innovation Lab, blended learning, personalized learning)
- job-embedded learning and summer institutes for MTSS led by nine content-area MTSS specialists
- the state's Professional Growth and Effectiveness System (PGEs)
- Professional Learning Communities
- Teacher and Leader training in the key initiatives of the reform model
- and the state's CIITS

The project management plan (Project Area Three:Staff Development) identifies PGEs training for school leaders, PGEs district wide implementation, The applicant indicates that continued PGEs learning, MTSS training by cohort, MTSS user-friendly forms developed, and Professional Learning (PL) in the key initiatives as appropriate- an explanation re what the applicant deems appropriate would add clarity. More information on the deliverables is needed. The narrative further states that "through PGEs, self-reflection is a process by which teachers assess the effectiveness of their instructional planning, lesson implementation, content knowledge, beliefs, and dispositions for the purpose of self-improvement." Principal evaluation is not addressed.

The plan minimally addresses how educators will use tools, data, and resources to close achievement gaps, increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly qualified teachers and principals, including hard-to-staff schools, subjects, and specialty areas. Although the plan indicates that educators will have access to the aforementioned, additional information regarding staff development on how to use and fully integrate the tools to meet the goals and objectives of the reform plan.

The applicant has a strong foundation and multiple resources to improve teaching and learning. Specific information regarding how the Project Management Plan's learning opportunities align with the project goals, how the plan links specific teacher/leader learning to student outcomes, and how effectiveness will be monitored. Additional information is required regarding how the applicant will increase the number of students who receive instruction for effective and highly effective teachers, including hard-to-staff schools, subjects (such as mathematics and science), and specialty areas (such as special education). The applicant describes the IB program and two grant-funded initiatives (Literacy Design Initiative and Math Design Initiative), but it is unclear whether all educators in the participating schools participate in these initiatives. Special education is not specifically addressed. Effective and highly effective principals is not specifically addressed.

The information provided does not fully address the criteria of this component.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	5
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has reorganized its central office to provide support and services to all participating schools. School Based Decision Making Councils at each school site are in place, and the leadership teams have sufficient autonomy to fully implement the reform model. The applicant did not provide information regarding comprehensive shared governance plans that would be able to support this initiative with respect to school policy and infrastructure.</p> <p>The applicant proposes development of a performance-based mastery recognition system that allows for students to progress through the curriculum at their own pace, giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways, with planning to begin in 2014. The narrative does not specify how students will be awarded credit.</p> <p>The Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) Framework is cited as providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully assessable to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners. Additional and specific information regarding supports for students with disabilities and English learners is needed.</p> <p>The applicant has some elements of a high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator (as defined in this notice), and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	4
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant mentions that several of the schools have allocated funds for teachers to work with students beyond the regular school day, one school will open its library in the summer and provide bus tokens, and that many of the schools across the district offer homework assistance and technology tools. Grant funds will be allocated to purchase student devices with priority given to high needs students.</p> <p>The plan does not fully address how parents will have access to the necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school.</p> <p>The plan does not address the needs of low-income students, students receiving special education, or English learners.</p> <p>The applicant has upgraded the wireless infrastructure in all schools, employs technology resource teachers, and maintains a Department of Educational and Administrative Technology. The district has implemented a Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) policy- how all students will have access to the BYOD is not clear.</p> <p>The applicant meets all requirements of (d).</p> <p>The applicant has some elements of a high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator (as defined in this notice), and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	4
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's evaluation team will be comprised of an external evaluator, the project coordinator, school and district representatives, and project partners and stakeholders. The applicant indicates the the evaluation team will collect a variety of data on an ongoing basis to determine the fidelity of implementation. The narrative includes information regarding the</p>		

methodology and research design, but is not convincing as to the quality of the approach. Component of the final evaluation plan are discussed, but specific measures, assessments, outcome indicators, a continuous improvement, frequency of reports, etc. are not provided or are general/vague in nature. Specific information as to how practice, policy, and procedure will be guided by outcomes, or how the outcomes will guide student comprehensive school improvement and student learning are absent. The applicant indicates that free access to the evaluation results will be provided via peer-reviewed journals or newsletters annually.

The applicant has some elements of a high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) 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 plan must address how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top – District, such as investments in professional development, technology, and staff.

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

5

4

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant plans to use multiple methods of communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders such as the district website, electronic newsletters, social media (Facebook and Twitter), district-operated cable television, school-based newsletters, PTO/PTA, and the district's Community Partners Leadership Team. It is not clear if newsletters will be sent via U.S. mail to ensure that stakeholders without access to cable television or Internet receive adequate communication, or if newsletters will be available in languages other than English.

The applicant has most elements of a high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.

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

5

0

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not provide rationale for selection of performance measures.

No data were provided for highly effective or effective teachers and principals.

The applicant provided performance measures for each grade band served except Kindergarten, as data were unavailable. Performance measures were not provided for all subgroups. Academic performance measures focused predominantly on the state's required assessments. The socio-emotional leading indicator used was in-school suspension rates.

The plan does not adequately address how the measure 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.

The plan does not adequately address how the applicant will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

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

5

1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant indicated the method of selecting an evaluator and the general components of the evaluation plan. However, the applicant does not adequately address this component of the proposal. More details are required, such as specific timelines, methods of measurement and intentional use of data for continuous improvement. The applicant's plan does not include a high-quality approach to continuously improve its plans or evidence of rigorous evaluation of effectiveness.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant identified all of the funds that will support the project and the budget appears to be reasonable and sufficient

for development and implementation of the proposal. Fund descriptions are provided, and the applicant identifies funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs.

The applicant addressed each element of this component and was awarded all points.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not provide a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant.

The applicant does not provide an estimated post-grant budget for the three years after the term of the grant. One-time equipment purchases (such as laptops, desktops, netbooks, printers, and handheld devices) are listed as comprising 3% of the overall budget, but there is not an evident plan for technology upgrades, repairs, or replacements. Multiple software programs are included in the budget, but there is not an evident plan for systematic and ongoing maintenance.

More information is required regarding the \$1,200,000. allocated for PBIS and MTSS supports described by the applicant as "A toolbox of supporting programs for all tiers, intervention through enrichment."

It is not clear how the applicant will support the increasing technological infusion over time in terms of IT personnel.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	2

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates a strong community partnership to support the plan.

Population-level outcomes include educational and family and community supports. However, the desired results are vague and goals have not been established.

Methods for tracking the selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all children and at the student level are inadequate. How the applicant will use data to target resources in order to improve results for participating students, with special emphasis on students facing significant challenges is presented in general terms and does not provide sufficient information. Some evidence of a strategy to scale up the model is provided, but is not convincing. Identification and inventory of the needs and assessts, creation of a decision-making process and infrastructure, and strategies to engage parents and families of participating students are not evident. The applicant states that implementation progress will undergo the same review as the other key initiatives of the reform plan.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant meets Absolute Priority 1 and addresses how it will build on the core educational assurance areas (as defined in this notice) to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice); 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.

Total	210	87
-------	-----	----