



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0184OH-1 for Gallia-Vinton Educational Service Center

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes a strong reform vision to build on its work in four core educational assurance areas and provides a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests. The applicant has been deeply involved in the State RttT grant and has already initiated a number of activities as part of that project. Each of the five districts in the consortium formed Transformation Teams with membership consisting of at least one-half teachers. The District Transformation Teams will assume oversight of managing the districts' roles in this project. Each district in the consortium engages groups of teachers to map curriculum, prepare pacing guides, develop common formative assessments to monitor student progress, and, teachers in each district execute the curriculum. utilizing an Assess, Plan, Teach model. Each district developed professionally to understand Response to Intervention (RTI) and central office personnel and building teachers crafted district RTI plans to improve student learning for all students, as well. Each district in the consortium has provided intense development to support the use of Scientifically Based Research approaches to curriculum, instruction, and assessment. The districts' administration and teachers have received intensive training in utilizing data to determine plans for continuous improvement. Mentors, building principals, and Gallia-Vinton ESC consultants assist new teachers with examining student performance, tying the results back to instruction, and making instructional decisions to improve results for students.

The applicant provides a clear overview of the various components of its reform vision. It proposes to expand the Formative Instructional Practices (FIP) to all of its schools as a result of this project .FIP process consists of four components: Creating clear learning targets, Gathering evidence of learning in formal and informal ways, Providing meaningful feedback for students, and supporting students to own their learning. Professional development will occur face-to-face, using on-line modules, and in collaborative study groups consisting of grade-level and/or content teams.

RttT funding will be utilized to present integration of technology as determined through building surveys. Technology will be purchased as per the needs assessment. PD will be offered on the operation of the equipment (e.g., how to operate interactive white board) as well as for delivering instruction/the curriculum utilizing the equipment (e.g., taking students on a virtual field trip or teaching math by accessing the National Library of Virtual Manipulatives).The consortium intends to increase the number of students enrolling in a university or college and decrease the number of students requiring remedial classes. The applicant's plan includes giving students access to the AP learning to increase college-and-career readiness.

Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career (PARCC) assessments will be implemented. The PARCC assessments are aligned to college expectations and will measure college-and-career readiness levels of the students. Teachers, students, and parents will have data to make mid-course adjustments to increase students' accomplishments. Additionally, the districts will give students another option to help them to better prepare for postsecondary education. Students will be permitted to take college courses online while they attend our high schools. Districts will also explore the capabilities of the new Instructional Improvement System to deliver college-level courses to students, will explore the options of funding the courses for students, will provide the technology necessary for the college coursework to occur, and will develop district policies and practices to guide the process.

Gap Coaches (consultants) will be placed in the buildings as resources to specifically improve results for vulnerable students. Gap Coaches will facilitate effective collaboration between the regular education teachers and special education teachers (Intervention Specialists) with the intention of improving student results. The collaborative framework will be systematic, will be institutionalized; and will continue beyond the period of time that coaches will serve. Gap Coaches will also provide expertise in the application of best practices promote higher levels of achievement.

The districts will be adding additional resources (e.g., Multiple Intelligence materials, Differentiation resources, hands-on manipulatives, and more) to facilitate personalization of learning. The districts are in the process of conducting related needs

assessments. The needs assessments include an examination of the needs of struggling students. Assistive technology will be added to each district to support all students' access to personalized learning.

These activities describe a strong vision and merits the awarding of the full value of points available for this criterion.

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

10

9

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant specifies that all 27 of the schools in the five districts of the consortium are to be included in the project. The vision and mission of the consortium is that every student, every K-12 classroom, and every teacher and leader be involved in the transformation to place students at the center of learning and that the RttT District plan must include primary teachers and students to initiate the process and prevent any gaps in achievement. The plan must also support grades 4-12 teachers and students to ensure students remain on track and achieve at college and career levels. As a result all 27 schools in the five consortium school districts will participate in the project. The applicant also describes how many students from each district, along with the number and percentages that are high need and low-income students. However, the number of educators to participate in the project is unclear as no educators are identified as participating in some of the school districts.

The demonstrates elements of a high quality plan for implementing its reform proposal in the manner in which it will individualize and customize resources, services and activities among the various participating school districts. According to the applicant, the member districts of the consortium are at different stages and levels within their developments of the process of reform, so each district will customize the full implementation of the project within a manner and timeframe that suits district's needs. The districts will collaborate throughout the life of the implementation to share successes and challenges and support one another on the road to excellence. Based on the elements of the applicant's plan to address this criterion, as summarized by the examples above, points are awarded in the high-range of possible points available.

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

10

9

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes how it intends to scale up the proposed vision. The consortium has already chosen to include every K-12 teacher and leader in the RttT District effort to personalize learning for every K-12 student. Implementing the Formative Instructional Process (FIP) is the main vehicle for building the personalized learning structure for students. Other efforts in the Southeastern Ohio consortium's RttT District plan will serve as scaffolds to bring FIP to a scale that translates to students being college and career ready.

According to the applicant, the project will be scaled-up by allowing teachers to initiate the FIP process in manageable chunks. For instance, teachers will be given time and practice in each of the four components of FIP (deconstructing the standards to identify clear learning targets, collecting student evidence of learning for analysis, provide meaningful feedback for students, and guiding students to own their work) before they must fully integrate the process. Teachers may also select classes for implementation before having to utilize the process in their full schedules. It is expected that the entire FIP process/ RttT grant process will be integrated and fully implemented in every classroom by the beginning of Year Three.

Even teachers that are not instructors of the Common Core and Ohio Revised Standards will be included in the study and implementation of FIP. This will support students being immersed in the process of understanding "how" to learn and will facilitate students owning their learning. New hires must receive initial training as well as be integrated in current delivery of the plan. Experts (coaches) will be added to help facilitate an evidence-based framework for providing the most effective instructional engagement for vulnerable students. All district actions will be aligned to the process of implementing Formative Instructional Practices to bring the goals for learning to fruition.

The applicant describes an effective and strong plan. However, it does not reach the level of a high-quality plan as it doesn't provide a description of how the applicant will grow the project beyond its current vision for ensuring long-lasting, systemic change. Therefore, although this criterion is scored in the high-range of available scores it is not awarded the full value of available points.

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

10

10

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a strong plan for improving student learning and performance and increased equity. Goals are described for academic achievement, high school graduation and college enrollment. The proposed target goals exceed those

set by the state education agency. The measures used are clearly explained and anticipated performance by appropriate subgroups is also included. The applicant's goals in reducing achievement gaps among identified subgroups are also clearly defined. The applicant's are ambitious. For instance, the applicant projects that 100% of all its students, including special education students will be proficient in reading as a result of this project. It also anticipates that 100% of its students will graduate from high school and that 80% of them will enroll in college. It is an ambitious goal to ensure that all students graduate from high school and that 80 percent go on to college. In math, slightly over 79% of students in the applicant's schools meet the state's proficiency standards and 84.2% are meeting the state proficiency levels in reading. The applicant proposes a goal of 100% of its students meeting the proficiency levels in both math and reading by the end of this project. However, the applicant does describe an impressive array of services, resources and activities to help students achieve these goals. For instance, students will have opportunities beyond the school day to master learning targets. Afterschool instructors will extend the FIP process for students that need additional time for mastery. Students will be identified for afterschool utilizing formative assessment results and target-focused learning experiences will be designed for students. Enrichment activities in afterschool will also be curriculum and target-based thus providing additional time for closing gaps. Parents will be informed as to the anytime, anywhere learning opportunities. Parents will understand the Instructional Improvement System (IIS) and the easy access it will provide to families for supporting learning. The IIS will also help parents to track student progress in their classwork. Community partners will engage with schools to overcome or alleviate non-academic barriers to student achievement. Community partners will take part in Parent Academies to provide parents information to the services and eligibility for family participation. And, a focus on K-3 literacy is a part of the District RttT plan. These planned activities and resources should help ensure that the applicant meets the identified performance measures.

In regard to high school graduation and college enrollment, project funds will support an intense increase on college/career awareness. Campus visits and job shadowing will be common. And, districts will purchase access to the Ohio Career Information System on the Ohio Department of Education website. The students with their families will prepare online portfolios of college and career goals, scheduling classes to meet the goals, collect evidence of their being on track for college and career, and more. The Gallia-Vinton ESC and its district partners have implemented a Transition Fair for Students with Disabilities. Access to college and careers is an important feature of the annual Transition Fair. All area students with disabilities attend. Parent Academies will help parents and students negotiate the path to college. The Parent Academies will present sessions for filling out FASFA, how to afford college, accessing student scholarships, student loans, and so forth.

The proposed activities and resources, such as those discussed above, should help ensure that the applicant meets the identified performance measures. Based on the applicant's description of its proposed activities and services the full value of points is awarded for this criterion.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes a clear record of success in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching and in achieve reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools. In 2001, four of the five districts in the consortium were on the bottom rungs of ranking with two labeled as “Academic Emergency” schools and two designated as “Academic Watch”. The districts have made concentrated, focused efforts to support teaching and learning, attendance, and graduation rates and each has made significant progress data is provided that shows that each district is now “Effective”, “Excellent”, and even “Excellent with Distinction”. The districts have also all demonstrated significant improvement in the Performance Index ratings. The applicant provides data related to a Performance Index to document its success in achieving reforms in its persistently low achieving schools. The Performance Indicator measures the achievement of every student, not just whether they reach “proficient,” on a series of 24 state achievement tests. Schools receive points for every student’s level of achievement. The higher the student’s level, the more points that apply toward the PI rating. The participating districts have all demonstrated significant improvement in the Performance Index ratings, including in the lowest performing schools.

The consortium's districts have applied themselves to the process of improvement, carefully analyzing data and examining possible root causes. Now all five of the districts are above the state average for graduation. And, four out of the five districts have shown improvement over the preceding year(s). The districts formed District Leadership Teams and Building Leadership Teams. The teams promote shared leadership and shared accountability. The teams ensure communication among all school staff. They closely examine data, interpret data, and guide the process for improving data. The teams assist with monitoring the progress toward goals. Teacher-Based-Teams (grade-level and content-based) are in place in the buildings. Their function is to collaborate to design support for students. The districts have afterschool programs to extend learning time

and expand opportunities for students, especially the targeted groups of the Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities.

The applicant states the consortium districts are not where they want to be in graduation rates, but all five of the districts are above the state average for graduation. And, four out of the five districts have shown improvement over the preceding year(s). There is currently a gap in the districts' capacities to track the college enrollment of its graduation. However, it is anticipated this gap will be bridged with collaboration between the Ohio Department of Education and the Ohio Board of Regents.

However, the applicant fails to describe how it makes student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. Therefore, the full value of points is not awarded for this particular criterion.

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

5

4

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes the procedures and policies in place to ensure a high level of transparency of actual school level expenditures for regular K-12 instructional support, pupil support and school administration. All school districts' public records, including salary schedules for teachers, support staff, and administrators, are available for public inspection and/or copying in accordance with State Law. Each of the districts has a policy defining the procedures for public access to records.

The consortium's local districts have procedures and practices in place for financial accountability and transparency. An annual budget is prepared and approved by the Budget Commission each year. Within that time frame, the public is informed via the media and in some cases, the district websites, that copies of the budget are available for their review. At the end of each fiscal year, the districts prepare an annual progress report. The progress reports contain information related to accountability: enrollment figures; revenue and sources of revenue including state, federal, local taxes and grants; expenditures relative to salaries and fringe benefits of personnel; other expenditures including purchased services, supplies, capital outlay and more. Per pupil spending is reported in comparison to state and surrounding district rates. The local share of the total cost of educating students is conveyed. The Ohio Department of Education home page has a link to district financial reports for the parents and the community. The districts also file a Continuous Improvement Plan with the State Department of Education.

The districts reveal the amount of funds dedicated to the different improvement strategies and actions. Additionally, the districts display their budgets, including the amounts directed toward salaries and benefits, in the Continuous Improvement Plan. The plans are stored electronically on the Ohio Department of Education website and are available for public view.

The districts use their websites to increase public awareness. The websites contain various information including the Ohio Report Cards; the districts' RttT Scopes of Work for the Ohio RttT grant; the College and Career Readiness Standards; parent access to child's achievement via Progress Book or similar program; links to educational sites for students; teacher access to professional development; Board of Education meeting minutes, and more. And, according to the applicant, the districts and buildings keep the public informed via newsletters and include financial information in those mailings when appropriate.

However, the applicant does not sufficiently describe a process that ensures transparency to the level required by this criterion including actual personnel salaries at the school level. Therefore, the full value of points is not awarded for this criterion.

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

10

8

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides some evidence that there are successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in its proposal. The State of Ohio and the Ohio Department of Education are supportive of providing personalized learning to raise and accelerate student achievement. The Ohio Department of Education (ODE) has structures in place to support the conditions and autonomy necessary for districts to pursue better results for students. The Ohio Revised Code 3302.07 authorizes the State Superintendent of Instruction to waive specific statutory provisions to implement innovative programs.

The districts in the Southeastern Ohio Alliance Group have waivers related to the required state minimum school days. Each of the districts has been granted four days in which students are released from attendance in order to permit the teachers to take part in professional development to increase their competency and capacity. Senate Bill 311 permitted the State Board of Education to enact a plan that enables students to earn units of high school credit based on a demonstration of subject area competency instead of being based on the hours of classroom instruction (Flex Credit). Flex credit is allowing the districts to assist students with closing achievement gaps. In the alliance group plan, vulnerable students will be permitted to achieve high school credits via virtual learning with the support of tutors (licensed teachers).

While this provides some evidence in regard to the requirements of this criterion, it does not provide adequate evidence of sufficient autonomy to implement the type of personal learning environments that the applicant describes in its proposal. Therefore, the full value of points is not awarded.

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

15

10

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes a great deal of stakeholder input into instructional activities within the consortium districts. When the state was developing its successful proposal for an RttT project the districts sought input from various parties to make the decision to. Union officers (collective bargaining membership in every district), community-based partners, community members, teachers and other staff members were made aware of the opportunity via a series of meetings. The depth of commitment, including participation in a new system for evaluating teachers and principals, was explained and explored. The districts reported they received favorable community feedback relevant to the RttT initiative and the districts' decisions to take part. The districts continue to encourage community awareness through their websites.

When Ohio received its RttT grant, the districts formed Transformation Teams consisting of at least one-half teachers (teacher union members) and including representatives from each of the buildings to develop and oversee the RttT Scopes of Work. The Transformation Teams compiled district and building data to drive the plan. Transformation Team members sought the input of all building members in focusing the plan. Union members (teachers) on the team made sure teachers were well-apprised of the data and garnered input relevant to union perspective. The Scopes of Work were completed incorporating the most widely-held views.

The districts collect information from parents and students regularly, especially in the form of surveys. School climate, school engagement, the quality of learning, learning preferences, leadership, and more, are rated by parents and students. The building principals and teachers interact with the building parent organizations at least monthly and the parent-representatives are able to express their perceptions in regard to school services and direction for improvement. The middle school and high school student councils contribute recommendations for school improvement. Parent-teacher conferences give parents a venue for sharing and teachers encourage the process. Community groups, for example Family & Children First Councils, sometimes use focus groups and/or surveys to garner parents' views of their students' needs in terms of the local school districts.

The results are shared with schools during joint meetings. And, the districts have parent mentors that work specifically to represent families of students with disabilities. The parent mentor shares parent concerns regularly and freely. All information resulting from interaction with students and parents is considered for direction for improvement.

These activities describe a significant amount of involvement on the part of stakeholders in instructional plans and activities within the school districts of the consortium for many activities and initiatives. However, the applicant does not sufficiently describe how stakeholders were engaged specifically in the development of this proposal. For instance, the applicant notes that the districts will enlist the services of school community representatives to monitor transformation progress and that input from stakeholders will be utilized to measure the success of the plan and to make adjustments accordingly. But, that is not adequate in addressing how stakeholders were involved in planning this proposal as required by this criterion. Therefore, the full value of points available is not awarded.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes an extensive plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. The plan includes an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students that enable participating students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards and college- and career-ready graduation requirements and accelerate his or her learning through support of his or her needs, and identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements, understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goals; The plan involves identifying clear learning targets (Common Core and Revised Standards); providing common instruction for students to build foundational knowledge; providing high quality differentiated learning experiences based on student needs, preferences, and choices; and frequent assessments to gauge student progress to provide them with meaningful feedback and guide them toward mastery. The process

continues until students demonstrate at least a level of proficiency within the standard. Mastery of the standards is aligned to students being on-track for graduation and being prepared for college and careers.

Teachers will prepare students to analyze their own work as well as the work of their peers. This includes teaching the students to utilize rubrics and to be exposed to numerous examples of products from exemplary to weak. Students will also learn to use tools to track their progress, to reflect on their progress, and to share their learning with others. This entire process occurs in an age-appropriate manner in every K-12 classroom for every set of learning targets. Each district will ensure the students are capable of utilizing technology to learn. Training students may be embedded in the curriculum and provided on an as-needed basis or actual classes may be implemented. The training will be conducted by teachers, the district technology personnel, or external consultants.

Part of the applicant’s reform process will include immersing the students in a culture of college and careers and students setting goals will be integral to the process. Conversations around learning, academic skills, college, and a myriad of careers will be held at least weekly. Teachers will help students to make connections between the standards and the usefulness of those skills in every student’s future pursuits. Every district will identify college immersion activities that will be facilitated in each grade. Activities may include dressing for a career, field trips, classroom guest speakers, campus experiences, job shadowing, internships, work experience, Service Learning and more.

The applicant’s plan also will assist students in accessing a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals and ensure he or she can graduate on time and college- and career-ready. Students will establish a web-based Portfolio to create an Individual Career and Academic Plan using the site’s planning resources. The students will create their student profiles and begin the exploration of careers by completing an aptitude assessment. Students will utilize the site to learn of occupations in the various career fields including the education and training requirements. Students will choose the career fields of greatest interest to them and use the Course Plan component, the high school courses of study, and district requirements for graduation to create an Individual Course Plan to map out four years of high school study. Students will carry their plan through high school tracking their success in meeting their goals. Students will maintain their portfolios through graduation and will visit as often as needed to keep their profiles up to date. They will be required to visit at least once per semester to measure progress toward goals and toward being on-track for graduation. The students will share their progress with teachers and parents.

The applicant’s plan also addresses high need students. According to law students with disabilities age 14 and older must have a Transition Plan with goals to assist them with successful transition to adulthood. The students are assisted with college- and career planning, an exploration of options for post-secondary transition, goal-setting, a course of study plan for achieving goals, etc. The Ohio Career Information System will become part of the transition planning for Students with Disabilities. In addition, students with disabilities take part in a Transition Fair annually. The Gallia-Vinton ESC Transition Team facilitates the Transition Fair on the campus of the University of Rio Grande. Students take part in real-world simulations related to work/education and living independently. They receive information regarding support services provided by agencies like the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation and Jobs and Family Services. They hear from speakers that talk about career-dress, interviewing skills, banking, campus support services, and more. Many students, including students with disabilities, will have the opportunity to participate in school-based or community-based work experiences.

It is the presentation/representation pieces of the Formative Instructional Process that involves students in deep learning experiences; exposes them to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate students; and, allows them to master critical content as well as develop dispositions they will need for college such as teamwork skills, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, and problem-solving. The Formative Instructional Process will support deep learning experiences in areas of academic interests, will permit students’ exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motive students and deepen learning, and will allow students to master content as well as important 21st Century skills like teamwork, critical thinking, communication, and perseverance. Students will have a variety of high quality approaches and environments. Students will receive focused instructional lessons from the teacher to build foundational knowledge for each learning target. Students will pursue learning paths to high and deep levels of learning related to targets dependent upon their needs, their preferences, their learning strengths, and evidence-based practices.

The proposed activities and resources described above describe a high quality plan that meets the requirements of this criterion. As a result, the full value of points available.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	18
--	-----------	-----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes a strong plan for all participating educators to engage in training, and in professional teams or communities, that supports their individual and collective capacity to support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student’s academic needs and help ensure all students can graduate on time and college- and career-ready. The Formative Instructional Process enables teachers to personalize learning for every

child. All of the teachers in the consortium will take part in high quality professional develop to train them as practitioners of the Formative Instructional Process. The teachers will be trained in deconstructing the standards to reduce them to clear learning targets that can be understood by students. Professional development activities will also be proved to assist them in gathering evidence of student learning and analyzing the evidence to determine the instructional needs of each child. Teachers will be able to provide meaningful feedback for students so students can understand how they need to proceed in order to improve their progress.

The professional development will include increasing teachers’ knowledge of the Formative Instructional Process, nine classroom strategies that optimize students’ learning (Marzano), multiple intelligences (Howard Gardner), using technology to facilitate teaching and learning, and how to utilize quality sites (Universal Design for Learning, INFOhio, Thinkfinity) to build quality experiences. Teachers will be trained to understand and administer the New Generation of Assessments and will learn to manipulate Ohio’s Instructional Improvement System to benefit students. Professional development will also include teacher-specific learning as identified by each teacher’s annual goals for learning or Improvement Plans as required by the new Ohio Teacher Evaluation System.

The professional development will be customized per district and will take place on development days built into the teachers’ contracts as well as additional time during the school year and in th summer. In many cases, teachers will be compensated for engaging in PD beyond their contractual time. Some professional development will be online. The Battelle Institute for Kids has developed a series of online learning modules for the Formative Instructional Process (FIP). Teachers will engage in three beginning study modules to initiate FIP and continue to build their skills in FIP by taking part in additional online modules.

Teachers will be able to participate in PD relative to personalizing learning for students as well as to address their needs to improve classroom competencies. Teachers will utilize the Universal Design for Learning site to increase their expertise in representing the curriculum in multiple manners and to engage students in the curricula in multiple manners. Teachers will use Universal Design for Learning to improve results for all students but it is especially effective as a method to support the learning of students with disabilities. Some professional development will be face-to-face learning, and some professional development will be embedded in the school day. Each building has or will select building facilitators to support the implementation and improvement of FIP practices. The facilitators receive specialized training from the Battelle Institute to acquire skills to lead building teachers to a mastery of providing personalized learning for students.

Teachers will take part in Professional Learning Communities to develop professionally. Teachers will utilize grade level meetings to advance their understanding of the Universal Design for Learning, the nine instructional strategies identified by Marzano as being highly effective, and the practice of using a multiple intelligence approach to curricula. Educators will have professional development to understand the nature of the New Generation assessments that measure students’ college and career readiness. Aside from understanding the content and structure of the assessments, educators will also have to learn to administer the tests.

The districts will soon have access to Ohio’s new Instructional Improvement System. The IIS will have multiple capacities to assist teachers with building student profiles to guide learning, gauge their progress, and keep parents and students informed. Data will be central to the process of personalizing learning for students. There will be multiple sources of data to understand students’ needs, to guide instruction, to gauge students’ progress toward college and career readiness, and to assess and improved educators’ practices. A pivotal component of FIP is frequent assessment of student data to make decisions to meet students’ needs. Teachers will learn of multiple ways to assess students’ skills both formally and informally. Teachers will analyze evidence of students’ learning to personalize learning. Teachers will provide explicit feedback to help students realize where their learning must go in order to reach learning targets. Teachers will also use those results to design appropriate experiences to continually increase students’ skills and knowledge aligned to clear learning targets.

The new Ohio Teacher Evaluation System and the Ohio Principal Evaluation System include differentiated performance results for teachers and principals. The RttT District grant will utilize the results of the new evaluation systems to ensure equitable distribution of highly effective and effective teachers and principals in the Southeastern Ohio Consortium.

The applicant describes an excellent plan for increasing the capacity of educators in the participating schools for providing effective learning environments and accelerating the learning of all students. The only aspects of this criterion in which the applicant falls a little short is in providing more information regarding how the teacher evaluation system will be used to improve teaching effectiveness and a more detailed plan for increasing the number of students who have access to effective and highly effective teachers and principals and is why this criterion does not receive the full value of points available.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes some evidence of how it provides support and services to all participating schools. It explains a structure and organization of the central office and the consortium governance structure to provide support and services to all participating schools. And, it has a process to provide leadership to improve instruction in the participating schools. Within this structure there is, according to the applicant, flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and noneducators, and school-level budgets. For instance, the Gallia-Vinton ESC provides services to districts according to district-identified and/or data indicated needs. A Gallia-Vinton ESC consultant has been Ohio Department of Education-certified to provide training for the new Ohio Teacher Evaluation System (OTES). The new Ohio Teacher Evaluation System requires that some teachers undergo the evaluation process annually. This places an additional burden on the principals' time and districts have indicated a need for support to ensure principals have adequate occasions to continue to lead the buildings' continuous improvement actions. Member districts have made resources available to make this possible.

As evidence of practices that personalize learning, the applicant describes its extensive afterschool program in which instructors utilize Formative Instructional Practices, active learning, student-owned learning, college and career readiness awareness and preparation, and the programs will provide social and emotional supports for families and students. For instance, afterschools are implementing Service Learning in the present school year. Service Learning has been proven to help students develop their personal assets, helps students develop emotionally and socially, provide students with opportunities for "real world" application of knowledge and skills, and Service Learning is an important component of college applications.

However, the applicant provides little information regarding how it gives students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic; gives students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways; and provides learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners. Based on these factors, this criterion is scored in low range of possible points.

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

10

7

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes a variety of ways in which stakeholders will support and resources to access content and learning tools. Project funds will be used to purchase equipment (like laptops or iPads) in numbers sufficient for personalizing learning. Adaptive and assistive equipment will be purchased to help students overcome obstacles to learning. Assistive equipment will ensure all students, especially the most vulnerable, will have access to the proper tools.

According to the applicant, the technology will be available to the students during the school day, during afterschool hours (approximately 15 hours/week). Parents will be invited to attend afterschool to utilize the technology to support students' learning. The families will have access to the new Ohio Career Information System as well as websites to support student progress and intervention during afterschool programming. Parents will receive training in the operation of equipment as well as training to access rich, trusted websites.

Every educator in the district will also be furnished a computer and other technology tools to fully participate in personalizing learning. Teachers will use the technology for instruction and to develop learning paths for students. And, the technology will also be utilized to track student data, especially as advances in data systems are made by the state and the districts.

The applicant also described how it will use information technology systems to allow parents and students to access information and data. The participating districts take part in Ohio's Statewide Longitudinal Data system. The state system stores demographic and certification data for Ohio teachers, teaching assignments, student information, student test results, and more. Data are utilized in various ways including providing district, building, and student results for the Ohio Report Card. Ohio intends to expand its Statewide 66 Longitudinal Data system to include a more robust Instructional Improvement System (IIS). The system will identify and assist at-risk students and assist in preparing students for college and careers. Tools will be provided for schools, teachers, and parents. The systems will support personalized learning by providing quick turn-around, valid data to measure progress and inform instruction. The system will also make parent reports available for families to measure students' on-track levels of achievement. The system will be interoperable for easy sharing of data once completed.

However, the applicant's plan lacks detail regarding the nature, form and content of the resources to be provided, nor does it adequately describe how appropriate levels of technical support will be provided through a "range" of strategies. Little information is provided regarding training and support to teachers, students and parents regarding the technology tools, or how the applicant intends to make it fully accessible and transportable. For this reason, this criterion did not receive the full range of points possible.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	14

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides information regarding a strong plan for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals. During the first year of the project, the focus of monitoring will be on making sure the activities have occurred in a way to keep educators and staff on track in accomplishing major project activities. The applicant describes a grant monitoring tool that it will construct for use by personnel. The tool will be organized around preparing the staff, providing the resources and tools, expanding the opportunities for learning, and providing social and emotional support. The activities that will lead to bringing the goals to fruition will be monitored using this tool. The monitoring tool will be completed/updated monthly by various personnel. The building afterschool site coordinator and site manager will complete the sections applicable to afterschool including Parent Academies, Developmental Assets, the Ohio Career Information System, and more. They will share the report with the Building Improvement Team. The principal will complete the tool as per his/her evidence and submit to the Building Improvement Team. Similarly, the school librarian will complete the monitoring tool related to updating the libraries for students and submit the results.

The Building Improvement Team will compile the results from the teachers', principal's, librarian, and afterschool reports to complete a building report. The Building Improvement Teams will use the building report to determine whether the building is on track for success as compared to the District RttT plan. The Building Improvement Team will also utilize the report to discuss next steps and recommend changes if needed. They will share their findings with the rest of the staff via the monthly staff meeting. The Building Improvement Team will submit a building report to the district. The Gallia-Vinton Education Service Center for Research, Evaluation, Data and Assessment will conduct the continuous improvement process at the consortium level. Personnel from the Center for Research, Evaluation, Data and Assessment will compile reports from the five districts into a monthly assessment of the progress of the consortium toward grant goals. The monthly reports will contribute to quarterly assessments of progress for the purpose of continuous improvement.

The applicant also describes a process for publicly sharing information. The Gallia-Vinton ESC will share the results of the quarterly report with every building in every district electronically. The Gallia-Vinton ESC will also include information regarding any changes that need to occur to increase the effectiveness of the grant plan. The quarterly report will be published on the Gallia-Vinton ESC RttT Grant page. The districts will publish the reports on their websites as well. Buildings will share the quarterly progress of the RttT District grant via a building newsletter and through the parent-teacher organization. The Gallia-Vinton ESC will share the progress of the project with the local newspapers semi-annually.

The continuous improvement process in Years Two and beyond will be more involved and will more closely scrutinize the impact of the activities on teaching and learning. A Gallia-Vinton ESC consultant from the Center for Research, Evaluation, Data and Assessment will meet with building committees every two months to lead the process. Building committees will include teachers representing each grade level, FIP Facilitators, the Literacy Coach, the Gap Coach, the afterschool site coordinator, and the principal. The process will occur during the school day and substitutes will permit teachers to attend.

The plan described by the district is thorough in many respects. However, it does not describe sufficient activities and procedures for sharing information with the public, beyond posting it on the website and reporting it twice a year to local newspapers. Therefore, this criterion does not receive the full value of points.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant reports that it will develop a grant monitoring tool for use by personnel. The tool will be organized around preparing the staff, providing the resources and tools, expanding the opportunities for learning, and providing social and emotional support, and will identify the Grant Activity, Description of Progress Evidence, and/or Needs. The proposed instrument focused strongly on professional development activities. The applicant describes a process for obtaining input from a wide range of internal stakeholders. For examples, the Gallia-Vinton ESC consultant will pose questions for building members to be answered regarding the project's progress. Answers must be supported with hard evidence. And, the questions will be related to the four components of the grant that will permit the personalization of learning: Prepare the Staff; Provide the Tools and Resources; Expand the Number of Opportunities for Learning; and, Provide Social and Emotional Support. The committee members will be aware of the topics to be addressed and will know the questions that will be posed. According to the applicant, this process and system will permit the representatives to gather input from all building members and will enable them to prepare to cite significant evidence.

However, the description provided in this section focuses primarily on internal stakeholders and the applicant provides little discussion or explanation regarding how it will ensure ongoing communication and engagement with external stakeholders, such as parents, community leaders, and other interested individuals. For this reason, this criterion is scored in the low range of possible points.

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

5

2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant identifies a number of performance measures that address some of the required components, but not all of the required measures are included. For instance, no measures were provided regarding the number of students who will have access to an effective or highly effective teacher and principal. The applicant notes that no data are available because the state is in the process of implementing a new teacher evaluation system. However, in spite of that situation other means of providing measures for this part of the criterion could have been explored.

The performance measures that are provided do appear ambitious. For instance, the applicant reports that 84.5% of students are currently college or career ready (according to the indicator of reading skills), but expects that to increase to 97.5% by the end of the grant. The applicant also provides information that the percentage of students in grades 4-8 who currently passed state assessments in reading and math ranged from 78 % to 85.5%, but predicts an increase of approximately 10 percent as a result of this project. These are ambitious goals, but should be achievable given the range of resources, services and activities that the applicant proposes to provide through this project. For instance, each of the districts has experienced leaders of curriculum that have led teachers through a transition to the new college and career readiness standards. Each curriculum department has begun the process of helping the teachers to more fully utilize the new online Ohio Model Curricula. The Model Curricula include detailed clarifications for teachers, contain assessment-aligned information, provide one-step accessibility to effective activities related to instruction, and provide resources to enrich the learning process for students.

However, there was little information or explanation regarding the applicant’s rationale for selecting the measures that were used, or how the measure would provide rigorous or timely information. Nor did the applicant describe how it will review and improve the measure over time, if necessary and appropriate. And, as mentioned earlier, some data regarding some performance measures were not provided. For these reasons, this criterion is scored in the low-range of points possible.

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

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes an evaluation plan that has a number of strong features. The Gallia-Vinton Educational Service Center for Research, Evaluation, Data and Assessment will bring together a team comprised of ESC consultants twice per year to engage in a formative and annual summative assessment of RtT District grant progress. The team’s mission will be to compile and analyze data/evidence to answer specific questions. The evidence will be derived from monthly and quarterly reports and from actual onsite visits of Gallia-Vinton ESC consultants in the buildings and districts. The evaluation team will examine evidence; observe in classrooms; interview personnel, parents, students, classroom coaches, the principal, afterschool staff and community partners.

The process of evaluation is being built around a logic model that includes Inputs, Activities, Outputs, Outcomes, and Long-term Impact (Kellogg Logic Model). The Gallia-Vinton ESC Center for Research, Evaluation, Data and Assessment will compose and distribute a Project Evaluation Guide from the outset of the project. The Project Evaluation Guide will inform the District Transformation Teams, Building Improvement Teams, FIP Facilitators, coaches, and classroom teachers of the evaluation process, the roles each will play, and examples of evidence for documentation. The guide will offer suggestions and templates for organizing information from the classrooms, buildings, and districts for the process. The guide will also include any rubrics and protocols that will be used for improvement.

The Project Evaluation Guide will also include the Guiding Questions pertaining to the consortium goals that will bring an exceptional learning environment to fruition. Each building will also prepare data related to the grant’s student achievement and performance measures as appropriate. The evaluation team will utilize the report for the formative and summative assessments. A rubric with differentiated values for the level and success of implementation will also be created. All interviewees will consider evidence to assign a numbers-based assessment of the levels of progress toward each goal.

The applicant also provides a series of objectives that will be specifically addressed by the evaluation process. These objectives correspond to the required components of this application and to the applicant’s proposed project activities. Specific information and data to be collected to evaluate progress toward these objectives are also identified. Based on the information provided, the applicant is awarded the full value of points possible for this criterion.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a budget that describes how all project funds will be utilized and that is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant’s proposal. Complete and appropriate descriptions are provided for all expenditures, including the calculations from which specific figures were derived. Explanations are provided regarding how expenditures are connected to specific project activities and objectives. For instance, substantial funds will be directed at technology hardware, laptops and iPads, but these are addressed in the plan of implementation for the project. Significant expenditures are also allocated for professional development, but these activities are described in the project’s planned activities.</p> <p>The applicant does not fully identify all funds that will support the project, focusing primarily on how the RttD funds will be spent. Sufficient information is also not provided regarding expenditures that are one-time versus those that are ongoing. The applicant does note that it plans to do this later, but that information is not specifically described in this applicant. For that reason, this criterion is not awarded the full value of points available.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes an effective plan for sustainability of the project’s goals after the term of the grant. The plan includes support from internal and external stakeholders. In addition, a description is provided regarding how the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use this data to inform future investments. For instance, the applicant will work with each district office, institutions of higher education, local government entities and others to develop a plan to secure long-term financial support. One way they will do this is to develop a critical mass of leaders from within and external to the school (including parents and the community) as the Sustainability Committee. The committee will assist with the consortium maintaining direction and momentum. The committee will inventory existing district resources (state, local, and federal) to plan for sustainability and identify the RttT District grant components that must continue to receive funding.</p> <p>Some components of the project will become institutionalized and will not require additional, or at most minimal, funding. Other components, like afterschool and technology, will need continued support. The committee will prioritize those components that must continue to receive monetary support and explore district, state, and federal sources of support. Prioritizing will include examining data to analyze the impact of the component to determine its merit for continuance. The committee will also build a collection of ideas to explore as possible funding sources for future support.</p> <p>Based on the information provided, the applicant is awarded the full value of points available for this criterion.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	5
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes a plan to address this competitive priority that will involve adding 12 afterschool centers in 2013-2014 so the every school in the consortium will be able to offer expanded learning opportunities for students. The afterschool sites are intended to provide a safe haven for students during the hours when students are most likely to be unsupervised. The afterschool sites will operate from 12 to 15 hours per week and will offer homework support, intervention assistance, and enrichment opportunities to increase students’ college and career readiness.</p> <p>Developmental Assets that serve to help children be happy and the afterschool sites will implement 40 Developmental Assets identified from research to engage students in appropriate activities. For instance, students will be provided opportunities to interact with peers to build connections (collaborative projects), provide leadership experiences (like Model UN), provide outlets for creativity (e.g., guitar lessons), and encourage students to own their actions including learning (Individual Career and Academic Plans). Service Learning will also be a significant aspect of the after school programs.</p>		

A number of partnerships are identified to collaborate with the applicant on this competitive priority. The partnerships will support the implementation of Parent Academies. The school partners will convene in a common area in the school and establish stations for parents. This will be similar to Vendor’s areas that one might see at professional conferences. After school programs will also offer parents a venue for interacting with their students in academic opportunities. Families that lack access to technology will be permitted time to come to afterschool to use computers and the Internet for the purpose of improving students’ academic achievement. Parents will be trained to use the equipment and will be trained to use valuable websites like Kahn’s Academy and INFOhio.

The applicant's plan will also provide all students and families access to the Ohio Career Information System. Parents and students will be trained to use the site to permit students in grades 8-12 to develop an Individual Career and Academic Plan. Parents will also be welcome to afterschool to support students in developing their Career and Academic Plan.

While the applicant describes some excellent activities that have a high potential for increasing student learning and success and provides appropriate population level results, it falls short of a high-quality plan. Although a discussion is provided regarding a partnership with community agencies in regard to the Parent Academies, more information regarding how they will specifically address project activities is needed. The plan does not describe how the partnership and consortium would build the capacity of staff in participating schools. Nor does the applicant sufficiently explain how it will identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community that are aligned with those goals for improving the education and family and community supports or provide a strong plan for how it will engage parents and families of participating students in both decision-making about solutions to improve results over time and in addressing student, family, and school needs. For these reasons, this Competitive Priority is awarded a score in the medium range of available points.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes an effective plan to meet the Absolute Priority of this application. Resources, services and activities are described that explains how the applicant will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements. Building on the research-based effectiveness of Formative Instructional Practices (FIP) the applicant will focus on four major initiatives: Creating clear learning targets, Gathering evidence of learning in formal and informal ways, Providing meaningful feedback for students, and Supporting students to own their learning. RttT funding will be utilized to integrate technology to address the specific and individual needs of schools as determined through building surveys.

The consortium intends to increase the number of students enrolling in a university or college and decrease the number of students requiring remedial classes. The applicant's plan includes giving students access to the AP learning to increase college-and-career readiness. Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career (PARCC) assessments will be implemented to students in all participating school districts. The PARCC assessments are aligned to college expectations and will measure college-and-career readiness levels of the students. Teachers, students, and parents will have data to make mid-course adjustments to increase students’ accomplishments. Additionally, the districts will give students another option to help them to better prepare for postsecondary education. Students will be permitted to take college courses online while they attend our high schools. Districts will also explore the capabilities of the new Instructional Improvement System to deliver college-level courses to students, will explore the options of funding the courses for students, will provide the technology necessary for the college coursework to occur, and will develop district policies and practices to guide the process.

Gap Coaches will be placed in the buildings as resources to specifically improve results for vulnerable students. Gap Coaches will facilitate effective collaboration between the regular education teachers and special education teachers (Intervention Specialists) with the intention of improving student results. The collaborative framework will be systematic, will be institutionalized; and will continue beyond the period of time that coaches will serve. Gap Coaches will also provide expertise in the application of best practices promote higher levels of achievement. RttT funding will be utilized to present integration of technology as determined through building surveys.

The applicant's plan also addresses the need to improve the effectiveness of educators. Comprehensive and targeted professional development will be provided on the use and integration of technology to address instructional objectives and to personalize education for all students. Professional development will occur face-to-face, using on-line modules, and in collaborative study groups consisting of grade-level and/or content teams.

The applicant's plan also identifies approaches to decreasing achievement gaps across student groups by using assessment data to identify individual student needs and developing appropriate interventions. Technology will be utilized to increase the access of students with special needs to effective instruction.

Based on the documentation and description provided in its proposal the applicant has met the requirements of the Absolute Priority.

Total	210	165
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District Technical Review Form

Application #0184OH-2 for Gallia-Vinton Educational Service Center

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The consortium has a history of working together to implement the reforms in the state.

a. In the 4 core assurance areas, the consortium:

- Has adopted the Common Core State Standards and PARCC assessments. They have been providing professional development and implemented model curriculum designed by the state.
- Have been using data to make decisions. The Ohio Improvement Process identifies Districts that have target areas. District Improvement teams then analyze data and work with Building Improvement Teams to analyze data and develop Improvement Plans. They are working with the state to develop a comprehensive data warehouse through the state Race to the Top grant.
- Are implementing a teacher and principal evaluation system which identifies effective and highly effective teachers and principals. Each group takes a self assessment, then develops a plan for growth and engages in targeted professional development. New teachers have a 4 year residency program with mentoring and must pass a proficiency test at the end.
- Does not have any identified turn around schools. However, each district has targeted areas of need. For these areas, they develop improvement plans, target those areas with grants and professional development, and track results.

Thus, the consortium demonstrates it's current work in the 4 core assurance areas and details how it will build on that work in the next phase- this grant proposal.

b. A clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning and increasing equity is provided through the use of a chart. This chart depicts a 4 pronged approach to personalization:

- Prepare teachers through professional development
- Provide tools/resources- standards, tech, coaches/specialists, library/classroom materials
- Expand student opportunities- after school, credit recovery, AP, college/dual
- Social emotional support- parent academies, career info center, asset building, service learning

This demonstrates a comprehensive approach to implementing the reforms throughout the districts. The chart is then supported by evidence to detail how the various districts will implement these 4 prongs differently based on the data.

c. A walkthrough of a school building is depicted to demonstrate how a school will look like with implementation. You will see extensive group work where groupings are determined based on data. Computers will be used for research, dual enrollment, and credit recovery. After school, the instructional day will be extended to provide re-teaching as well as enrichment. Activities will be based on real world explorations.

Overall, the consortium demonstrates evidence of a plan that builds on the 4 core assurance areas, articulates a clear and credible approach to personalization of the learning environment and illustrates what a person will see walking through a school building. Details regarding a teacher's experience and a student's experience in this environment is lacking. Therefore, the consortium scores in the high area on indicator A(1).

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6
--	-----------	----------

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The consortium is composed of 5 districts and 27 total schools. A list of those districts and schools is provided. There is no description as to how these districts decided to partner in this grant. It is unclear as to if this consortium was in place as part of a state regional structure or if it was formed by choice. The total numbers of students, educators, high need students and low income students are provided by district rather than by school and one district did not provide numbers. Of those provided for the 4 districts, each district does meet qualifications. Details are lacking to support the consortium's approach to high quality district or school level implementation. Due to the lack of a rationale of how the consortium was formed, the missing data from one district and the failure of the districts to break down numbers by school, the consortium scores in the middle range on indicator A(2).

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	9
--	-----------	----------

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The plan does call for full implementation throughout the 5 districts that are in the consortium. The details provided in their plan to scale up reform efforts illustrate the methods that will be utilized to take the districts and schools from where they are currently performing through full implementation of the grant proposal. Therefore, the consortium scores in the high range on indicator A(3).

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	1
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

While overall baseline and targets are provided for summative assessments, achievement gaps, graduation rates and college enrollment rates, they are not provided by district. Rather, an average of the consortium is given. Additionally, while the targets are very ambitious, it is not reasonable to think they are achievable. Over the term of the grant, the consortium states that 100% of students will be proficient on achievement measures, no achievement gap will exist and everyone will graduate from high school with 80% of those going on to college. Therefore, the consortium scores in the low range on indicator A(4).

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	3

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a. All districts in the consortia have shown an increase in the state's Performance Index Ratings over the past 9 years. However, as this data is not broken out by year, it's not clear what gains have been made in the past 4 years. No data is presented to demonstrate success in closing achievement gaps. While it is stated that 4 of the 5 districts have improving graduation rates, no specific data is provided as evidence. Currently, the state is unable to track college enrollment rates and thus estimates are provided. It is unclear from the evidence presented that a clear record of 4 years of success exists for the 5 districts in the areas of student achievement, decreasing achievement gaps, high school grad rates and college enrollment rates.

b. While an extensive list of reforms and programs is provided, it is unclear how these reforms relate to low performing schools. No data is provided along with these reforms to demonstrate their effectiveness.

c. There is no discussion regarding how performance data is made available to parents or students. The consortium does describe how teachers and building teams examine data and make decisions regarding instruction and services based on that data.

Overall, the consortium lacks clear evidence to demonstrate success over the past 4 years in student achievement, decreasing the achievement gap, improving the high school graduation rate and increasing college enrollment rates. The listed reforms are not connected to data regarding low performing schools. While the use of data by the district, schools and teachers is discussed, there is no description provided to show how data is made available to students and parents. Thus the consortium scores in the low range on indicator B(1).

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

While the application states that the Buckeye Institute for Public Policy Solutions maintains a website that publishes the salaries of all Ohio educators, there is no evidence to demonstrate that the districts publish this information. The consortium states that individuals can make public records requests and that each district's Continuous Improvement Plan, which contains budgets, is available on the state website. However, there is no evidence to show that each district makes public salaries at the school-level for instructional and support staff, personnel salaries for instructional staff only, for teachers only and non-personnel expenditures. Therefore, the consortium scores in the low range on indicator B(2).

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The consortium provides evidence to demonstrate autonomy on the part of each district to implement the proposed plan. As a Race to the Top state, the state as a whole is already engaged in personalized learning. Quotes from the administrative code are provided as documentation of support for personalized learning environments. A law was passed to allow credits to be issued based on mastery rather than seat time. The consortium states that the state Superintendent has the authority to grant waivers to districts for statutory provisions and shows that some of the districts in the application have requested waivers for students attendance and those have been granted. Overall, the consortium demonstrates evidence of sufficient autonomy on the part of each district to implement the proposal and thus earns full points on indicator B(3).

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	9
--	-----------	----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

In describing the methodology for garnering engagement for this reform proposal, the consortium states that members of the Transformation Teams from each district met to discuss applying in order to expand on the scope of work from the state Race to the Top grant. Details regarding how various stakeholders are regularly involved in school and district processes are provided, but no details specific to this application are included. There is no evidence to substantiate how various stakeholders were engaged in the development process or the feedback process for this application. However, 25 letters of support are provided. Some are from parents, some from students. Support or acknowledgement from city leaders are included as well as from district leadership. Letters are included from teacher associations and parent associations.

Overall, the consortium lacks evidence to demonstrate that stakeholders were directly engaged in the development of the proposal. This includes collective bargaining, students, families, teachers and principals. However, letters of support from various stakeholders are provided. Thus the district scores in the middle range on indicator B(4).

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	16

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The consortium plans to implement the Formative Instructional Process to personalize student learning.

a. According to the consortium, helping students take ownership of their learning is key to students understanding what they are learning is key to accomplishing their goals. Through this process, students will learn to set goals relative to

academic targets and then to use tools to track their progress. Technology will be utilized to allow students access to deep learning experiences and to gain exposure to other cultures and perspectives outside of the community through virtual field trips and guest speakers. Students will keep online portfolios to measure progress towards goals and to plan for post-secondary transition.

b. The consortium states that students will have choices in terms of paths of learning. High quality instructional strategies such as Marzano and Universal Design are mentioned as methods that will be employed. High quality content is also mentioned with online dual enrollment and credit recovery courses provided as examples of digital content. The PARCC assessment will be administered at multiple times and allow for adjustments to instructional plans. Accommodations for high needs students will be provided through work with specialized coaches and instructors. Students will engage in conversations about learning, academic skill, college and careers at least weekly. College immersion activities will occur at every grade.

c. Documentation is provided to demonstrate that training will be provided to students in the use of new tools as it becomes necessary in the curriculum and as needed thereafter. The parties responsible for providing training are the teachers, district technology personnel and external consultants. Actual training classes may be created if needed as well. This plan for providing students with the training necessary to utilize the new tools and resources is sufficient for implementation.

Overall, the consortium details aspects of a high quality plan for an approach to learning that engages and empowers all learners. Statements are made demonstrating that personalized learning will occur and high quality instructional strategies are mentioned, however some details are lacking regarding specific activities and implementation as well as timelines and responsible parties. In the area of training and supporting students in the usage of new resources and tools, the consortium does demonstrate evidence of a high quality plan and details are provided to show training activities along with identification of trainees. Therefore the consortium scores in the lower area of the high range of indicator C(1).

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

20

15

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The consortium states that all teachers will engage in professional development aimed at providing a personalized learning environment for all students.

a. All participating educators will complete online training modules in the Formative Instructional Process method by a set deadline. Additional professional development will be provided in a variety of formats: online, face to face, Professional Learning Communities. The applicant states that part of the FIP is using data to determine the instructional needs of each child. They will then design exceptional learning experiences to advance students towards mastery. Professional development will occur in research based strategies that will assist teachers in adapting their content and instruction to meet individual student needs. The applicant mentions the teacher and principal evaluation system and states that once scores are in, staff will be reassigned to ensure equal access to effective and highly effective staff.

b. The applicant states that the Ohio Instructional Improvement System, once created and implemented, will have the capacity to build profiles for teachers and students to guide learning, gauge progress and keep students/parents informed. This system will contain multiple data sources that will in turn help teachers assess student needs, guide instruction and gauge progress student progress towards goals. Once the system is operational, training in this tool will be provided.

c. In terms of leaders having the tools and resources to improve teacher effectiveness and climate, the consortium mentions the principal and teacher evaluation system and suggests staff will be reassigned based on their scores. Each teacher will be required to have their own professional growth plan annually and they will be able to select professional development to help them grow. The applicant states that professional development will also include teacher-specific learning as identified by each teacher's annual goals as required by the teacher evaluation system.

d. To increase access to highly effective and effective staff, the consortium states that it is the intention of the districts to reassign staff based on scores from the evaluation system to ensure equity.

Overall, the consortium lacks some details to fully demonstrate a high quality plan to help educators improve instruction and increase their capacity to support full implementation of a personalized learning environment. There are specific activities related to professional development documented and these are research based strategies that will assist teachers in meeting each student's needs and allow teachers to use data to accelerate student progress. Limited evidence is provided to demonstrate that the data gathered from principal and teacher evaluations will be utilized to prescribe needed professional development. Tools and resources such as Formative Instructional Process and Instructional Improvement System are mentioned and it's stated that all staff will be trained in their usage, however there is insufficient information to determine if those resources will fulfill the requirements of high quality digital resources that will match student needs to instructional approaches. While the consortium states that it will reassign staff to ensure equitable distribution of effective and highly effective staff, there is no documented plan to show how the districts plan to improve educators' scores on the

evaluation system. Therefore, the consortium scores in the high end of the middle area on indicator C(2).

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	3
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant documents that one of the districts has taken the lead role. Evidence is presented to show how this district has provided support and leadership in the past regarding policy and professional development as well as in seeking out partnerships. However, there is no documentation of how school teams will have autonomy and flexibility over school factors. There is no evidence to show that students will have the opportunity to progress and earn credits based on mastery or to demonstrate that mastery at various times in various ways. Similarly, there is no description of how learning resources and instructional practices will be adaptable and accessible to all students. Therefore, the consortium scores in the low range on indicator D(1).</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The consortium demonstrates that all educators will have access to the necessary tools and resources from a work computer. Students and parents will have access but only during school hours or at the school building during afterschool programs. Evidence is presented to show that technical support will be available to educators through consultants and to students and parents in that same afterschool setting. While the applicant states that parents will have access to reports regarding student progress, there is no discussion regarding making this information available for download in an open format. Similarly, the consortium states that the new Ohio information system will be interoperable, it does not detail which systems will be included in this warehouse.</p> <p>Overall, evidence is presented to document stakeholder access to tools and resources but on a limited basis as it will only be accessible from the school sites. Sufficient training will be conducted at the school sites. There are plans to provide parents with data regarding student progress but not necessarily in an open format. Finally, there are plans for an interoperable data system but details are lacking in regards to what data will be included. Therefore, the applicant scores in the middle range on indicator D(2).</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Detailed evidence is provided to document the high quality plan in relation to continuous improvement. The lead district will construct a monitoring tool organized around the 4 main areas of the grant proposal. Responsible parties at each school site are identified as well as the reports they will complete utilizing the tool on a monthly basis. Those reports will be submitted to the Building Team. The Building Team will review, analyze and make adjustments. They then send that report to the district who will repeat the process then to the consortium to repeat it again. The consortium will compile data and reports organized into the 4 main areas of the proposal into quarterly reports. These reports will be shared publicly through a variety of methods including parent organization meeting and through the media. Annual reports will be compiled and shared in the same manner. At each of these timelines, course corrections and improvements will be made as determined by the data.</p> <p>This process will occur in the first year of the grant. The monitoring process for the following years, including the years following the grant, will be determined based on the results from the previous year.</p> <p>Overall, the consortium demonstrates a high quality plan for continuous improvement including timelines, responsible parties, activities with deliverables and goals. The consortium is justified in believing that implementation of this plan will result in opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements to the overall reform proposal. Plans are included to</p>		

publicly share the results of the investments made through the grant as well their impact on the classroom. Therefore, the consortium earns full points on indicator E(1).

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

5

3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Evidence is presented to detail how the consortium intends on engaging and communicating with internal stakeholders. This will be completed through a monthly continuous improvement cycle. Details are provided to demonstrate that communication will be two-way with stakeholders first providing feedback and input to the level above them in the reform hierarchy and then with feedback and adjustments coming back to them through reports. However, there is no discussion regarding two way communication and thus engagement with outside stakeholders. Details are presented to show how information and data will be shared with outside stakeholders but no mechanism is discussed to allow outside stakeholders to provide feedback and engage in the communication process.

While the consortium documents a high quality plan for sharing information from it's improvement process, it does not address an avenue for outside stakeholder engagement in the communication process. Therefore, the consortium scores in the middle range on indicator E(2).

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

5

1

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

All: There is a chart to establish annual targets however no data is included. The consortium states that the evaluation system is currently being implement for the first time this year and that targets will be established once baseline data is gathered.

PreK-3:

- a. academic: one measure is indicated as the number of students that meet the requirement of 3rd grade but the rest of the text is cut off. A baseline and target are included in aggregate format. It is not clear what this measure is and therefore a determination of ambitious and achievable goals cannot be determined. Another measure inclusive of grades 3-5 and disaggregated by school is provided for the number of students passing achievement assessments in both reading and math. The text underlines "and at what levels." However, there is a single number given for each school, there is no subgroup disaggregation and it is not clear what this single number is measuring nor what district these schools represent.
- b. A proposed measure of a safety and security survey is listed. The survey is not identified, it has not been implemented, and thus no baseline or targets are provided.

4-8:

- a. college and career ready and academic: An aggregated percentage is provided for all students in the consortium that are proficient or above on the state exam. The chart is disaggregated by grade and by reading/math. However, it is not disaggregated by school or district and no subgroups are listed. There is again a mention of the number of students passing achievement assessments in reading and math with the language "and at what levels" with middle schools listed. In this case, grade levels and subject are not broken out. It is not clear what district the numbers are from.
- b. A proposed measure of a safety and security survey is listed. The survey is not identified, it has not been implemented, and thus no baseline or targets are provided.

9-12:

- a. FASFA: no baseline data is provided and no targets set.
- b. college and career ready: Listing for 10th grade reading, math, science with baseline and targets but not disaggregated by district/school/subgroup.
- c. career ready: measure indicated is building educational plans in the Ohio Information system. No baseline or targets provided.
- d. academic: Again an indicator of how many pass achievement measures with same language. Baselines provided for list of high schools. Not clear which district. Not disaggregated by grade/subject/subgroup. No targets provided.
- e. A proposed measure of a safety and security survey is listed. The survey is not identified, it has not been implemented, and thus no baseline or targets are provided.

Overall, the consortium fails to demonstrate ambitious yet achievable performance measures. It is unclear exactly which

measures will be utilized. For those measures proposed, information is limited. Several indicators have no baseline or targets established. Those that do have baselines and targets do not provide these in the disaggregated manner as required (by grade level, subject area and subgroup). There are no rationales provided to justify selection of specific targets nor any discussion regarding how these measures will lead to feedback of the reform proposal. Therefore, the consortium scores in the low range on indicator E(3).

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 Evidence is presented to demonstrate the high quality plan the consortium has implemented in regards to evaluating the effectiveness of the investments. In addition to the process described in the continuous improvement section, two consultants will be contracted to examine the semi-annual and annual reports and make an analysis of the investments and activities in relation to the change in student achievement. A detailed process is outlined to make this determination and is complete with guiding questions and rubrics. A logic model is described and it is stated that the consultants will utilize this model to make their determinations. It is reasonable to assume that this process will result in actionable feedback in regards to the investment in reform activities and will be timely in order to make needed corrections. The consortium plans to publicly share the results on district websites and through parent teacher meetings. There is no discussion to suggest that this formative evaluation will continue after the term of the grant. Therefore, the consortium scores in the high range on indicator E(4).

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:
 The consortium provides an extensive breakdown of budgeted items for grant funds. Items are categorized as one time vs ongoing costs. However, no additional funding sources are identified or discussed and no revenue sources are provided. The projects and expenses provided are reasonable and sufficient for the four main areas of the reform proposal: 1. Prepare the staff= \$4.6 million, 2. Provide tools/resources= \$8.6 million, 3. Expand opportunities= \$9.7 million, 4. Provide social/emotional support= \$ 1.9 million. The most significant investment is made in the area of Expanding opportunities which includes activities such as providing more time for students, providing access to AP and online courses, credit recovery programs and expanding experiential backgrounds. The second largest investment is in the area of Providing tools/resources which includes activities such as investments in technology and classroom resources. The consortium scores in the middle range on indicator F(1) as the proposed budget is reasonable and sufficient but the rationale for investments is limited and additional sources of funding and revenue are not provided.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
---	-----------	----------

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 The consortium demonstrates evidence of some components of a high quality plan to ensure sustainability after the term of the grant. A Sustainability Committee will be formed and will be composed of both internal and external stakeholders. This committee will meet at least quarterly to explore and pursue additional funding sources after the term of the grant. Potential funding sources have been identified. Activities that will required ongoing funding are identified (technology and afterschool programs) and the Sustainability Committee will prioritize expenses associated with those. There is limited discussion surrounding evaluation of past investments and how that will influence future investments. The consortium states that budgets will be aligned to student outcomes and that student outcomes must continue to drive budgets.
 Overall, the consortium identifies most of the components of a high quality plan for sustainability and provides evidence of how sustainability will be a goal from the very first year of implementation of grant funds. However, some aspects of a high quality plan are lacking or vague (budget, funding sources). Therefore, the consortium scores in the high range on indicator F(2).

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	5
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The consortium proposes to expand it's afterschool offerings to 12 additional sites. These sites are staffed by the regular school teachers and funding is provided in part through this grant proposal. One hour will consist of homework help with the following 2 hours being dedicated to enrichment activities with service learning components included.</p> <p>A list of various partners that provide services to families through referrals from the schools is provided and evidence is presented to demonstrate that various partners come to the afterschool program as guest speakers for parents but the overall afterschool program is an extension of the school day, staffed by school personnel, and funded through Absolute Priority 1 in this grant. Everyone is welcome to participate but the target audience are students with disabilities and low income students.</p> <p>Population desired results are provided with 4 being educational outcomes and 2 being family supports. However, no discussion is provided to demonstrate how these indicators will be tracked and how the results will assist in targeting resources. There is no evidence to show that there are plans to scale the program over time.</p> <p>There are no details provided to demonstrate how these partnerships will build the capacity of staff or how an integration of services would occur. Two performance measures are identified but no baseline data is provided and no targets are set. Thus they are neither ambitious nor achievable.</p> <p>Overall, there is limited evidence of a coherent and sustainable partnership with multiple agencies that will offer services to students and families during an after school program. However, a list of various outside agencies is provided to demonstrate a commitment on the part of the consortium to offer expanded services to families. Therefore, the consortium scores in the middle range on the Competitive Preference Priority.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:		
<p>In it's application, the consortium proposes to provide high quality professional development in the Formative Instruction Process for teachers and principals and to expand educational offerings for students through online and distance learning courses that will include AP classes, credit recovery and dual enrollment. The professional development will assist teachers in transitioning to the Common Core State Standards and help build the capacity of staff to address student needs and analyze data. The consortium feels that by doing so, the end result will be increased student achievement and increased effectiveness of educators thus expanding student access to the most effective educators. Plans are also included to extend the school day by providing 3 additional hours of academic support and career exploration.</p> <p>However, the data provided for baseline measures and annual targets to measure grant reform efforts are incomplete and the link between the investment in the professional development of educators and the resulting student performance is limited. Although specific aspects of the overall application were weak, the consortium did provide sufficient evidence to meet the indicator for Absolute Priority 1.</p>		

Total	210	129
--------------	------------	------------

**Race to the Top - District
Technical Review Form**



Application #0184OH-3 for Gallia-Vinton Educational Service Center

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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consortium has provided an impressive picture to articulate a comprehensive and coherent reform vision. • Applicant's plan to build on four core educational assurance areas using standards and assessments, data systems to improve instruction, having effective educators, and turning around lowest performing schools is strong. • Applicant articulates clear goals to create conditions for personalized learning using a four-step approach to prepare staff with knowledge and skills, empower students and educators with necessary tools and resources, expand students' number of opportunities to learn and provide students and families with social and emotional support. • Applicant describes typical classroom experience for students and educators participating in personalized learning is strong. Plan describes classrooms as learning labs where teachers are facilitators and students work in multiple ways to master targets and develop perseverance, problem solving, communication and critical thinking skills. • Overall, applicant's approach to improving student achievement is comprehensive and coherent because it addresses what will be needed for educators, staff and students to implement the learning environment. • Overall score is high for this criterion. 		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consortium's approach to implementation is reasonable. • District describes including primary teachers and students to initiate process and prevent gaps in achievement and also to support grades 4-12 teachers and students to ensure students remain on track and achieve at college and career levels. Because all districts in consortium are similar in makeup of student populations and needs, all districts chose to use same structure to personalize learning. • Weakness is no description of how schools were selected, nor number of educators identified. • Each district lists all participating schools in plan using graphs. Weakness is Vinton Elementary not shown on both graphs. • Each district supplies raw data to support total number of students in plan, from low income families, those who are high need students and participating educators. Weakness is Gallipolis City does not supply numbers to support any participating students. • Applicant's score in this area is medium because approach is likely to support high quality implementation, but there are some weaknesses. 		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consortium's plan for reform and change is strong. • District describes how new hire initial training will be carried out, as well as monitoring in various ways including teacher self-assessments, principal walk-throughs, facilitator documentation and coaching reports. In order to improve student learning outcomes, plan includes literacy being the focus for primary grades to support third grade guarantee, modeling, and using Formative Instructional Practices process will support struggling students is named. Parent academies will provide parents with access to student data using state instructional improvement system. • Although there is no timeline to carry out reform and change, applicant lists several activities to support its efforts for reform and change and includes all other elements of a high quality plan. • Applicant's plan will spread reform district wide in all districts participating in the consortium because it will serve all 		

- students in every school.
- Overall score is high for this criteria.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- Consortium wide goals for improved student outcomes are weak.
- Plan used formula of 100% and divided over five year period. Weakness is the goal of achieving 100% to be proficient is not realistic.
- District wide goals need to be provided for each district participating in plan.
- Plan does not include subgroup breakdown by district nor by grade level.
- Another weakness is plan does not mention how goals will be evaluated. Plan includes changing assessment if need be to one that matches rigor of New Generation. Plan mentions it will track literacy in K-2 grades by giving students explicit instruction in five essential components of reading, and will assess using Star, Terra Nova and Rigby, but does not include a process to do so .
- Plan to decrease achievement gaps in reading, language or in math using Ohio Achievement Test and Formative Instructional Practices. Plan mentions students will be presented multiple opportunities to construct knowledge within standard and demonstrate learning in multitude of manners to progress toward mastery.
- Plan to increase graduation rates and college enrollment using technology is reasonable. Formative Instructional Practices will teach students to set goals and their own learning. By end of K-12 schooling, students will recognize potential to be successful in post secondary education and college going rates will increase. Parent Academies will help parents and students negotiate path to college. Plan mentions students having access to credit recovery classes to permit students remaining on track for on time graduation.
- Overall score low in this criteria because applicant did not include goals for each district which makes it hard to determine if goals are ambitious and achievable.

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	7

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- Consortium provided a reasonable record of success in last four years.
- Plan provides district designations in lieu of data to close achievement gaps. No data to support breakdown by years.
- One weakness is gap in districts' capacities to track college enrollment of its graduation; even though, it is anticipated that gap will be bridged with collaboration between state department of education and state board of regents to track college rates using state instructional improvement system.
- Consortium will make student performance data available to students and educators, but no mention of sharing information with parents.
- Weakness is no record of success established because no data to support increased performance.
- Plan mentions how educators will utilize data from Marzano on-going trainings to guide differentiated instruction using lesson plans, feedback from observations and book studies is noted.
- Score is in medium range.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
---	----------	----------

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- Consortium's evidence to increase transparency in processes, practices, and investments is minimal. This is because applicant states that this information is available on website, but did not provide evidence in appendices.
- Applicant refers to actual personnel salaries at school level for all school level instructional and support staff, salaries at school level for instructional staff only, teachers only and non-personnel expenditures is made public via the media in some cases, but also districts use their websites to increase public awareness.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- Consortium's plan for state context for implementation is strong.
- Applicant cites state revised code that supports providing personalized learning to raise and accelerte student achievement.
- State department of education has structures in place to support conditions and autonomy necessary for districts to pursue better results for students.
- State adopted and is executing Common Core standards, and developed new robust standards for Social Studies and Science. State has prepared and released new Model Curricula to accompany each set of standards. Model Curriula are aligned to college and career readiness.
- Overall, score is high. District is prepared for change and structures are in place to implement personalized learning environments.

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

15

10

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant's plan for stakeholder engagement and support is reasonable.
- Districts began seeking input from various parties to make decision to participate in grant. Union officers, community based partners, community members, teachers and other staff members were made aware of opportunity via series of meetings. New evaluator system was explained and explored. Local news media monitored decisions by publishing details, and interviewing district officials. Districts continue to encourage community awareness through their websites.
- Districts formed transition teams including teacher union members to develop and oversee plan. Districts collected information from parents and students using surveys to share concerns regularly and freely.
- No mention of how various interest groups gave feedback throughout development of proposal.
- Letters of support from mayors of each district, a student from elementary, middle and high school, PTO, parent, community college professor, and district personnel accompany proposal.
- Overall score is medium.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	18

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicants plan to prepare students for college and careers through learning is strong.
- Districts will implement Formative Instructional Process approach to personalize learning for students. Applicant provides rationale for FIP as research based and having documented record of success for improving results for students.
- However, plan does not mention timelines or responsible parties for improving learning and teaching.
- Applicant mentions how students will be involve in learning process by identifying clear learning targets, having differentiated learning experiences based on needs, preferences, choices, frequent assessments to gauge student progress to provide them with meaningful feedback and guide them toward mastery. Process will continue until students demonstrate at least a level of proficiency within standard. Mastery of standards is aligned to students being on-track for graduation and being prepared for college and careers.
- FIP components involve students in deep learning experiences, expose them to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate students, which is impressive. FIP components also allow students to master critical content as well as develop dispositions they will need for college such as teamwork skills, perserverance, critical thinking, communication, and problem-solving.
- Students accept and practice ownership of their learning by setting goals relative to academic targets. Teachers prepare students as they make decisions regarding outcome of studies. Teachers prepare students to analyze rubrics and be exposed to numerous examples of products from exemplary to weak. Students will use tools to track progress, reflect on progress and share progress.
- Students establish web-based portfolios to create individual career and academic plan where student profiles are created to begin exploration of careers by completing aptitude assessment. Students utilize site to learn of occupations in various career fields of greatest interest to them.

- Students have access to technology such as computers, interactive whiteboards, video equipment which will motivate and give teachers and students access to world of learning. Additionally, websites will be incorporated in paths of study designed for personalized learning.
- Accommodations and high quality strategies for students with disabilities age 14 and older are in place and are strong. Students with disabilities must have a transition plan with goals to assist them with successful transition to adulthood. Students are assisted with college and career planning, an exploration of options for post secondary transition, goal-setting, a course of study plan for achieving goals.
- Students' progress will be closely monitored by frequent informal and formal assessments. Students' instructional paths will be modified as needed to ensure they meet curriculum learning targets.
- Applicant's score in this area is in high range.

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

20

18

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant's approach to teaching and leading is strong.
- Participating educators will engage in professional development trainings to optimize students' learning. Strategies will include Marzano's nine classroom strategies, Gardner's multiple intelligences, using technology to facilitate teaching and learning, and utilizing quality sites to build quality experiences. Professional development will be differentiated through face to face learning, embedded throughout work day and online through PD 360. Weakness is no other digital resources mentioned.
- Measurement of student progress toward meeting college and career ready standards will be implemented using state's new Instructional Improvement System. IIS will have multiple capacities to assist teachers with building student profiles to guide learning, gauge progress, and keep parents and students informed.
- Frequent assessment of student data is paramount. Teachers learn multiple ways to assess students' skills, analyze evidence of students' learning to personalize learning. Teachers provide explicit feedback to help students realize where their learning must go in order to reach learning targets. Teachers will also use those results to design appropriate experiences to continually increase students' skills and knowledge aligned to clear learning goals.
- Applicant's plan for increasing student access to highly effective educators is strong. District uses new state teacher evaluation system and principal evaluation system that includes differentiated performance results. Weakness is applicant does not name process for hard to staff schools, hard to staff subjects or hard to staff specialty areas.
- Weakness is applicant does not address how it will recruit teachers.
- Overall score in high range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant's plan for practices, policies, and rules is reasonable; however, multiple elements of selection criterion was missing from the response.
- Southern Ohio Consortium organized to provide support and services to all five districts and all twenty-seven buildings. Lead partner is Gallia-Vinton for consortium and will provide support to districts and to individual buildings as data-indicated or as requested.
- Lead partner, Gallia-Vinton, to send consultants for training in new state teacher evaluation system. Consultants will administer tests and roll out PD for New Generation of Assessments. Plan describes superintendents to convene regularly to discuss district status, state department of education updates, legislative items, budget information and continuous improvement. Plan does not describe how often superintendents will meet.
- Weakness is no details to explain process to provide flexibility and autonomy over factors such as schedules, calendars, school personnel decisions, nor educator responsibilities.
- Weakness is no details to support how to give students opportunity to progress and earn credit based on mastery nor opportunity to demonstrate mastery at multiple times and in multiple ways.
- Another weakness is plan does not mention how it will provide learning resources and instructional practices adaptable to students with disabilities and English learners.
- Overall score in low range.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	6
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant's plan to support school infrastructure is reasonable. • Weak plan to ensure all students, parents, educators and stakeholders have access to content, tools, and other learning resources. Plan mentions the purchase of equipment like laptops or iPads in numbers sufficient for personalized learning, but does not explain how resources will be implemented. • Plan supports using technology for students during school day and in after school for 15 hours per week. Plan supports parents utilizing technology to support students' learning. • Weakness is technology access is limited only from school site. • Plan supports using an open data format, state's longitudinal data system, to store demographic and certification data for educators, student information, and student test result. However, there is no description of the data and how it will be used. • Overall plan in medium range. 		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant's plan for continuous improvement process is strong. • Plan will construct grant monitoring tool for use by personnel. Tool organized around four prong approach to personalized learning and will include: prepare the staff, provide tools/resources, expand opportunities and provide social/emotional support. Activities will be monitored and progress will be described with citing evidence. • Monitoring Tool completed monthly by various personnel, with grade level collaboration and results given to building improvement team. Further improvement includes building improvement team to compile results using after-school reports to create a building report. Building improvement team will use report to discuss next steps and recommend changes if needed. Findings shared with rest of staff monthly at staff meetings. District transformation teams will receive reports from each building and prepare monthly district report to send to Gallia-Vinton ESC. Gallia-Vinton ESC will conduct continuous improvement at consortium level. Monthly reports will contribute to quarterly assessments of progress. Gallia-Vinton will study report at consortium to determine quality of progress being made. Quarterly report published on Gallia-Vinton grant page to publicly share information on quality of grant funds. • Applicant's score in this area is high. 		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant's approach for ongoing communication and engagement with internal stakeholders is credible; however, external engagement is not mentioned at all. This is a problem because the applicant's approach requires community partners to be successful. • District has a plan, but plan only includes internal stakeholders. 		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant's performance measures are weak because some key information is not supplied or currently unavailable. • Population All, applicant does not supply a number and percents of students participating because baseline data is not established. Applicant will supply students with highly effective educators and will use new state educator evaluation system to gauge implementation progress. • Population PreK-3, applicant proposes Ohio Achievement Assessments in reading and math and non-cognitive indicator of growth in social and emotional security. • Population 4-8, applicant supplies data to support reading and math scores for students who score proficient or above on Ohio Achievement Assessment. For grades 6-8, applicant provides data to support an increase in scores for those students who took Ohio Achievement Assessment in reading and math. 		

- Population 9-12, applicant does not have data to supply tracking college access information.
- No information was provided to address parts b or c.
- Overall score in low range.

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

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant's plan to evaluate effectiveness of investments is strong.
- Lead district will convene a team comprised of consultants twice per year to engage in a formative and annual summative assessment of grant progress.
- Team's mission will be to compile and analyze data using evidence from monthly and quarterly reports. Evaluation team will examine evidence, observe in classrooms, interview personnel, parents, students, classroom coaches, principal, afterschool staff and community partners.
- Plan identified evaluation model to use inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes and long term impact.
- Overall score in high range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant's budget for project is strong.
- Budget is prepared in graph and in detailed narrative form.
- Applicant identifies only RTTD grant funds to support project. No funds from other sources were identified. This does not appear to be a problem as the applicant's budget does not rely on funds from other sources. Budget seems reasonable and sustainable to support project.
- Funds are reasonable and sufficient to support development and implementation of plan because applicant details all elements that would be required to implement proposal. Budget provides thoughtful rationale to include description of funds. One-time investments and on-going funds are identified. All funds used are ongoing with the exact same amount being spent for four years.
- Overall score in high range.

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

10

6

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant's plan to sustain project goals is average quality.
- Plan names a sustainability committee, weakness is plan does not list project goals after term of grant.
- Lead district will use community collaboration model to sustain project goals by sharing data and research, developing shared leadership to ensure integrity of grant management and governance, developing and implementing technical assistance and developing plan to secure long term financial support.
- Plan includes long-term support for year one to establish vision, define focus, leverage resources and identify grant components that must continue to receive funding. However, no mention of year two and year three.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

- Applicant's competitive preference priority is reasonable.
- Each of five districts has formed partnerships with public and private entities that support student success is strong.

Examples of partnerships include Search Institute, University of Rio Grande, Holzer Hospital, Help Me Grow, Women and Infant Children Agency, General Mills and others.

- Plan identifies four educational and two family supports as population desired results is strong.
- Search Partnership will support youth in afterschool sites and will engage students in opportunities to interact with peers to build connections, provide leadership experiences, provide outlets for creativity and encourage students to own their actions including learning such as individual career and academic plans.
- Service Learning will be a community service project and will have an academic component. Students will investigate areas of interest, communicate knowledge in various manners including presentations to an audience and design and carry out related service component.
- Grant will provide all students and families access to Ohio Career Information System is strong. Parents and students will be trained to use site to permit students in grades 8-12 to develop and individual career and academic plan.
- Afterschool will include family fun nights, where families participate in learning experiences such as a STEM activity, investigating electronics, virtual brain surgery, building a robot or dissecting a frog is impressive.
- Plan will provide social and emotional support and this will be monitored using an evaluation system.
- No plan to describe a decision making process and infrastructure to select, implement, and evaluate supports that address students needs.
- Weakness is also no engagement of parents and families to improve results over time.
- Plan does not provide data to support performance measures. Plan does not address how partnerships would track select indicators, develop a strategy to model beyond students or improve results over time.
- Overall score in medium range.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant's plan to build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments is reasonable. • Applicant provided a vision to build work in four educational assurances to create learning environments, but made no effort to use data to show how it will decrease achievement gaps across student groups or how it will use data to increase high school and college and career readiness rates. • In addition, applicant provided goals to improve student outcomes; however, goals are not broken down by district nor by grade level. Goals are not achievable. • Overall, applicant provides information to meet absolute priority 1. 		

Total	210	146
--------------	------------	------------