



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0233KY-1 for Lewis County Board of Education

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>

**(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant fails to articulate a comprehensive and coherent reform vision in the narrative.

(a)

The applicant will build on its work in four core educational assurance areas ensuring that students perform at grade level, be college and career ready upon high school graduation, and obtain the necessary skills to function in a diverse society in the following ways:

**(1) Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy:** The standards include multiple assessments during the school year and data collection of progress. This information is collected with the use of MAP (Measure of Academic Progress) testing three times per year and the annual Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress (K-PREP). MAP testing provides instant results of student skill knowledge and skill application performances. The skills are re-evaluated with the next testing cycle and the data is examined to determine the level of individual mastery of each grade-level appropriate skill. The Kentucky Core Content are another set of standards the applicant will use.

**(2) Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction:** The applicant is building a data system that will measure student growth and inform teachers and principals of student progress as well as provide information to improve instruction. A district-wide database has been established and implemented to give focus and direction for instructional practices and core curriculum. The testing data that is currently collected by the use of skill-specific assessments is analyzed for each student, providing the necessary information to create an IEP for individual students. The data collected from the formal assessments will provide a skills-specific analysis for individual mastery of skills that will provide specific-skill requirements.

**(3) Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most:** Currently, teachers and principals in the district are supported by an Instructional Teacher Coach who acts as a liaison between administration and staff, and helps to develop proven instructional practices that promote student educational success. The teacher coach helps the teacher to analyze data and verify progress toward success for all students, as well as movement toward mastery of the Kentucky Core Content. Teachers are also involved in early career development activities through the use of Kentucky Internship Program with the incorporation of the Learning Standards/Teacher Standards that are a critical factor in the learning and instructional process.

These development measures will no doubt improve teacher effectiveness; however, the applicant fails to detail how it will recruit, reward, and retain these teachers who they will develop. More information is needed to address this important portion of the vision.

**(4) Turning around lowest-achieving schools:** Although the applicant has provided evidence that it has made some instructional improvements such as purchasing books, videos, and other materials to implement math standards and increase student achievement, the applicant does not offer any information about how it turned around its lowest-achieving schools. Evidence of change made on a larger level would assure the reviewer that the applicant could effectively make even more change after receiving grant funds.

(b)

Although the district hopes that by adopting untested measures such as new textbooks and technology, these measures will accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning, and increase equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests. Yet, it is unclear how the program will be structured to achieve these tasks. For example, the applicant will use a series of tests to gauge student achievement; however, the feedback garnered from these assessments is not frequent (three times per school year) and

may not be received in a timeframe which the student can make immediate gains.

(c)

The applicant does not clearly describe what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments. It appears that many programs and projects will be implemented throughout the year, such as as the College/Career Readiness Program, but the reviewer fails to see the larger picture.

Overall, the applicant seeks to implement the Comprehensive Higher Education Excellence Reform project which, the applicant believes, will create life-long learners who are successful in the 21st century as a result of a superior education. Yet, the applicant fails to clearly state how this will be achieved. Much is mentioned about testing and benchmarks, but nowhere is it mentioned how the new purchases will translate into creating a cadre of life-long learners. Additionally, critical information such as recruiting and retaining teachers is missing. Because of this, the applicant scores in the middle range for this criterion.

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

**10**

**8**

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant presents a clear and complete plan for implementation of the program.

(a)

The applicant states that in order to realize its vision, all students in the district will be required to participate in grant activities. All schools, according to the applicant, collectively meet the competition’s eligibility requirements. All district schools have Title I status and enrollment populations are identified as high-need students, additionally 188 students were identified as homeless during the 2012-13 school year.

(b)

The applicant provides a complete list of the schools that will participate in grant activities. The four elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school in the district will participate in the program (Lewis County Central Elementary, Garrison Elementary, Laurel Elementary, Tollesboro Elementary, Lewis County Middle School, and Lewis County High School).

(c)

The applicant provides an exhaustive list of the number of participating students, participating students from low-income families, participating students who are high-need students, and participating educators. For example, Lewis County Central Elementary has 491 students with 73% of students receiving free or reduced lunch; Garrison Elementary has 308 students with 82% qualifying for free or reduced lunch; Laurel Elementary has 90 students with 79% qualifying for free or reduced lunch; Tollesboro Elementary has 283 students with 77% qualifying for free or reduced lunch; Lewis County Middle School 469 students with 72% qualifying for free or reduced lunch; and Lewis County High School has an enrollment of 705 students with 67% qualifying for free or reduced lunch. The Lewis County School District has a total of 2,414 students, 73.1% qualify for free and/or reduced lunch, and the applicant classifies them all as high need. The total number of participating educators is 138.

Overall, the applicant will attempt to affect change by changing the way instruction is implemented. The applicant states that a wide range of educational opportunities and continuous tracking of student educational progress with individualized assessments and targeted goals pre-k through grade twelve to ensure the success of all students; however, the applicant fails to detail in its plan how targeting all schools and all subjects will support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation given the large number of students and the desired performance goals. Because of this, the applicant scores in the high range for this criterion.

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

**10**

**2**

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant fails to outline a high-quality plan that describes how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools, and will help the applicant reach its outcome goals.

Through much of the narrative, the applicant details how assessments will be administered and analyzed as well as the perks of the new curriculum and technology such as a 1:1 student to computer ratio. Yet, the applicant does not state a

logic model or theory of change of how its plan will improve student learning outcomes for all students who would be served by the applicant, and more importantly, how these reforms will create meaningful district-wide change--in particular those students who do not take advantage of after-school activities.

Moreover, the applicant seeks to add on programs at the preschool level that may not foster significant results for district student growth and achievement for several years such as the Reading Street program. In addition to the phonics program, the strategies that the applicant proposed such as textbook and technology adoption create lateral changes at best. Because of this, the applicant scores in the low range for this criterion.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

It is unclear how the applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity.

Many of the district's annual goals are both ambitious and achievable, such as increasing the college enrollment rate by more than 20 percentage points over the course of the grant. Yet, goals such as ACT scores and Graduation rates cannot be determined. For example, the applicant proposes the infusion of technology and the implementation of tutoring to affect change in the high school culture, yet modest gains of 1-2 points on the ACT are expected to be achieved over the course of several years. Similarly, high school graduation rates are expected to increase by less than one percentage point over the course of the grant. Where possible, the applicant offers data that shows that while the achievement gap is somewhat large, the measures the consortium plans to take will decrease double-digit numbers to single-digit differences.

Yet, there is a much larger concern for the reviewer. The applicant provides goals and targets overall, but fails to provide sufficient subgroup information. For example, in the Decreasing Achievement Gaps table, the applicant states district goals but uses the individual schools for subgroups--not for the subgroups within each individual school. The applicant does not provide this information.

Overall, the data presented is not consistent with the program to be implemented and the applicant did not provide a sufficient rationale and explanation for how it would reach its LEA-wide goals. Because of this, the applicant scores in the low range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant fails to demonstrate a clear track record of success in the narrative.

Overall, the data provided is insufficient and does not show a clear four-year growth trajectory. The narrative does not include a convincing description, charts or graphs, raw student data, and other evidence to demonstrates the applicant's ability to affect change.

(a)  
The applicant does not provide any information on its prior ability to improve student learning outcomes or close achievement gaps. The raising student achievement data provided includes K-Prep scores in the district's elementary schools. For example, from 2011-12 to 2012-2013, the Lewis County Central percentile score increased from 1 to 23. The applicant also states that additional improvements have been made since August 2010, such as increasingly effective classroom observations and textbooks review, but the applicant fails to explain the effect that these actions have had on student achievement or its already high graduation rates (over 96%). And as stated in a previous section, the applicant does not provide student subgroup information.

(b)  
When explaining its ability to achieve ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools or in its low-performing schools, the applicant provides examples of a few significant reforms, but the ambitiousness of the reforms cannot be determined because baseline data such as information about the original goal is absent from the narrative. The

applicant states that the lowest scoring school in the district during 2011-12 school year, Lewis Count Central Elementary, improved from the 1st percentile to the 23rd percentile for the 2012-13 school year. Garrison Elementary gained from 17th percentile to the 31st percentile, Laurel Elementary gained from the 9th percentile to the 39th percentile, Tollesboro Elementary gained from the 40th percentile to the 63rd percentile, Lewis County Middle School gained from 24th percentile to 37th percentile, and Lewis County High School gained from the 28th percentile in 2011-12 to 79th percentile in 2012-13.

(c)

The applicant does not explain how it will make student performance data available to parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. For students participating in the WorKeys, individual job skills were assessed and as a result, students were grouped and regrouped based on their academic progress and career-choice clusters. The Infinite Campus and COMPASS systems will also be used to make student performance data available to students and educators.

The applicant scores in the low range for this criterion

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

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

There is a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments, including by making public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration. The applicant states that salaries for all (including instructional, teaching, and school-level staff) will appear on its website and in the local newspaper. All finances will be available on the district's website. Overall, this plan will give those with internet access, and those without, the ability to obtain this information.

The applicant scores in the high range for this criterion.

<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The extent to which each LEA has demonstrated evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal is unclear. The applicant currently administers assessments and analyzes data to change instruction and design individual student plans; but it not known whether the applicant can do so without receiving prior clearance. The applicant also fails to include evidence such as letters supporting their autonomy or cite state law or statues.

The applicant scores in the low range for this criterion.

<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has demonstrated adequate stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal; however it does not demonstrated meaningful stakeholder support for the proposal.

(a)

The applicant provides an adequate description of how students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools were engaged in the development of the proposal. Annual student and family need-based surveys were distributed. Site based Councils, parent and teacher groups, were actively involved in the defining the project scope and direction.

(b)

The applicant includes one letter of support, but the organization's purpose and level of participation in the program is unclear. The applicant provides no additional letters from such key stakeholders as parents and parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, the business community, civil rights organizations, advocacy groups, local civic and community-based organizations, and institutions of higher education.

However, the applicant does not effectively demonstrate that teachers and/or their collective bargaining units were involved or engaged in the process. The applicant scores in the middle range for this criterion.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant outlines an adequate 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.

This plan includes an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students; however, the rigor of the program is questionable. The applicant states that it will design a program that includes technology and innovative teaching strategies, but fails to mention anything about the intensity or rigor of the program.

In particular, the applicant’s approach to learning that engages and empowers all learners in an age-appropriate manner seeks to do the following.

- Use the ePrep program to help students, teachers, and counselors understand student progress,
- Use the ACT and CCR assessments to Identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements to understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goals,
- Seniors may visit colleges on college days, while gifted and talented students may explore deeper academic challenges and experiences,
- Receive guidance and support from the PMC and TC, and
- Receive exposure to diverse cultures and perspectives through the classroom experiences incorporated into art classes, social studies, history, and co-curricular settings.
- A personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed by teachers using data from the Measure of Academic Progress and teacher assessments.
- Interactive White Boards for student and teacher use, individual student answering devices, iPads High school students participate in Project Lead the Way, an innovative approach to creative science labs, to enhance student creativity in science demonstrates the variety of high-quality instructional approaches, environments, and content, including digital learning content that is aligned with college- and career-ready standards.

Overall, the applicant does not outline a high-quality plan, but does offer a partial explanation of the teaching and learning that will take place. Many details such as the school’s role in explaining data to parents, specific accommodations that will be made for high need students, and the exact digital tools that will be used to increase technology education have not been addressed. Because of this, the applicant scores in the middle range.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant outlines an incomplete 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.

This 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.

All participating educators will be engaged in adequate training, and in professional teams or communities. An instructional coach will assist in supporting the effective implementation of personalized learning environments, while content will be adapted to meet the individual needs of all students with the use of the interactive white board, videos, project based learning, collaborative work and discussions, the use of manipulatives, and individualized computer programs.

The proposal is unclear as to how actionable information will help educators identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests. Although many resources are listed, it is not clear whether the proposed resources will be of high quality or provide sufficient rigor. Nor does the applicant discuss its plan to provide continuously improving feedback about the effectiveness of the resources in meeting student needs.

Finally, the applicant does not address the following in the narrative:

- The district’s teacher evaluation system. The applicant does not provide a copy of the current evaluation nor does the applicant provide a detailed description of the tool.
- Initial training and professional development for staff is detailed, but follow-up and continuous learning opportunities are not mentioned.
- The plan for increasing the number the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals, including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects, and specialty areas.

Overall, the applicant fails to outline a high-quality plan. Because of this, the applicant scores in the low range for this criterion.

**D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant presents an unclear description of its practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning.</p> <p>(a) A comprehensive list of relevant central office positions and their respective duties are listed in the narrative. For example, the resource administrators at the central office are available every instructional day, and additional support days throughout the calendar year. The Instructional Supervisor develops, oversees, and manages the day-to-day operations of the educational programs for the district. The Instructional Supervisor plans, develops and implements functions related to curriculum, instruction and staff professional development. The amount of support is sufficient.</p> <p>(b) The applicant offers a vague description of leadership on the school level. Schools will receive assistance from the central office based teams. Additional support will be provided by instructional coaches; however the effectiveness of these coaches is questionable. One coach will service four elementary schools at a ratio of 1:67 (coach to teacher). Because this support is critical to the success of the program, additional support or coaches should be added.</p> <p>(c) High school students will be given the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery through dual credit and credit recovery programs. For example, students working beyond the required level of mastery in mathematics and English Composition are given the opportunity to enroll in College Algebra and/or English Composition for dual college level credits. The middle and high schools have implemented the use of COMPASS as a source of credit recovery which allows the students to work on the specific skills that they needed for mastery in order to gain the desired course credit. The work is completed independently on the computer, and can be available for completion at home or during afterschool sessions. The plan to extend this to an everyday activity is laudable.</p> <p>(d) The ability to give students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways has not been stated by the applicant. This is separate from earning credit.</p> <p>(e) The applicant will provide adaptable and fully accessible learning resources and instructional practices through its after-school tutoring and summer school programs.</p> <p>Overall, key components of a high quality plan are missing or are unclear. While the applicant appears strong in some areas, such as central office support and credit recovery, the plan falls short in areas such as effective teacher support and the opportunity to master skills at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways. The applicant scores in the middle range.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant describes a somewhat adequate district and school infrastructure that will support personalized learning.

(a)

The applicant has ensured that that all participating students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school. COMPASS is a widely accessible credit-recovery program and will be the primary mode of creating personalized instruction for students by their teachers. The COMPASS learning option for educational success is accessible for use with any computer, requiring a password established through the system; however, the applicant states that it is a fee-based program and it is provided as an educational resource through the Boy's and Girl's Club educational partnership. Parents will be provided access to Infinite Campus to monitor grades, attendance, and student credit progress. Yet, many, if not all, of these students are classified as low income. Using fee-based program ignores the 'regardless of income' requirement outlined in the criterion. The applicant does not mention supplementary programs such as stipends. Because of this, the plan is not high quality.

(b)

The applicant states that students, parents, and educators will receive sufficient and appropriate levels of technical support, which may be provided through monthly Parent/Teacher Meetings and visits to the school. This level of training will meet the needs of this population and are scheduled at appropriate intervals.

(c)

Many systems will be used to provide information to parents and students, but their ability to export their information in an open data format is unclear. For example, report cards will include assessment data, but the applicant fails to explain whether these will be distributed electronically or on paper. Additionally, iPads will be used during instruction, but the applicant fails to explain how the data generated from this will be collected and used to make recommendations for additional learning supports. A key part of this section is the availability and accessibility of information. Without a clear plan to distribute or make this information available, the plan misses the point--to provide useable data to students.

(d)

The applicant will use Infinite Campus as its interoperable data system. This system stores and shares student information and is accessible by faculty, staff, students, and parents. This systems covers the basics and should include much more information, such as human resources data and instructional improvement, which would provide a more robust system.

Overall, the applicant addresses many items in the criterion; however, a complete, comprehensive, and high-quality plan has not been presented. The applicant scores in the middle range for this criterion.

**E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>

**(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant offers some steps of its plan to implement an improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. For example, the applicant will collect MAP assessment and state testing data to analyze student academic growth and educational gaps. Student performance data will be collected and analyzed by schools and teachers for increased identification of student and effective teacher goals. And finally, teachers will be provided training and professional development workshops that will provide the support necessary for educationally sound adaption of materials and implementation practices.

Overall, the applicant could include more information about its plan to monitor activities in order to continuously improve the program. Much of the narrative explains how things will be implemented but not necessarily monitored. The frequency at which the tests are administered (more than three times per year) could be improved to enhance student achievement. Moreover, the applicant fails to demonstrate the level of rigor of its plan. Because of this, and the failure to detail a high-quality plan or approach, the applicant scores in the low range.

<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant offers a plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. The applicant will continue the communication policies that have been implemented by all stakeholders in the school system. External information is publicized on the Lewis County Schools website, announcements are made on the local radio station, and ads are placed in the local newspaper. Email and telephone communication will be the most common form of internal communication and with the director of the Boy's and Girl's Club of Lewis County. The applicant also states that the success of the CHEER Project will be measured by the assessment data collected, as well as annual surveys to be completed by all stakeholders.</p> <p>However, a high-quality plan would include more opportunities for two-way communication. As the proposal currently reads, most of the effort will come from the applicant. And while communication is important, there is little proof that the applicant will engage internal and external stakeholders. For example, Will stakeholders be able to respond to the information disseminated on the website and in ads in a meaningful way? A more detailed plan that includes timelines and regularly scheduled updates such as meeting and newsletters would have been helpful.</p> <p>The applicant scores in the middle range for this criterion.</p>		

<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
---	----------	----------

<p><b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant fails to outline a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve its plans.</p> <p>The applicant offers the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) scores are given three times during the instructional year (Fall, Winter, and Spring) to provide multiple data collections. These assessments offer a skill continuum evaluations as well as national comparisons for performance levels. This assessment data is collected for all students in grades K-8.</li> <li>• Students are assessed multiple times during the Primary Grades because early detection of academic, social, or developmental delays are most easily addressed at this time. The PreK-3 age students are expected to exit third grade as a proficient reader, and on grade level in all core content areas.</li> <li>• Students in grades 4-8 are identified as an academic target group due to the gap in the performance record of the age of students within the Lewis County School District. The continued use of the MAP and Kentucky mandated annual assessments indicate that students need to be monitored and evaluated for the alignment of performance and the student Individual Learning Plan (ILP).</li> <li>• Students will be expected to perform academically proficient in core content areas with an embedded use of technology. All students will also participate in "Explore" interest inventory as an indication of college/career ready demonstration.</li> <li>• Students enrolled in grades 9-12 at Lewis County High School are provided an educational opportunity to receive dual credits in College Algebra and English Composition. Students who do not meet benchmark or the Mathematics portion of the ACT will enroll in Developmental Math to ensure the academic success of College Algebra.</li> <li>• All students will participate in the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) during the 11th grade to assist with career guidance. Students and parents will be assisted with the FAFSA and college enrollment applications.</li> <li>• All students are expected to graduate high school and be college/career ready.</li> </ul> <p>The above information outlines an assessment plan, not a plan for continuous improvement.</p> <p>Additionally, the reviewer is unable to determine whether the goals stated in the tables are achievable or ambitious as no rational for selecting each measure has been offered. There are many lines in the performance measures which have been left blank such as the information on the first two tables, more specifically the subgroup information. And it is unclear whether items such as surveys are mandatory and therefore skew the anticipated goals and does not allow for accurate annual targets. There is also no indication how the applicant will review and improve these measures over time. Because of this, the applicant scores in the low range for this criterion.</p>		
---	--	--

**(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)****5****1****(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not offer a high-quality plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities, such as professional development and activities that employ technology.

Many of the items that the applicant outlines are activities that are currently being implemented without RttT-D funds. For example,

- Students are screened and assessed multiple times throughout the academic school year. Pre-school students are given screenings and diagnostic assessments for speech, language, and motor skill development before they enter the State Funded Preschool Program.
- Instructional staff members in the elementary schools district wide administer the Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) assessments three times during the academic school year (fall, winter, and spring). Data for these assessments is used to target learning gaps and individualize instruction in order to meet the academic needs of all students, ensuring the educational progression of skills in mathematics and reading. The assessments are norm referenced, providing an educational average for skill development.
- The individual skills report indicates areas of strengths and weaknesses to provide the educational opportunity for a personalized academic growth approach.
- Kentucky Core Content Testing is also conducted near the end of each school year, with a reference of performance of Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, or Distinguished. The student scores are analyzed and improvement plans are established.

The applicant also mentions programs and activities that it hopes to fund with grant money. For example,

- Currently, all of our schools are using older wireless technology (over 5 years old) that has neither the capacity nor the speed to adequately support the addition of any significant number of new wireless devices. At this point the Lewis County School District does not have the funding resources to meet our current and future needs for technology and the required infrastructure. The addition of updated computer labs, personal electronic devices, and the necessary infrastructure updates will become a reality with possible grant funding. The educational benefits of this plan would be for the educational advancement of all students PreK-12, and students will have the capability to graduate from high school with a technology background that will truly ensure that they are College/Career ready.
- The Professional Development success will be successful with the implementation of instructional, age-appropriate use of digital equipment. Observations in the classroom setting will indicate the teacher and student use of embedded technology during instruction. At the present time, the Lewis County School District offers extended school services provided in the schools that the student attends with transportation available on a limited number of days during the school year.
- A partnership with the Boy's and Girl's Club of Lewis County has provided, and will continue to offer, an educational and social opportunity for all student (K-12) with partial bus service provide by the district and past 21st Century Grant Funding. This partnership ensures that all students have the opportunity for a safe, educational, and socially enhanced experience beyond the school day. The increase in the number of students taking advantage of the services will increase because of the additional equipment available at the facility and transportation availability. Both school and club provide tutoring services as well as computer availability that many students do not have access to at home. The grant funding would make possible the availability of extended school services each instructional day for the next four academic school years, ensuring additional educational resources for the growth of students in the Lewis County School District.

While the applicant does state what it is currently doing to improve the effectiveness of its current activities, it does not offer any plan to evaluate the effectiveness of programs it hopes to fund. Instead, the applicant make blanket statements about the benefits of the activities and programs, but nowhere is it mentioned how they will be evaluated to determine their current and continued effectiveness.

The applicant scores in the low range for this criterion.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant outlines a limited plan to support the project for the duration of the grant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It appears that most of funds to support the project will come from Race to the Top-District grant funds.</li> <li>• Additional funds will come from prior funding support from a variety of sources including LEA, State, and Federal monies.</li> </ul> <p>The budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal. And though some rationale about investments and priorities are offered, such as grant-related positions and one-time investments, others are lacking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technological purchases appear to be one-time investments, yet given the rate of technological advancements, this should be an ongoing operational cost. There is also no maintenance plan mentioned.</li> <li>• Textbooks also appear to be a one-time investments. The applicant should consider making this an ongoing operational cost or, at the very least, upgrading supplemental resources such as workbooks on a regular basis.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the budget appears to support items that should be covered by the district such as textbook purchases. The applicant fails to convey in a meaningful way how these purchases ensure long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments.</p> <p>The applicant scores in the middle range for this criterion.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant does not describe a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant.</p> <p>Many of the program's salaries will be absorbed by the district budget. For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The College/Career Student Coach, will be Perkins funded through the technical center after the grant funding ends.</li> <li>• The funding for the additional high school counselor will be sustained with General Funds of the Lewis County Board of Education.</li> </ul> <p>But the applicant fails to describe of how the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use this data to inform future investments.</p> <p>An estimated budget for the three years after the term of the grant that includes budget assumptions, potential sources, and uses of funds was not included.</p> <p>And though the applicant states that it will supplement grant funds with state monies, the applicant provides no evidence or letters of support form state and local government leaders.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant outlines how many salaries will be absorbed, but little is offered about how items related to the infrastructure (computers, software licenses, etc.) will be sustained. Of particular concern is technology equipment, developmental supplies, and intervention materials, which the applicant states will not require additional funding. Plans for the continuation of the extended school services are anticipated funding from General Funds. This is the cornerstone of the plan.</p> <p>The applicant scores in the low range for this criterion.</p>		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score

<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant provides a thorough description of the coherent and sustainable partnership that it has formed with public or private organizations, such as Head Start, Primary Plus, and the Boy's and Girl's Club of Lewis County. Many of these partnerships have been in existence for years and will continue to provide support such as tutoring, career planning, and family counseling. As the LEA is located in a rural area, it appears as if it is taking advantage of as many partnerships as possible. This is a commendable effort.</p> <p>The applicant has also identified 10 population-level desired results for its students. The results include both educational results and other education outcomes such as Emotional intervention success and health and safety awareness.</p> <p>There is no mention of how the partnerships will track the selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all participants, now it will use the data to target its resources in order to improve results for participating students, how it will develop a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students, and how it will improve results over time.</p> <p>Yet, the applicant somewhat describes how the partnership would, within participating schools, integrate education and other services for participating students. For example, the Boy's and Girl's club will provide tutoring while the Family Resource Youth Service Centers offer family and student support for those students that have physical needs such as school supplies or clothing.</p> <p>The applicant fails to describe how the partnership and school district would build the capacity of staff in participating schools by providing them with tools and supports to create a decision-making process and infrastructure to select, implement, and evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating students and support improved results; 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; routinely assess the applicant's progress in implementing its plan to maximize impact and resolve challenges and problems; and identify its annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population-level and describe desired results for students.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant offers an adequate plan. It is important to note that the academic goals outlined in section A are not consistent with the goals presented in this section. Because of this, the applicant scores in the middle range.</p>		

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant has not met Absolute Priority 1.</p> <p>The four core assurance areas were not fully addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most: The applicant fails to detail how it recruit, reward, and retain these teachers who they will develop. More information is needed to address this important portion of the vision.</li> <li>Turning around lowest-achieving schools: The applicant does not offer any information about how it turned around its lowest-achieving schools. Evidence of change made on a larger level would assure the reviewer that the applicant could effectively make even more change after receiving grant funds.</li> </ul> <p>The applicant fails to present a comprehensive and cohesive narrative that illustrates how a personalized learning program will be implemented, evaluated, and continued after the initial grant funding period. The applicant continually mentions items that will be purchased but cannot detail how these items will translate into meaningful student achievement.</p> <p>Moreover, much of the subgroup information is not included. Information such as this is critical to determine changes in the achievement gap and to determine the ambitiousness and achievability of goals.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant fails to outline a clear and effective program. It appears that many of the items such a computers and textbooks would be best purchased by district funds.</p> <p>The applicant does not meet the priority.</p>		

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>78</b>
--------------	------------	-----------



## Race to the Top - District Technical Review Form

**Application #0233KY-2 for Lewis County Board of Education**

### **A. Vision (40 total points)**

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

**(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

Comprehensive Higher Education Excellence Reform (CHEER) Project

(a) The four educational assurances

The Lewis County School District (LCSD) has adopted standards and assessments of academic and psychosocial physical wellness goals. These standards are measured using the multiple assessments and testing periods available through the MAP (Measure of Academic Progress) and KPREP (Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress).

A district wide system has been developed to measure student growth and success. This system collects and organizes data to inform teachers' and principals' decisions regarding student improvements. Data is analyzed for each student, providing the necessary information to create an Individual Education Plan (IEP) for each student.

There is an explanation of how teachers will be supported through instructional support from individual administrators at Central Office and related professional development. There is no plan for recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most.

The applicant provided a description of a new College/Career Readiness initiative that has been implemented across three campus schools to provide a counselor to work with students to ensure a successful transition of all students into college and/or the workforce. There is, however, no specific description of how the district will turn around low performing schools.

(b) The applicant's approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support is through an IEP to be developed for each student. A district-wide database has developed and implemented to provide a clear focus and direction to inform instruction.

(c) The classroom experience has been described as a collaborative one. A teacher coach will meet with teachers individually and by grade level weekly to analyze data and verify progress toward success for all students. Teachers will have Common Core preparation time to plan and share learning techniques. The teachers have access to early career development activities through the Kentucky Internship Program (KTIP).

The applicant has described a reform vision that meets two of the four core components; standards and assessments, and data system. Teacher/principal recruitment and retention and turning around low performing schools have been addressed minimally or not at all. There is a vision that the classroom experience will be collaborative; however, this is described in very general terms. This section is rated in the medium scoring range.

<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

Applicant's approach to implementation

(a) All students and schools within the Lewis County School System will be participating in the CHEER Project for

improvement. All district schools have Title I status and enrollment populations that are identified as high-need. They collectively meet the competition's eligibility requirements. There is no rationale or process for deciding to include all schools other than they all had a high level of need.

(b) A list of all district schools is provided.

(c) The applicant has included the total number of participating students, participating students from low-income families, participating students who are high-need students and participating educators.

All students and schools within the Lewis County School System will be participating in the CHEER Project for the improvement of educational experiences district wide. The implementation will include Lewis County Central Elementary has 491 students with 73% of the student population on free or reduced lunch, Garrison Elementary has 308 students with 82% qualifying for free or reduced lunch, Laurel Elementary has 90 students with 79% qualifying for free or reduced lunch, Tollesboro Elementary has 283 students with 77% qualifying for free or reduced lunch, Lewis County Middle School 469 students with 72% qualifying for free or reduced lunch, and Lewis County High School has an enrollment of 705 students with 67% qualifying for free or reduced lunch. The Lewis County School District has a total of 2,414 students and 73.1% qualify for free and/or reduced lunch.

Data on the participating students who are high-needs is equal to the number of students enrolled.

The applicant's approach to implementing its reform will be district-wide. Data on the number and percentage of high need students is provided to show that the need is significant throughout its schools. There is no rationale provided for deciding that all schools would be served. The applicant has provided the required data in this section; however, there is no evidence that the applicant's approach would lead to a high-quality district or school-level implementation. The rating is in the high range.

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

**10**

**2**

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

A Kindermusik approach to phonetic awareness and application will be purchased for pre-school students. The adoption materials will include intervention strategies to ensure individualized instruction while meeting core curriculum guidelines. A Teacher Coach position will be added. Services will be shared among the four elementary schools to assist in curriculum instruction and continual professional development and support.

Curriculum design and implementation guides aligned with the new Kentucky Core Content Standards and instructional materials are needed so that all grades have access to appropriate instruction. This is currently available for some but not all grade levels. iPads and E-readers will be purchased to integrate educational experiences through the use of technology.

The applicant plans to increase dual credit opportunities for high school students.

A principal coach will be added to assist principals in the implementation of new programs.

After school tutoring will be provided through a partnership with the Lewis County Library.

The applicant has listed needs throughout the district for programs. These include textbooks and supplies. The purchases are not adequately linked to a specific reform plan. It has not proposed a high-quality plan describing how the reform proposal will translate into meaningful reform to support district-wide change. Since all schools are to be served, the plan would not be required to describe how it would be scaled up to other schools. There are no goals, activities, rationales, timelines or roles of responsibilities provided to document how the district will improve student learning outcomes for all students in this section or in the appendix. There are no specific outcome goals provided; so, it is not possible to determine the success of these activities. This section is rated in the low range.

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

**10**

**2**

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes

(a) Assessment for Grade 11 is based on the ACT. The applicant proposes to increase achievement in English, math, reading, science, and composite areas. The English baseline for 2011-12 is 16.8% with a goal of 17.9% in 2017-18. Goals in the other areas show a similar increase. This is provided for students overall and not by subgroups. There is no narrative provided to explain what these numbers mean or on why the measure was selected. Performance on goals for K-PREP percentiles by school are provided. Goals for each school are provided. The overall percentages vary. For example, the baseline in 2011-12 at Lewis County Central Elementary is 1 with a goal for 2017-18 set at 62.

The percentage of proficient/distinguished combined for reading and math are provided for the district and for each of the six schools. Data is for all students is not broken out by grade level or by subgroups.

(b) No data to determine decreasing achievement gaps was provided.

(c) Graduation rates for Lewis County High School are provided. The rates are broken out for females and males but not by subgroup. The baseline rate for 2011-12 for all students is 96.7% with a goal of 97.2% in 2017-18.

(d) College enrollment rates.

District college enrollment rates are provided for students overall. They are not broken out by subgroups. The 2011-12 baseline rates is 60.2% with a goal of 85.2% in 2017-18.

(e) No postsecondary degree attainment is provided.

Data provided is insufficient to determine that these goals are achievable or ambitious.

Based on the performance goals described in this section and its tables, the Lewis County School's vision is not likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity. The section is rated in the low scoring range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The extent to which each LEA has demonstrated evidence of a record of success</p> <p>(1)The applicant provided a narrative to summarize some success in advancing student learning and achievement. There were no charts or graphs provided. Raw student data was not included.</p> <p>K-Prep scores indicate a percentile gain in scores at all 4 elementary schools from 2011-12 to 2012-13 school years. The most notable was Lewis County Central where there was an increase from 1% to 23%. Increases were noted across all content areas.</p> <p>(a) Insufficient data was provided to demonstrate how the applicant has improved student learning outcomes over the past four years. No data was provided by subgroup; so, the gap between subgroups cannot be evaluated.</p> <p>The district has an impressive graduation rate of 96.7% for the school year ending 2013.</p> <p>The number of students from the graduating class indicates that 39% will be attending college. This is significantly lower than the state average of 56.4%.</p> <p>(b) The applicant included a description of how it has provided staff development and materials to support the teachers' ability to implement the eight CCSS Standards for Mathematical Practice to teach the CCSS content. Books, videos and other materials have been purchased to support students. There was no specific data provided as evidence of how this increased teaching and learning.</p> <p>Operation Preparation and WorkKeys are programs available to students to assist them in becoming more career oriented.</p> <p>(c) There was no description of how the applicant would make student performance data available to students, educators and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services.</p> <p>The applicant has not provided a clear record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching. Data provided is not based on achievement over time. Data is not provided to indicate decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups. Programs mentioned are not part of a reform plan to increase student achievement. This section is rated in the low scoring range.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The Lewis County School System is audited annually to determine that federal and state guidelines have been met.</p>		

The completed budget summary is available on a website and in the newspaper. The website includes an excel spreadsheet where every salary schedule can be accessed. This includes "all data information concerning current Annual Financial Reports and Working Budget Reports."

The applicant has provided evidence of processes, practices, and investments. This includes making public the school expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration. This is readily available to all stakeholders who would like to access it. The applicant has not provided evidence to document any of the budget documents that are available; so, a high level of transparency cannot be determined. The section is rated in the high scoring range.

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

**10**

**2**

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has provided information about assessments and data; however, it has not clearly addressed the criterion. Kentucky provides a state funded pre-school.

Measure of Academic Progress (MAP) is administered three times per year to measures academic performance in the common core content areas.

Kentucky Core Content Assessments which identifies the student performance categorized by Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, and Distinguished is administered annually.

District students in grade 8 and in grade 10 are administered the PLAN program in addition to the state testing. This helps students build a foundation for future academic and career success.

All 11<sup>th</sup> grade students are given the ACT test to assist students and teachers with the academic planning for the senior year of high school.

This data provided does not directly address the requirement of the section. Successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement a personalized learning environment beyond state testing and pre-school have not been included. This section is rated in the low scoring range.

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

**15**

**3**

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

Monthly meetings of site based Councils with representation from parents, teachers, and principals were held. These groups were actively involved in defining the project scope and direction.

(i) The applicant indicates that "the instructional staff is eager to implement all components of the project." There is no indication of collective bargaining representation or evidence that at least 70% of teachers from participating schools support the proposal.

(b) One letter of support was provided by the Lewis County Educational Foundation. This is support for the Lewis County Board of Education Multi-Media Literacy Integration Project and is dated March 21, 2011.

Meaningful stakeholder engagement throughout the development of the proposal and meaningful stakeholder support for the proposal is not extensive. Monthly meetings were held at the school level; however, there is no evidence provided to document them through a calendar, minutes, planning documents, council members' names, or letters of support from these councils. There is insufficient documentation. There are no letters of support specific to the CHEER Program. There is no documentation of teacher support. This section is rated in the low scoring range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has provided descriptions of approaches that engage and empower all learners to improve learning by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students with support to graduate college- and career-ready.

(i) Students participate in multiple activities to develop and understand that what they are learning is the key to their

success.

Student data can be accessed by parents through Infinite Campus using the Parent Portal for all students. The Infinite Campus allows teacher and parent interaction on the progress and behaviors of their child. This data is updated a minimum of once per week and allow parents the opportunity to view their child's class work assignments, grades, and attendance.

Technology is a key component in providing career awareness and the skills needed to pursue interests. Upgrading the wireless infrastructure has been identified as "the single most important use of technology funding within the district."

(ii) Students have opportunities to Identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

All freshmen, sophomores, and juniors are assessed three times a year using e-Prep, a web based assessment for college readiness standards. Aligned with the ACT, this program identifies strengths and weaknesses and provides individual, prescriptive tutorials for help with skill improvement and practice. Computer time on e-Prep is scheduled based on each student's identified needs

PLAN provides individual and group settings for sophomores to determine their status in relation to skill attainment needed for post-secondary goals.

Individual assistance in scheduling high school courses congruent to post-secondary and career pathways is provided.

All students participate in college/career planning with their guidance counselors.

(iii) Opportunities for deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest and opportunities to customize coursework to careers are provided. For example, middle school students can develop their Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) to choose a career cluster based on their interests. High school students are given opportunities to follow their goals by enrolling in the career choice classes that are available at the Foster Meade Career and Technical Center. Other opportunities are provided through on-line coursework.

(iv) Students are provided instruction and exposure to diverse cultures and perspectives through the classroom experiences incorporated into art classes, social studies, history, and co-curricular settings.

(v) Students are provided access to master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving activities that increase critical thinking, communication skills, creativity, problem solving, perseverance, teamwork, and goal setting through participation in clubs, academic and sports teams, student organizations (4-H, band, career and technical clubs), allowing students to apply knowledge learned in the classroom to practical applications.

(b) With the support of parents and educators each student has access to—

(i) The Individualized Learning Plan developed for each student will provide a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable the student to achieve adequate learning goals to graduate on time college- and career-ready.

(ii) Students will be able to 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. This will be provided through state and other assessments. Strengths and weaknesses will be identified and the appropriate instruction will be provided through various means to address areas of need. Programs include ePREP and opportunities available through the counselor.

(iii) Students are able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest through dual course offerings at the Kentucky Technical College. There is an emphasis on using technology to further students' interests. Digital learning through Compass Learning is encouraged as is the use of blogs and wiki. Participation in the Kentucky Department of Education's technology initiative "bring your own device" will enhance student access to various programs where technology is lacking at the district. Students are encouraged to bring their own wireless devices to school (smart phones, tablet pc's, iPads, etc.) to be used as a learning tool within their classroom instruction.

(A) With the support of parents and educators, students receive students are given various opportunities for academic success through the classroom instruction approaches (technology, small group, whole group, clinical labs, landscaping). Students requiring intervention types of instruction are currently offered the extended school services two days per week with transportation provided. This grant would extend this this opportunity to five days. Other extended learning opportunities are offered but not specified.

(B) The student's Personalized Learning Plan is used to personalize student learning and ePrep is used to individualize

student learning

(v) Accommodations and high quality strategies for high need students are provided by classroom teachers, as well as special education teachers. Students with accommodations are provided instruction to help ensure they are also meeting the college and career standards.

(c)) The applicant states that mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students to ensure their understanding of the tools and resources and how to use them.

The district plans to extend the services provided by Tiffany Lavoie for 60 days per school year for the next four years to assist instructors on the use of technology required to implement the personalized learning plans.

The applicant has provided a description of how it is improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students with support to graduate college-and career-ready. Some ways to expand this initiative are included. This description contains some excellent components such as the ePREP program and partnerships with higher learning institutions to support student awareness of career choices and whether or not they will have the skills required to pursue them. The applicant has not, however, provided a high-quality plan in this section. There are no specific goals stated. The activities, deliverables, timeline, and personnel responsible have not been provided. This section is rated in the mid scoring range.

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

**20**

**4**

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

Support for teaching and learning

(i) All teachers attend Professional Development based on the Kentucky Core Academic Standards.

ISLN Professional Learning Communities are established within each department and meetings are held weekly to ensure that all students are progressing.

A technology instruction specialist provides support for the implementation of technology needed to implement the curriculum.

(ii) Content is adapted to meet the individual needs of all students through the use of the interactive white boards, videos, project based learning (classroom projects, 4-H), collaborative work and discussion (within lessons and collaborative work among content areas), the use of manipulatives, individualized computer programs, and vocational tools such as those used in welding, carpentry, agriculture, and health classes.

Students are grouped among peers based on academic needs, personal interests, and future goals to ensure that all student needs are met.

Anticipated grant funding would allow the purchase of additional technology to increase the individualized use of student involvement ensuring a personalized academic approach.

(iii) Student progress toward meeting academic and college/career goals is measured annually on the ACT, Explore, and End of Course Assessments.

A continuum of the assessments provides all instructional personnel with the essential core content goals and identifiable intervention strategies will be identified and implemented.

(iv) Formal evaluations of teachers and principals are conducted semi-annually and formal feedback is provided. Multiple informal evaluations are conducted throughout the year.

The Kentucky Department of Education teacher evaluation will be mandated in 2014-15.

(b) All participating educators have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

(i) All participating teachers have access to, and know how to use a wide range of tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college and career ready requirements. Teachers and instructional staff receive regular professional development trainings and updates on data analysis of standardized tests and assessments. The analysis is used to respond to student needs as identified by this assessment.

(ii) Teachers and educational staff are trained to be effective at establishing the framework for student success. Contact time instructional opportunities have been developed to allow teachers and students to discuss individual goals and to track data to improve data driven instructional practices for continued growth.

(iii) The applicant states that there are processes and tools to match student needs with specific resources and approaches. These are discussed in general terms and are not specifically addressed.

(c) All participating school leaders and school leadership teams have training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs.

(i) The applicant does not specifically address how information from the district's teacher evaluation will assist school leaders and school leadership teams to assess teacher performance. There is no discussion on how steps will be taken to improve individual and collective educator effectiveness or school culture and climate for the purpose of continuous school improvement.

(ii) The applicant addresses training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement. The teachers in the Lewis County School System meet the qualification standards of the Kentucky Department of Education. Educators have access to district and state training. Teachers receive financial tuition assistance if they wish to pursue the certification required to teach dual credit courses.

(d) The applicant has not provided a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from highly effective teachers and principals, including in hard-to-teach subjects and specialty areas.

The applicant has provided some information on improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. There are initiatives in place such as Professional Learning Communities to evaluate that students are progressing toward their goals. There is no discussion on how the number of effective teachers and principals will be increased. The applicant states that there is professional development on the use of tools, data, and resources to assist students in meeting their needs; however, specifics to describe how this is done are not provided. There is no evidence of a high-quality plan with goals, activities, deliverables, timelines or personnel responsible provided.

This section is scored in the low range.

#### D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

LEA practices, policies, and rules

(a) The district has organized central office staff to provide a governance structure to provide support and services to all participating schools.

A district has resource administrators who will oversee the CHEER Program implementation.

An instructional Supervisor develops, oversees, and manages the day-to-day operations of the educational programs. A list of essential duties includes coordinating and monitoring the district improvement process.

The Director of Special Services develops, oversees, and manages the day-to-day operations of the District's Special Education programs and services and the Preschool Program.

The Director of Federal Programs is responsible for the development and management of federal programs.

The District Director of Pupil Personnel is responsible for the development and management of the pupil personnel program that promotes student attendance and well-being.

Director of district Services will assist with the planning, development, and implementation of functions as they relate to instruction and personnel staff development.

(b) Site Based Decision Making Councils in each school provide leadership with sufficient flexibility and autonomy over school schedules and calendars, personnel, school-level budgets and other school matters.

(c) Students have opportunities to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic.

Students working beyond the required level of mastery in mathematics and English Composition can enroll in College Algebra and/or English Composition for dual college.

Middle and high schools have access to the COMPASS Program which provides a source of credit recovery. Students can work independently on this computer based program at school or at home to gain mastery.

The Boy's and Girl's Club KIDS College offers remediation and recovery assistance through several programs including college prep classes, on-line programs, and summer programs. Students also have additional computer access at this location.

(d) Multiple opportunities to demonstrate mastery on core content standards are provided through the administration of the Measure of Proficiency (MAP) assessment which is administered three times a year.

e) No specific learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners were included.

The applicant described central office positions and a school level structure to support project implementation. There is no detail provided to demonstrate how these positions or structures will interact.

There are some excellent opportunities for students offered through the Boys' and Girls' Club to receive supplemental support and on-line courses to demonstrate mastery on subjects. Assessments are in place for students to demonstrate through the MAP given three times during the school year. The Site Based Decision Making Councils provide the structure for flexibility in planning at each of the schools.

The applicant has not articulated a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator and level of the education system with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed. There are no descriptions of how learning resources and instructional practice will be adapted and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners

The description did not include a high-quality plan complete with goals. Therefore, activities, deliverables, timelines, rationales, or staff responsible for implementation could be provided.

This section is rated in the mid scoring range

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

**10**

**5**

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The LEA and school infrastructure supports personalized learning by through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator and level of the education system with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.

(a) The district and each individual school have the infrastructure required to provide all students, parents, and educators the opportunity to benefit from the personalized learning opportunities and the available resources.

The COMPASS learning option for educational success is accessible through any computer. The applicant did not provide a description of COMPASS. It is included as the infrastructure to provide all students, parents, and educators the opportunity to benefit from the use of available personalized learning opportunities and resources.

Programs that require access fees are provided as an educational resource through the Boy's and Girl's Club. No detail was provided on which programs have fees.

Infinite Campus information portal provides parents and guardians with access to grades, attendance, and student credit progress.

Parents are encouraged to attend fall and spring Parent/Teacher Meetings to personally discuss the progress of their child and establish academic and future goals.

Annual instructional data for individual schools is located on the Lewis County School District website as a countywide report card that includes the academic progress, attendance, and other educational factors that are pertinent for a successful educational experience. This information is available to the public for review and feedback.

(b) Parents are invited to the school their child attends to set up a password, for technical support and assistance with the use of Infinite Campus, or other technology issues that could resolved at the school level. There is no detail on how the applicant will provide the appropriate levels of technical support or the strategies that will be used to provide it.

(c) Parents and guardians are provided access to grades, attendance, and student credit progress with the use of the parent portal on Infinite Campus. This information portal is available to students and parents continuously throughout the school year.

(d) Infinite Campus is the interoperable data system provided to store and share student information that is accessible by faculty and staff. School district budget information is located on the Lewis County School District website under the Finance Office heading. The range of data available through this system has not been provided.

The applicant has not comprehensively and convincingly responded to the four sub-criteria in this section. It has provided basic district and school infrastructure that will support personalized learning. Student data is available through Infinite Campus which can be accessed easily after contacting the school for an access code. Computer access is available at the Girls' and Boys' Club. Appropriate levels of technical support have not been detailed other than those who require support can request it. The applicant has not provided a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure. There were no goals or the required activities, rationales, timelines, deliverables or person responsible included.

This section is rated in the mid scoring range.

### E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>In this section the applicant has described the programs or materials that will be used. The applicant states that it will “monitor and track” progress and names some of the assessments that will be used. There is no specific measure of success provided. There is no description of how it will publically share information on the quality of its investments funded by RttT-D.</p> <p>The applicant has not provided a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve its plan. Specific measures to determine student success are not described. This section is rated in the low scoring range.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>On-going communication and engagement with external stakeholders will be done through the website, radio announcements, ads in the local newspaper, and through an open door policy for communication within the district.</p> <p>The district maintains regular communication with the director of the Boy’s and Girl’s Club of Lewis County. The Club tracks the participating students through testing data and interest inventories. The information collected at the Club is available for school information need, and parents of the students who are under the age of 18.</p> <p>Success of the CHEER Project will be measured by the assessment data collected, as well as annual surveys to be completed by all stakeholders.</p> <p>The applicant has provided multiple traditional and non-traditional means of communication. There is, however, no discussion on how this communication will be used to continuously improve its plans. There is also no description included that the communication methods provide adequate opportunity for stakeholders to provide input rather than just to receive it. The applicant has not provided a high-quality plan. Goals and the accompanying activities, rationales, deliverables, timelines, and responsibilities to meet this requirement are not provided.</p>		

The section is rated in the mid scoring range.

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

5

3

**(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

Proposed achievement goals

All students attending the Lewis County School District in grades PreK-12 are currently receiving instruction from a Highly Qualified Teacher as defined by the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) and the Kentucky Department of Education. Kentucky Effective Teacher and Principal Evaluations will be implemented in 2013-2014. The chart regarding highly effective teachers and principals has been left blank.

Students enrolled in the Lewis County Schools are expected to demonstrate mastery levels of proficiency or distinguished performance on the state mandated Core Content assessments, and students are expected to academically progress one grade level each year.

The measures proposed by the applicant are consistent with those required by RttT-D.

Students entering Kindergarten will be given diagnostic screenings of the Brigance Readiness upon entry into public education to identify developmental or social delays.

The PreK-3 age students are expected to exit third grade as a proficient reader, and on grade level in all core content areas.

Students in grades 4-8 are identified as an academic target group due to the gap in the performance record of the age of students within the Lewis County School District. The continued use of the MAP and Kentucky mandated annual assessments indicate that students need to be monitored and evaluated for the alignment of performance and the student Individual Learning Plan (ILP).

Students will be expected to perform academically proficient in core content areas with an embedded use of technology.

All students will also participate in the Explore Interest Inventory as an indicator of college/career readiness.

Students enrolled in grades 9-12 at Lewis County High School are provided an educational opportunity to receive dual credits in College Algebra and English Composition.

Students who do not meet benchmarks on the Mathematics portion of the ACT will enroll in Developmental Math to ensure the academic success of College Algebra.

All students will participate in the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB) during the 11th grade to assist with career guidance.

Students and parents will be assisted with the FAFSA and college enrollment applications.

All students are expected to graduate high school and be college/career ready.

The applicant has ambitious performance measures overall but not by subgroups. Rationale for selecting assessments includes alignment with state standards or that they are important indicators of future success. A clear description of how the measures will provide rigorous, timely and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action are not provided. There is no discussion of how revisions will be made if the chosen measures are insufficient to determine implementation progress over time..

Some of the required assessments are not included--teacher and principal effectiveness and performance goals by subgroups. This section is rated in the mid scoring range.

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

5

1

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

In August 2010, the district contracted with an expert to work with teachers to identify weaknesses. The plan of action developed included short term goals for the 2010-2011 academic year as well as long-term goals for the next several years. This work included collaboration with administrators, review of resource materials, and classroom observations. Professional development for elementary, middle school, and high school teachers and administrators were discussed. This planning has been continued and areas of improvement have been determined. This includes the need to update technology and textbooks. The RttT-D grant would provide the updated materials, provide extended day/year services to children, and provide much needed improvements in technology.

The applicant has not provided a clear description of this work. A high-quality plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities such as professional development and activities that employ technology have not been clearly stated. There are no identified goals. Activities, deliverables, rationales, and timelines have not been articulated.

The applicant has listed some activities and materials that are needed in the district. They are not tied to specific goals or planning. The applicant has not provided a high-quality plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of RttT-D. This section is rated in the low scoring range.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>(a) The budget for the Lewis County School District’s Comprehensive Higher Education Excellence Reform (CHEER) Race to the Top-District grant includes prior funding support from a variety of sources including LEA, State, and Federal monies. Specific resources of this funding have not been included.</p> <p>(b) The expenditures are clearly stated and appear to be reasonable and sufficient to support needs identified throughout the application including technology expansion and improvements, instructional materials, and staff development. The needs have been identified; however, they are not linked to a plan and specific no goals have been provided in other sections of the application.</p> <p>(c) The applicant provided some rationale to support its investments is in sections D2. These were for purchase of needed materials or technology and were not specific to a system of reform;</p> <p>(i) A description of all of the funds from sources other than RttT-D has not been provided beyond a reference to the ESEA Title II Program.</p> <p>(ii) The budget includes a one-year expenditure of \$1,112,992.09 that will be used for technology. There are programs, textbooks, and materials listed that will be one-time expenditures throughout the four year grant period. The need for these materials has been documented in other sections of the application but not detailed here. The rationale for expenditures is not clearly presented. The applicant has not provided goals throughout the application; so, a determination of how they will be used to support high quality reform cannot be made.</p> <p>The applicant has clearly stated what is to be purchased and the costs appear to be consistent and reasonable with these expenditures. Funds from other sources are reported but not specifically identified. These are not linked to a high-quality plan to provide individualized learning consistent with the RttT-D grant requirements. There are no strategies included to demonstrate how the district will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environment provided.</p> <p>This section is rated in the low scoring range.</p>		

<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant has detailed ten projects and how they will be sustained after the term of the grant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• College/Career Student Coach-General Funds</li> <li>• Developmental Mathematics Facilitator-General Funds</li> <li>• Core Content Materials, Individual Assessment/Instruction/Intervention,</li> <li>• Individual Assessment/Instruction/Intervention, General Funds</li> <li>• Individual use of technology,-No additional funding required</li> <li>• Technology Infrastructure- Individual Assessment/Instruction/Intervention,</li> <li>• Principal/Teacher Support-Title II of ESEA</li> <li>• Grant Coordinator- No additional funding required</li> <li>• Technology equipment, developmental supplies, and intervention materials- No additional funding required</li> </ul> <p>The applicant has not provided any narrative or additional detail to include support from state and local sources. There is no description of how the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments or use this data to inform future investments. There is no estimated budget provided for the three years after the grant term ends. There is no mention on</p>		

how one-time investments such as technology will be maintained. Technology is scheduled for purchase in the first year of the grant. It would be reasonable to think that repair, replacement, and updates would be necessary for sustaining this investment. The district has not provided a proven record of success in securing additional financial resources for key initiatives in the narrative or through letters of support from partnerships or other funding sources. The applicant has not provided a high-quality plan for sustaining its project goals. This section is rated in the low scoring range.

### Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

Competitive Preference Priority.

(1) The Boy's and Girl's Club of Lewis County offers a safe haven for children after school. They provide students with academic tutoring services, social interactive activities, career planning programs and summer camp to interested children at no cost.

The Lewis County Extension provides offers advice and programs to students at the district. These programs include Reality Store (students get the opportunity to work through a household budget), American Private Enterprise System (APES) that gives students a hands-on experience of entrepreneurship, 4-H Programs and Camps, and healthy food workshop presentations.

The Lewis County Public Library offers supplemental educational materials for students to use and take home. The library provides technology opportunities including access to computers, computer software, eReaders.

The Lewis County Head Start Program provides high quality readiness to pre-school age children who qualify based on Federal guidelines.

The Lewis County Health Department provides every school with the district a school nurse to ensure the health and medical well-being of all students.

The local law enforcement office, Lewis County Sheriff's Office, provides security services and drug awareness programs.

The Family Resource Youth Service provides family and student support for students that have physical needs such as school supplies or clothing.

(2) (2) Goals have been set for the percentage of students who perform academically on grade level and the percentage of students who demonstrate an increase in school attendance

(3) (a) There is no description of how the applicant will track the selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all children within the district and at the student level for the participating students.

(b) There is no narrative on how the applicant will use the data to target its resources in order to improve results for participating students. There is no description of any special emphasis on students facing significant challenges, such as students with disabilities, English learners, and students affected by poverty, family instability, or other child welfare issues.

(c) There is no narrative on how the applicant will develop a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students to at least other high-need students and communities. In section A the district stated that its RttT-D grant proposes to serve all schools and they all have significant levels of poverty.

(d) There is no description of how partnerships will improve over time. The applicant has only provided the names of the partnerships and the services they offer.

(4) The Lewis County Health Department accepts referrals for students with social-emotional and behavioral needs. They do not specifically address needs such as acculturation for immigrants

(5) There is no description of how the partnerships would build the capacity of staff in participating schools by:

- providing them with tools and supports to assess the needs and assets of participating students;
- identifying and inventorying the needs and assets of the school and community; to create a decision-making process and infrastructure to select, implement, and evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating students

- engaging 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; and
- assessing routinely the applicant's progress in implementing its plan to maximize impact and resolve challenges and problems.

(6) The proposed results are measured on grade level attainment and school attendance. The academic goals do not appear to be the ones included in section E3. The assessment that will be used to measure these goals is not named. There is no narrative to clarify what improved attendance means.

The applicant has provided partnerships designed to augment the district's resources by providing additional student and family supports. The services provided are offered at little or no cost and address social, emotional, or behavioral needs. There is no discussion of how priority will be given to high-need students

The applicant referenced the Boys' and Girls' Club throughout the application and this this appears to be an important partnership to assist students in academic and other success. There was, however, no evidence of any of the partnerships would build the capacity of staff. The goals for reaching ambitious yet achievable performance measures were not clearly stated.

This section is rated in the low scoring range.

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Not Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant's plan supports comprehensive educational education reform based on the Kentucky Core Content Standards and assessments. There are opportunities for students to determine what they need to graduate college or career ready and mechanisms available to track their progress for being on track their chosen fields of interest. There is a system that collects and organizes data in a way that is available to all educators, students, and families. Recruiting, developing rewarding effective teachers and principals will not be addressed until the Kentucky Effective Teacher and Principal Evaluation is available in 2013-14. There is no description of how schools will be "turned around," There is evidence of success in increasing student achievement at some schools; however, there data provided is not sufficient to show success over four years. Data provided is not organized in a thoughtful and clear manner. Important data elements are missing. This includes data by disaggregated subgroups. No school is considered to be high achieving. There is no data provided to document what the achievement gaps are or measures provided to demonstrate how achievement gaps will be lessened.

There are areas of need indicated and strategies included to meet these needs. These are provided in general terms with no specific goals with the required activities, deliverables, rationales, timelines specified for meeting these goals. Staff development is not specifically described. The applicant has not articulated a comprehensive and thoughtful approach to creating personalized learning environments.

he applicant has not sufficiently addressed the requirements included in Absolute Priority 1.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>72</b>
--------------	------------	-----------



## Race to the Top - District Technical Review Form

Application #0233KY-3 for Lewis County Board of Education

## A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>From reviewing the application, it does not appear that the district has a comprehensive and coherent reform.</p> <p>Granted, it does build on four core educational assurances but the goals outlined in the proposal appear to be too simple such as "be on the grade level throughout the academic career." The problem with the goal is that it is too simple and does not address those children who might below their grade levels. It is risky to make this one of your central goals and it creates an illusion that all children are at even start when entering schools. Realistically, there are many children who reach school a year or two behind their peers for a variety of reasons and they would be precluded should the applicant decide to adopt this as one of the district goals.</p> <p>The applicant explains that it has adopted standards and assessments that will prepare the students for college and career and the standards include both academic and psychosocial physical wellness goals. The applicant explains that it will utilize multiple assessments such as Measure of Academic Progress and Kentucky Performance Rating for Educational Progress and they will provide the applicant with instant results to guide their instructional planning.</p> <p>The proposal includes some discussion on how the applicant will build district-wide data system to measure student growth, inform teachers and principals of progress and information to improve instruction.</p> <p>The applicant identifies the Instructional Teacher Coach as the person, who will train and support teachers and help them improve classroom practices. The coaches will help teachers raise the quality of instruction in classroom including assisting them with coordination of lesson plans, multi-faceted instructional and assessment planning. Also, teachers are expected to become involved with career development activities through Kentucky Internship program (KTIP) and the program will assist with incorporation of Learning Standards/Teacher Standards as well.</p> <p>Conclusively, the proposal doesn't appear to have much substance. Using only two types of assessment, relying on the Instructional Teacher Coach to work with teachers without any plan for administrators, and shared dedication are not enough and do not make for a high quality plan.</p> <p>Simply put, the reform vision does not appear high quality and for that reason, the applicant receives 4 out of 10 points.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant explains that their approach to implementation is defined by: If the applicant improves quality of teaching and learning, heighten expectations, and increase the levels of family and community engagement, then classroom experiences will become more rigorous and relevant and every student will graduate from high school on a path to college and career success.</p> <p>Behind this approach is a focus on creating a culture of urgency with teaching and learning, creating and supporting leadership for instructional improvement, establishing clear metrics and expectations &amp; transparent accountability, and revising how resources are allocated and structured in support of the new vision.</p> <p>This approach will drive the applicant's implementation.</p> <p>In identifying the participating schools, the applicant used its Achievement Zone approach, meaning the schools were identified based on schools' "context and relative achievement." Basically, the lowest performing schools were identified and invited to participate in the project. There are 7 schools that were identified as lowest-performing schools and they total around 4 thousand students ranging from K to 12th grade. About 84% of the children in the schools qualify for free and reduced lunches and a large number of these students speak languages other than English (about 1/3 of the students at the participating schools).</p> <p>However, the applicant did not describe in details how it will create a culture of urgency, establish metrics and clear expectations, and revise resource allocation, structures, and cost savings in support of the new vision. They were a part of recommendations made from a report developed by a third party evaluator. The applicant does not provide many details about the third party evaluator and any description of their process. For the applicant to put the entire approach to implementation, it is critical that the applicant explain in details how the evaluator came about this conclusion and how they came up with the recommendations, in which, the applicant didn't.</p>		

In addition, the applicant does not provide any details on how they developed their principles: "improve the quality of teaching and learning, heighten expectations, and increase the levels of family and community engagement then more rigorous and relevant classroom experiences and every student graduating from high schools." Again, for the applicant to stake their proposal on something like this, the applicant provide a rationale for this principle and how it is tied to selecting the whole school district to participate in this proposal.

Due to some missing information, the applicant receives 7 out of 10 points.

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant explains that it will utilize multiple approaches in the implementation of the CHEER Program.

The framework behind the applicant's proposal for translating into meaningful reform to support district-wide changes is unclear and is not coherent. First of all, the framework needs to be consistent across the board and the framework need to be logical so that the readers will understand what it is trying to accomplish, which is not the case here in the proposal.

It is evident from the early parts that the applicant hopes that the children will be assessed more closely and monitored more effectively to ensure that no child falls through the crack. For instance, Head Start and Early Start will provide each child with the necessary tools to start learning at early age. From there, the children will be assessed periodically with MAP and Brigance to ensure that they are progressing through the early grades and reduce the possibility of falling behind during the early years.

Yet, the applicant talks about new textbooks and technology to support middle school and high school students without any discussion on how the applicant will assess their progress throughout the later grades. This is an example of disjuncture between focusing on assessing and monitoring progress versus ensuring that they are taught with better textbooks and iPads.

The applicant also discusses how it will offer college-level dual credits in English and Math that are transferable to universities and courses that offer certifications in Welding, Certified Nurse Assistant and Model Office but it is not clear how this is tied to the reform model that the applicant is implementing as a part of LEA-wide reform and change.

Conclusively, the selection criteria asks for a high quality plan in which the applicant describes how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform and the applicant does not respond to the selection criteria.

Instead, the applicant talks about what it will do as a part of the reform. In essence, this section asks the applicant to provide some theoretical framework that it will utilize as it implements personalized learning environment and the applicant fails to provide any kind of framework.

In absence of theoretical framework, the applicant does not provide a high quality plan that has a clear framework to support the reform. For that, the applicant receives 2 out of 10 points.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has provided a set of tables indicating baselines and target goals for student achievement. The applicant identified MAP scoring, national norm-referenced assessments (mandated by the nation and the state), and ACT in the narrative. However, the tables show K-PREP, combined reading and math scores, graduation rates, college enrollment rates, and post-secondary degree attainment. It is not clear which performance measures in the narrative correspond with the performance measures in the tables.

The performance measures are mostly ambitious but there are a couple of target goals that may be unachievable such as: increasing number of students testing at grade level from 52% to 90% within four years & improving K-Prep percentile score for Lewis County Central Elementary from a percentile score of 1 to a percentile score of 63 by the end of the grant cycle. The district is not likely to achieve these kinds of improvements within the timeframe.

Another area of concern with the tables is that the tables are so disjointed that it is hard to follow the tables. For instance, the first table indicates ACT scores for Junior students then proceed to present data on one of state assessments, K-PREP, which covers the entire K-12 grade bands. The flow from ACT scores to K-PREP is illogical and difficult to comprehend.

The applicant also did not include much on College enrollment rate. The only data included in the table is baseline and annual target goals for a single subgroup and the applicant does not label which subgroup nor did it provide any description so it is hard to understand that particular performance measure table.

The applicant receives 3 out of 10 points.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant has demonstrated a limited evidence of track record of success. The only clear record of success may be that the district has been able to achieve 96.7% graduation rate for the school year of 2013 but they didn't provide any additional data on graduation rate for the past four years.</p> <p>Another demonstrated evidence of clear record of success appears to be school ranking percentile-wise. The narrative shows that the schools improved on an average of 25.5 percentile points for 6 schools. This reveals that the district has been able to improve the schools but it is not clear what the district did to result in this improvement. However, that's the only indication of achieving ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools or in its low-performing schools.</p> <p>Other than that, there isn't any evidence of clear record of success in the areas of improving student learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps. In addition, there's no charts, graphs, tables or raw data showing any type of improvements. Without any data on student performance, it is hard to determine if the district has any evidence of clear record of success.</p> <p>In addition, the applicant did not respond to Selection Criteria (B)(1)(c): Making student performance data available to students, educators and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services.</p> <p>The applicant receives 3 out of 15 points.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>In regard to increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments, the applicant explains that it posts financial information on the web site as well as published in the local newspaper. Additionally, the applicant provides "completed budget summary" through online and in the newspaper.</p> <p>The applicant adds that it gives lists of individual employees and salaries to the newspapers annually and that all financial information concerning annual financial reports, working budget reports and excel spreadsheet containing every salary scheduled can be found at the LEA website.</p> <p>The applicant does not outline specifically whether it does make actual personnel salaries all instructional and support staff and actual non-personnel expenditures but one can infer that the applicant does provide the information through budget summary, financial reports, budget reports, and spreadsheets. Due to ambiguity and failing to provide specifics, the applicant receives 4 out of 5 points.</p>		
<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The proposal does not provide evidence to support that the applicant has successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the application.</p> <p>The applicant explains that it provides multiple assessments and that the students are assessed several times throughout the year. However, this has nothing to do with the selection criteria for this section.</p> <p>The applicant will receive 0 out of 10 points.</p>		
<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant explains that "Stakeholder feedback was critical throughout the entire development process of the CHEER project." The applicant goes on to explain that the concept for the project arose from review of the data from the student and family surveys. The applicant writes, "Then, throughout the process, various stakeholders were engaged to provide specific feedback and insight." The applicant fails to provide additional details on how feedback and insight were collected.

However, the applicant does not offer any details on how the input were gathered nor were there any details on roles the stakeholders had in developing the proposal. The only evidence of engagement comes from a statement expressing that the stakeholders were critical throughout the entire development process.

Without any clear description of who were involved in the developing the proposal and without any clear description of how the input were gathered, the applicant shall receive 2 out of 15 points.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12</b>

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

In regard to Preparing Students for College and Careers, the applicant has proposed a series of changes that they will undertake to improve "learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment," (Selection Criteria (C)(1)).

First, the applicant must present a high quality plan to ensure that with the support of parents and educators, all students understand that what they are learning is key, identify and pursue learning and development goals, become involved in deep learning experiences, have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives, and finally, master academic content and develop skills and traits. The applicant has explained that the district staff and counselors work closely with the students in helping them understand their academic skills and help them develop individual goals.

Additionally, if the students continue to struggle academically, the counselors will work with them and provide them additional instructional time to ensure that they develop college-readiness and career-readiness skills. The applicant explains that all students will be exposed to diverse cultures and perspectives through the classroom experiences and that all of the students are required to have one credit of Fine Arts before graduation. Finally, the applicant explains that all students will be involved with activities that will result in increase in critical thinking, communication skills, creativity, problem-solving, perseverance, and teamwork.

Second, the applicant is asked if the students have access to personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development, a variety of high-quality instructional approaches, and high-quality content, including digital learning content as aligned with college- and career-ready standards, and ongoing and regular feedback. In regard to this area, the applicant explains that they have adopted several digital-based tools such as Compass Learning, CCR, and others that will enable them to benefit from personalized learning. The applicant has repeatedly stated that they will work with the students to develop personalized learning but the applicant does not offer details on how the applicant will ensure that the students have access to personalized sequence of instructional content except to say that they will have access to digital content but that's not the same thing as personalized sequence of instructional content. The applicant adds that middle school aged students will be able to utilize Individual Learning Plan (ILP) to help them identify career clusters and customize their coursework based on this. However, this is nothing on how the applicant will provide college-track students personalized instructional content. Finally, the applicant explains that it will use Infinite Campus to help both the students and the parents track students' academic progress more effectively.

In regard to ensuring that mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students to ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them, the applicant has stated that they will utilize variety of assessment tools to help students develop personal goals. Additionally, the applicant has stated that it will retain a consultant to help students learn more about using technology such as iPads and other technology devices.

There are some areas that were not addressed in the proposal such as how the applicant will help deepen learning experiences for the students. Additionally, the applicant does not really elaborate on how it will provide personalized sequence of instructional content for the students. Also, the proposal does not go into details on high-quality instructional approaches and environments. The applicant discusses briefly how it will help provide ongoing and regular feedback but the applicant does not go into details how it will help students utilize ongoing and regular feedback to guide their personalized learning experience.

The proposal is, in essence, a plan for implementing personalized learning environment but it isn't completely a high quality

plan based on the fact that the applicant relies more on shift in thinking and how business is done as opposed to providing real tools that the teachers can utilize as they implement the personalized learning model.

The applicant receives 12 out of 20 points.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

In regard to Teaching and Leading, the applicant needs to submit a high quality plan which provides details on how it will train and equip teachers to implement personalized learning environment for the students. Also, the applicant needs to present how it will help teachers receive training, policies, tools, data, and resources to enable them to structure effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs. Finally, the applicant needs to present a plan on how it will staff those hard-to-staff positions.

The applicant explains that all teachers will receive training on implement Kentucky Core Academic Standards and additional training to meet the academic needs of every student. Professional learning communities are established and held weekly to provide teachers with support and continuity. Also, the applicant explains that the teachers will receive training on use of educational technology such as white board, videos, computer labs and iPads.

The applicant explained that the teachers will use a variety of assessment tools such as ACT, Explore, End of Course assessments, MAP, and others to track student progress and utilize data to develop intervention plans. The applicant adds that, "the future plan for these data tracking processes is to continue the programs that are already implemented and to increase the data driven instructional practices for the continued growth of the student within the Lewis County School System." However, the applicant does not provide many details about how it will train teachers to use the assessment tools and more specifically, the applicant does not offer any details on what programs will be continued and what it means "to increase data driven instructional practices."

The applicant follows up with discusson on how teachers and principals will be evaluated using formal observations and feedback. Additionally, the State is upgrading the requirements for teacher effectiveness and that the district will implement a new pilot evaluation process at the start of 2013-14 academic school year but the applicant fails to provide specifics on how the new teacher effectiveness requirements will be upgraded and what new pilot teacher evaluation process looks like.

The applicant adds that all participating teachers will have access to, and know how to use tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress through professional development updates on data analysis of standardized tests and assessments. The teachers are expected to use formative and summative assessments, MAP data, and direct instruction interaction as one of the ways to evaluate student progress.

Conclusively, there's no discussion on how the teachers and principals will be evaluated. Also, there's no discussion on how the district will increase the number of students receiving instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals including how the applicant will staff those hard-to-staff positions.

The applicant has not addressed the full selection criteria and for that reason, the applicant will receive 7 out of 20 points.

**D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant lists the current positions that are employed with the school district and their essential duties, which include a wide spectrum of responsibilities and roles within the district. It is not clear if the applicant is redefining the positions to provide support to the project mission. Also, the applicant did not include any discussion on how it will restructure the office to support the project or provide visual evidence such as organizational chart to aid the readers in understanding how each position relates to each other as far as responsibilities and roles are concerned.

The applicant provides some details on how it will support students earning credits through demonstrated mastery rather than time spent in classrooms and the applicant mentions that it will support credit recovery through alternative means (COMPASS) and lists how the students can recover credits through remote learning, extended school services, and collaboration with local organizations (Boys' Club and Girls' Club have a program called KIDS College that supports this effort).

Overall, there isn't a high quality plan as the applicant provides some general details what positions will be involved in implementing this project and how the students may earn credits through alternative means (credit recovery) and how the students may demonstrate mastery as opposed to seat time. But the recommendations made in the section are more facelift than actual program changes such as complete reorganization to better support the project mission and rewriting the local regulations to better support credit recovery and demonstrated mastery.

However, the applicant will receive 10 out of 15 points mainly due to the fact that it provides great amount of details on how it intends to support demonstrated mastery, credit recovery & alternative learning pathways.

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

**10**

**4**

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides some discussion on how it will support personalized learning by setting up online-based learning portals for the children in the district (COMPASS). It also discusses how it will help parents become involved with their children's progress through Infinite Campus, which will allow parents to access grades, attendance and student credit progress. The applicant explains that it will provide "appropriate levels of technical support" such as helping parents set up accounts and passwords to access the Infinite Campus.

However, the applicant does not provide any response to open data format in the proposal

The applicant also explains that it will make district-related information such as educational improvement plans, assessment data, school report cards and other data such as attendance and academic progress available to the public through interoperable data systems (Infinite Campus).

The applicant has not submitted a high quality plan and fails to provide any response to specific selection criteria such as ensuring that the parents and other stakeholders have access to necessary content and learning resources. The applicant explains that it will provide technical support to the parents through setting up accounts and passwords but does not discuss whether the applicant will provide training on how to access learning portals. Additionally, the proposal doesn't include any details whether the applicant will use open data format to support data sharing. For that reason, the applicant receives 4 out of 10 points.

**E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>

**(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant writes, "The strategy for implementing continuous improvement plan with the CHEER plan will actively involve all stakeholders." Then the applicant fails to provide much substance to this statement. The applicant does offer some explanations on how it will monitor progress toward project goals through data collections of MAP assessments and state testing and monitoring whether student are demonstrating academic growth and achievement gaps are closing.

The rest of the section focuses on how common core standards will be implemented and reviewed, how the applicant will build corpus (textbooks, materials, et al), and what services will be expanded to better serve students.

The selection criteria asks that the applicant provide explanations on how the applicant will be able to monitor and evaluate the process in a timely manner and receive regular feedback. The criteria asks that the applicant provide some discussion on how it will correct and improve the process during and after the term of the grant as well. The applicant is expected to discuss how it will monitor, measure and share information on the quality of its investments. In which, the applicant does not suitably provide any response.

In short, the applicant is performing a low-level evaluation of the progress and focuses primarily on whether the students are improving academically as the main indicator of progress and improvement. However, projects of this kind involve many moving parts and it is critical that every moving part is evaluated such as whether the parents are satisfied with the progress. Whether the professional developments are working or not. Whether the students are emotionally supported in

undertaking this kind of challenge. Simply put, there are much more to be evaluated other than student performance. For that reason, the applicant receives 3 out of 15 points.

<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
---	----------	----------

**(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant listed how it will provide communications internally and externally including posting information on its website and giving announcements to local radio stations and local newspapers. Emails and telephone communications will be utilized for internal communications.

The applicant does not describe in details what kind of information will be used for radio announcements and what kind of information will be used for newspaper announcements. The applicant does not provide details on how they will communicate via emails (through blast emails, district-wide, school-wide, list-servs, or other forms). Additionally, it is not clear if making project director available daily will result in more participation from other stakeholders such as parents or community members. It is critical that the project director put in more meaningful dialogue with the external stakeholders other than make her/himself available for any conferences.

Conclusively, it is implausible to expect high level of parental and stakeholder engagement based on communication plan that the applicant has proposed.

In absence of details and lack of high quality plan, the applicant will receive 3 out of 5 points.

<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
---	----------	----------

**(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

In regard to Performance Measures, the applicant has identified Core Content assessments, MAP, Brigance Readiness, Mathematics portion of ACT, Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB), FAFSA and college enrollment applications. However, the applicant does not provide rationale for selecting the performance measures other than indicate that the assessments are performed multiple times throughout the year to better address developmental delays.

However, there is no baseline or target annual goals for Highly Effective Teacher or Principal and Effective Teachers and Principals, which means it is not possible to gauge whether the goals are ambitious yet achievable in that particular area.

For the remaining performance measures, the goals are ambitious but achievable. However, the biggest concern with the performance measures is that most of the measures that were identified are not solid. For instance, "All students will participate in "Explore" interest inventory," and "Students will participate in ASVAB." Both are examples of performance measures that "measure" participation, not achievement, which makes it somewhat impossible to determine if the annual goals are ambitious yet achievable especially when they measures participation, not achievement.

The applicant does not include any specifics on how it will provide rigorous, timely, and formative assessment/analysis.

The applicant has listed several performance measures with ambitious yet achievable annual goals but some of the selected performance measures are not solid. For that reason, the applicant receives 3 out of 5 points.

<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>
--	----------	----------

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The only discussion in the section on how the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of the RTT-D funded activities is "The Professional Development success will be successful with the implementation of instructional, age-appropriate use of digital equipment. Observations in the classroom setting will indicate the teacher and student use of embedded technology during instruction." That's the only evidence that the applicant will review in evaluation of the effectiveness of the investment. The applicant will review if the implementation yields academic success and whether the teachers use technology during instruction.

The applicant does not provide a high quality plan on how it will evaluate the effectiveness of RTT-D investments. For that, the applicant will receive 0 out of 5 points.

**F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)**

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Score</b>
--	------------------	--------------

<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant has submitted a budget proposal as a part of the application. The requirements for a clear budget request includes identifying all funds that will support the project, reasonable and sufficient to support the project from development to implementation, and provides rationale for investments and priorities.</p> <p>The applicant has requested for \$6.021 million dollar to be disbursed over four year period for the project. Within the request, the applicant has listed line items of how the budget will be spent and what will be allocated to fund specific activities. The applicant, also, provided a narrative for the budget request including providing rationale for each budget line item.</p> <p>The applicant explains that RTT-D along with LEA, State, and Federal monies will be used to support this project but the applicant does not provide any specifics such as amount, whether the support will cover entire four year project, or whether the applicant will pursue other funding streams such as private, corporate, or foundation.</p> <p>Additionally, the applicant identifies in the request what will be one-time investment as opposed to what other investments will be made on an on-going basis. Equipment, computers, iPads, and other technology-based equipment will be one-time investment.</p> <p>Finally, the applicant does provide expenditure-level details such as how much they will be spending on laptops, iPads, textbooks, contracts, and others. Additionally, the applicant's request of 6.02 million dollars appear to be reasonable and sufficient to support the project considering that this is a small district serving close to 2,500 students. Furthermore, the scale of the project is not so huge that it would require more money.</p> <p>The applicant does provide many details on how it will utilize the budget and what it will spend on with few exceptions such as lack of details on external funding sources, which is critical to ensuring that this project can continue beyond the life of the grant. For that reason, the applicant receives 7 out of 10 points.</p>		

<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant gives details on what will be sustained within the project after the grant monies run out. The applicant lists what will not be continued or funded beyond the life of the grant cycle but the applicant does not discuss anything about how it will evaluate the effectiveness of the RTT-D funding to inform how it will fund the project beyond the life of the grant. The applicant does not provide any details on how it will evaluate improvements, productivity, and outcomes to support post-grant budget and efforts.</p> <p>The applicant has divided the entire proposal into 10 projects and has identified how each project will be sustained beyond the life of the grant. For some of the projects, they will be sustained with funding from Perkins' grant and General Funds. However, Projects #3 (Core Content materials), #6, and #9 will not be sustained. Other investments such as Project #5 (individual student technology), #7 and #10 were made possible through one-time investment so it will not require additional funding.</p> <p>However, the applicant does not provide any high quality plan such as evaluating effectiveness of the investments or how the applicant will use data to inform future decisions, and the applicant doesn't include a three-year budget for post-grant activities including budget assumptions, potential sources, and use of funds.</p> <p>Due to low quality plan, the applicant receives 2 out of 10 points.</p>		

**Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)**

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The criteria ask the applicant to list different partnerships that support the project outside the academic scope such as providing health care, education, counseling and others. The applicant lists Boys' Club, Girls' Club, American Private Enterprise System, and 4-H Programs and Camps as the organizations that will work with the district. The district also lists county offices such as County Public Library, Head Start Office, Health Department, and Sheriff's Office as local</p>		

offices that support this project. There's no list of business, local universities, or other programs that will support this project, which is a concern.

Additionally, the applicant does not provide any details on how it will *integrate* education and services nor does it provide any details on how it will build capacity to support the integration.

The applicant lists 10 population-level desired results and categorizes them under Educational, Social, Community, and Health. But the applicant does not provide baselines and target scores for each result. Also, the applicant does not list any data or target scores for students with disabilities, English learners or low-poverty students.

The applicant does not discuss how it will develop strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students nor does it provide any details on how it hopes to improve the results over time.

The applicant receives 3 out of 10 points.

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Not Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not meet the Absolute Priority mainly because it does not have a high quality plan.

First of all, the applicant hasn't adopted standards and assessments yet and has indicated in the proposal it hopes to receive the RTT-D to support the implementation. It is not clear if the applicant intends to adopt the standards should it not receive the RTT-D funding, which is an indication of the district's level of commitment to the standards. Second, the applicant has not provided much details on how it will build data systems and how the applicant will make it interoperable for others to use. Third, the proposal doesn't discuss much about how it will recruit or build teacher and school leader capacities. Finally, it does not discuss how it intends to turn around failing schools nor does it provide any details on how it will improve the results if the implementation turns out to yield unexpectedly low results.

Basically, the plan that the applicant has submitted isn't likely to deepen students' learning and create a personalized learning environment. The main reason for this is the simplicity in the proposal and the applicant hasn't invested much in fleshing out the proposal. For instance, there's no any evaluation process for any of the professional development therefore it is not possible for the applicant to determine what's working and what's not working. Nor can the applicant use this to inform post-grant activities, which is one of the requirements. Another example where the applicant falls short in meeting the absolute priority is the credibility of hiring two consultants: Dr. Sheffield and Ms. Lavoie to support the entire district. For a project of this scale, it would require more than two consultants to make this happen.

Conclusively, the applicant hasn't submitted a high quality plan and for that reason, it has not met the absolute priority.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>78</b>
--------------	------------	-----------