



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0089ME-1 for Maine School Administrative District #60

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 4 |
| <p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section begins with a few student stories which illustrate past success and current efforts related to personalized learning. The narrative continues to reference a goal of 21st century schools with learning to take place beyond the school walls. The content includes references to students being able to build their own pathways toward graduation and post-secondary education. However, no reference is made to the key assurance areas. No reference is made to standards (college / career-ready) in this section although later sections make it clear that the state and district have adopted Common Core State Standards. No reference is made to the assessment of those standards, nor to datasets, effective teachers, etc. Some of this is implied in the student stories, but it is not explicit.</p> <p>The student experiences give some indication of what classroom experiences would be like under this reform vision.</p> | | |
| (A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points) | 10 | 9 |
| <p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district plans to implement its project district wide. A list of participating schools is included and the numbers fo low-income students meet minimum requirements. Numbers are also provided for high-need students.</p> <p>Reference is also made to past flexibility of the staff and willingness to implement reforms.</p> | | |
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 5 |
| <p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Goals are listed followed by extensive narrative. This narrative includes reverences to authentic learning, flexibility of curriculum, multiple accurate measures of mastery, etc. However, these components do not represent the activities and rationale required for a high-quality plan. Scheduling and graduation requirements will be changed but it's not clear how this will result in the goal of competency-based learning for all. Deliverables and a timeline are needed.</p> <p>Overall it is not clear how the proposal will be translated into increased student learning. The goals are clear and seem to connect well with the core assurance areas. However, the other components of a high-quality plan - necessary to demonstrate how the district's vision will translate to greater student learning - are not included. It's clear the district has many ideas related to past work and success, but as presented these ideas do not represent a high-quality plan.</p> | | |
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
| <p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Tables are included which show the assessments to be used to determine growth and are disaggregate by subgroup. In some cases the growth targets are not ambitious (e.g., 10% to 11% proficiency for math special ed students). This level of growth / increased performance is not especially ambitious as it should not be hard to achieve 11% proficiency from 10% proficiency. This is true for the general population in some areas as well (e.g., 71% - 73% - 75% - 80% in 7th grade math). These are likely achievable but are not ambitious.</p> <p>Based on the numbers provided most achievement gaps will close or be narrowed.</p> <p>Graduation rates and college attendance rates are ambitious and achievable. They will require increased performance and effort but appear to be achievable given the district's vision.</p> | | |

Postsecondary degree attainment is not addressed.

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

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 6 |
| <p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>a. The narrative includes reference to several past reform efforts such as "de-tracking," "embracing heterogeneous grouping," and a range of collaboration efforts with teachers and families. However, no reference is made to how these efforts closed achievement gaps, increased graduation rates, or increased college enrollment rates. The information provided does not represent a history of success in the areas referenced.</p> <p>b. No reference is made to reforming persistently low-performing schools.</p> <p>c. Reference is made in Section B2 to open school board meetings and a district website. However, no specific reference is made to the availability of student performance data.</p> | | |
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 3 |
| <p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Total salaries are referenced as being available in the district's budget. However, this aggregate reporting does not represent individual-level salaries.</p> <p>The district budget is mailed to every home in the district as well as is posted on the district website. However, no reference is made to individual teaching or non-teaching staff salaries beyond an aggregate category in a district budget. No evidence is provided to indicate a high level of transparency.</p> | | |
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points) | 10 | 5 |
| <p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal notes that the state emphasizes local control of schools. The proposal also references state policy to focus on building from "the learner out" suggesting tacit approval for personalized learning. The proposal states that nothing in state statute would prohibit activities included in the proposal. Little evidence is included to show this is the case beyond a statement to this effect in the proposal. No letters of support from state or local legislators or education department officials are included.</p> | | |
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points) | 15 | 3 |
| <p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The content in this section focuses on ongoing engagement between the community and the district. It's not clear how this relates to the crafting of this proposal. It's not clear what work these collaboration efforts included on the proposal.</p> <p>The proposal goes on to argue that the district will build public support for the project and for students through a process informed by Students First and the United Way Believe Committee. However, none of this relates to how stakeholders were consulted or directly involved in the content or actual drafting of the proposal.</p> <p>Although the district is represented by a teachers' union, no letters of support are included to show teacher or staff buy-in to the project (note that the president of the union did sign the application).</p> <p>No letters of support from community groups were included in the proposal.</p> | | |

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

| | Available | Score |
|------------------------------------|-----------|----------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 7 |

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a. The proposal references that the foundation of its plan will be competency-based teaching and learning in line with the Common Core State Standards as well as extended learning opportunities allowing students multiple opportunities to learn content and demonstrate mastery. This is in line with part of the core assurance areas and the absolute priority.

This section (C1) is broken down by goals followed by key objectives and desired outcomes. This information does not cover all areas required for a high quality plan. Missing is information related to the responsible parties. Information regarding activities is also not provided in detail. Instead, "objectives" such as "create curriculum teams" and design and implement virtual courses" are included. These lack sufficient detail to be a high quality plan.

The goal of extended learning opportunities will help in the pursuit of greater student depth of mastery, students being able to pursue content of interest, and the mastering of critical content. What is provided for how this will happen (activities and responsible parties) is weak. What is provided is an outline which does not represent a high quality plan.

Desired outcomes (deliverables) are provided for each goal. Most are in line with the areas of student learning and individualized programs, but it is not clear from the content provided how the district will arrive at these outcomes. Activities and their rationale are not presented in sufficient detail. This further means that the roles of parents and educators are not specified.

b. Several of the goals referenced do relate to students having individualized learning opportunities as well as a variety of approaches or opportunities to learn both content of interest and college / career content (i and ii).

Reference is made to a goal of teacher data-driven instruction (#7) whereby teachers will be trained in using a variety of data. However, there is no detail provided for how this will happen or for how this information will be used to communicate progress to students. No information is included for how these data will lead to personalized learning plans. No reference is made to high-need students.

c. Many of the goals and action steps relate to programs or policies (#8 teacher evaluation, #4 shared decision making, etc) and do not relate back to student learning. Those that do focus on students (e.g., #6 Pre-K program development) do not provide concrete, measurable outcomes. There is also no reference made to assuring student involvement in their personalized learning.

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points) | 20 | 5 |
|--|-----------|----------|

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A section is included on "Implementation" that provides a broad overview of the district's plan. This section is very general. Ideas such as "create a coordinator of extended learning" are provided, but this is an action step that needs to also be linked to a timeline, deliverables, and responsible parties to equal a high quality plan. What is provided in this section is an overview of ideas that does not represent a high quality plan.

a. The only reference to data or teacher training comes in Goal #7 (Teacher Data-Driven Instruction). Nowhere is a plan provided for how educators will be developed to deliver personalized learning or how staff will leveraged to accomplish any of the stated goals. There are passing references to teams and groups of educators, but there is no plan for how or where teachers will receive training necessary to facilitate the achievement of the stated goals.

b. No reference is made to teacher / staff access to data. It's not clear that teachers will have the training or technology to access and use student data to inform their instruction. It's not clear what data will be available on students or what these data could tell about students if made available. Passing reference was made to learning style inventories that could be used to inform optimal learning environments, but no detail is provided.

c. The district's teacher and principal evaluation system is described in Goal 8 and in the Implementation section. However, in neither case is reference made to how this information will be used to better student learning. No reference is made to how evaluation data will be used to create better learning environments or accelerate student learning.

d. No reference is made to how the district's plan will result in more students being taught by effective or highly-effective teachers.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Section D provides a broad overview of the district decision-making structure. Included are examples for seeking input from students and community members as well as a general process for crafting policy with regard to collective bargaining. However, very little of this content relates to the review criteria stated in D1.

- a. No reference is made to how the central office is or will be structured in such a way as to facilitate the plan. Some reference is made to the familiarity of district administrators as well as literal school structure, but this does not address how the central office staff will help facilitate the plan.
- b. No reference is made to the flexibility or control of building leaders. Statements are included that "more policies will need to change" such as those regarding the granting of elective credit, but this is not discussed in detail and does not represent a high quality plan.
- c. Earlier reference (Section C) was made to competency-based learning where students advance based on master and not based on amount of time spent in class. However, a plan for how this will be implemented is not included.
- d. Multiple references were made in previous sections (B and C) regarding Extended Learning Opportunities where students have many varied chances to learn and demonstrate mastery. However, a high quality plan for how this will happen is not included.
- e. Reference is made to the district having a high quality special education program, but no reference is made to a plan for how practices and programs will be made available to ELLs and students with disabilities.

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

10

4

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- a. Mentioned in earlier sections was that all students have netbooks that they are able to take home. High school building structure is also presented (pods for a small-group learning environment including dedicated special education teachers) to demonstrate accessibility to personalized learning. Although relevant, this information does not represent a high quality plan. No reference is made to assuring access outside of school.
- b. No reference is made to technical support for students, teachers, or families (in or out of school).
- c. No reference is made to data access for students, parents, or staff.
- d. No reference is made to a school data system or training in how to use or access it.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 5 |

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal makes reference to a District Community Council that will be charged with oversight and progress monitoring of the project. This council will use varied information (achievement data, feedback, artifacts) to make decisions. However, no process or high quality plan is included for how this will happen (activities and rationale) or what will happen if progress is not being made.

Reference is made to investing in a data system to help facilitate analysis and progress monitoring. It's not clear when or if this will happen or what or how data will be used to track progress and make changes - a plan is not provided.

As it stands, a general decision-making group is described, but there is no plan for how this group will work to make ongoing revisions.

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

5

3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The District Community Council will make reports and presentations to the school board and will post information to the district's website. However, no process or plan for this is included. No reference is made to what will be posted or how the district will stay involved with the community in an ongoing fashion beyond those individuals on the Council.

| | | |
|---|----------|----------|
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points) | 5 | 2 |
| <p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Several of the tables were illegible due to formatting.</p> <p>No rationale is included for the proposed measures nor was any discussion included for how these measures will provide timely information that will help facilitate personalized learning. No reference was made to how the district will revise or change measures over time. Overall, no narrative was included in this section.</p> <p>In general, the information provided was not in line with the requirements provided in section E3. Many pieces are missing including the following:</p> <p>Tables were not disaggregated by subgroup. For example, the table showing percentage of students being taught by effective educators only showed data for all students. Data were not disaggregated.</p> <p>No pre-K measures of growth (academic or cognitive) were included. No measures included students below grade three except RtI referrals for social-emotional concerns.</p> <p>Math and reading goals are disaggregated by income group and special ed status only. No reference is made to other subgroups.</p> <p>No assessment is referenced as a measure of college-career readiness.</p> | | |
| (E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points) | 5 | 1 |
| <p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>No reference is made to a high-quality plan for evaluating project effectiveness. The only reference to ongoing review and revision is a paragraph describing a District Community Council that will be charged with these duties. However, no plan is included.</p> | | |

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
| <p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A budget is provided that includes each component and its total cost. No reference is made to any source of funds. It is assumed that all funding will come from Race to the Top with no other support. Further tables are provided which disaggregate the budget by goal area (provided in section C).</p> <p>The budget rationale and item-level descriptions in the budget itself rely heavily on to-be-determined specifics. For example, many speakers or professional development facilitators will be hired but these are yet to be determined. Further, staff will be hired to undertake activities (such as curricular creation or alignment) but these activities were not sufficiently described earlier in the proposal in order to evaluate the reasonableness of the budget item.</p> <p>Some reference is made to one-time vs. ongoing costs (such as ipads as a one-time cost) but most costs are not explicitly labeled as one time or ongoing.</p> <p>One of the budget components involves staffing for teachers to be released for both professional development and for the crafting of curriculum. This will result in individuals at the substitute teacher level acting as full-time educators. This is likely to result in fewer students being taught by effective or highly-effective teachers.</p> | | |
| (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points) | 10 | 2 |
| <p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The section on sustainability references policies, beliefs, and finances as potential barriers. However, none of these are addressed as far as how they will be overcome. In general, vague references are made to collaboration and engagement as vehicles through which the district will sustain the project. This is not a high quality plan and is not likely to result in the project continuing after the grant period.</p> | | |

No budget is included for post-grant periods nor is any discussion of how the district will evaluate improvements.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points) | 10 | 4 |

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The description of the partnership (Ready for Kindergarten) is very general and does not include a plan of what will happen, who will conduct which activities, etc. The goal of the partnership is kindergarten readiness. However, it's not clear how the partnership will result in furthering the overall goal of personalized learning. No information is provided on how this partnership will integrate into the larger district plan or how this partnership will be sustained.

Four outcomes and goals are included that do relate to school readiness as well as parent-family surveys. These include ambitious and achievable goal targets.

Overall, what will "happen" as part of this partnership is not clearly outlined. This section does not highlight what needs assessment will take place, what decision-making process will operate, how parents of students will be engaged or located for the program or how the program will be evaluated.

It's not clear how this partnership integrates with the district's larger goals and plans as described throughout the application.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

| | Available | Score |
|----------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | | Not Met |

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The program did reference college and career-ready standards (Common Core) as being adopted by the state. It also referenced the design of curriculum in alignment with these standards.

There was no reference to how student growth will be tracked using a coherent and easily usable / accessible data system. It was never outlined how teachers will have access to and knowledge of how to use these data to personalize learning.

The proposal never addressed how teacher effectiveness will be evaluated in a way consistent with this request for proposals nor how the district will make sure that more students are taught by effective and highly-effective teachers.

No reference was made to turning around low-performing schools - though extensive reference was made to past reform efforts.

In the end it was not made clear how the district's plan would result in personalized learning. Many strong ideas were suggested (e.g., ELOs, wider and more numerous opportunities to pursue areas of interest, etc) that would yield better learning for students, but these were never brought together in a high quality plan that would likely result in personalized learning based on the core assurance areas. Overall, the plan and content provided were not credible in terms of resulting in personalized learning.

| | | |
|--------------|------------|-----------|
| Total | 210 | 85 |
|--------------|------------|-----------|

Race to the Top - District



Technical Review Form

Application #0089ME-2 for Maine School Administrative District #60

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 7 |

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- a. The applicant provides details on a very good plan to covering all four assurances to build a program that is student-centered and meets the four educational assurances like a teacher evaluation system; A principal evaluation system; A superintendent evaluation system; a robust data system; Students will be able to design pathways towards graduation and post-secondary education that are rigorous, yet tailored to their interests and aspirations. Measuring student progress will be on-going for the duration of the grant and beyond. The core of the program presented by the applicant is to address primarily the traditionally underserved student and at the same time provide components covering the education of all students. In addition, the applicant notes the program will incorporate the latest technology for the classroom and all stakeholders.
- b. The applicant provides a detailed and credible plan centered on a competency-based, student-centered, community-wide endeavor to assist student reach their full educational capacity. The plan includes teacher and administrator enrichment, student-centered to allow freedom of choice and interest career-wise, data collection and analysis to review progress of the program. The applicant’s plan indicates students will be able to design their own goals towards graduation and post-secondary education that are rigorous and tailored to their interests and aspirations. The plan, MSAD 60, is design to serve pre-K through 12-grade. The applicant clearly shows the program structure is collaborative, systemic, and inclusive of all stakeholders. The applicant includes in the documentation a table with the state’s common core standards for reference.
- c. The applicant indicates in the narrative it is within the letter of the grant requirements by providing excellent components in the plan showing the pace of each student’s education will be developmentally appropriate and competencies instead of arbitrary measures. On-going monitoring of student progress and staff competency are at the core of the program. The applicant indicates all students will take on greater autonomy, responsibility, and accountability as they endeavor through their school experience with emphasizes on understanding what they are learning in the classroom and its application to the real world.

WEAKNESS

- a. The applicant does not clearly address how it will handle low effective teachers and what remediation will be taken. It is also unclear what will be done by the program to attend low scoring students. It is not clear what is meant by traditionally underserved students.

| | | |
|---|----|---|
| (A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
|---|----|---|

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- a. The applicant indicates in the past five years they have engaged the community about school reform and the need to move to a proficiency-based system. The applicant indicates over the past two years, teachers, administrators, parents, community members, and many students worked collaboratively to develop the program. In addition, community involvement includes community members will be providing mentoring, coaching, and instruction to students. The applicant shows the community has governance and shared decision-making in the program and strong two-way communication between the schools and the public. In addition, the school system has adopted the state’s common core standards.
- a. **WEAKNESS.** The applicant does not provide details on how it will select schools in the system or what approach it will take. 2 points not awarded.

b. The applicant provides a chart with details on the participating schools of the program.

c. The applicant provides a chart with information on the total number of students participating in the program and identification of higher need students and educators. The chart is very detailed.

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
|--|-----------|----------|

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

A3. The applicant provides a good plan for LEA-wide changes. The plan includes intervention from the cradle to graduation, student-centered basis for approach including staff development; learning is personalized and takes into consideration the strengths and challenges, as well as the needs and interests of the students. Learning is personalized to consider the strengths and weaknesses, as well as the needs and interests of the students. The plan will monitor for mastery of authentic skills and knowledge, rather than time spent in the classroom. The program has the flexibility to provide targets supports for traditionally underserved learners who need additional support.

The plan extends to others besides the students. Teachers and mentors will receive specialized training in effective competency-based instructional and assessment practices.

New testing practices will be based on performance, formative, and benchmark assessments will be the norm, ensuring that each student is given multiple ways to demonstrate proficiency. In addition, the applicant shows they will develop a cohesive data collection system that builds from grade to grade and is focused on reporting student progress toward competencies.

WEAKNESS

The applicant does not provide adequate details on what specific interventions will be made for a competency-based learning system for teachers. The applicant speaks of meaningful reforms but does not go into sufficient details to have an idea what will the meaningful reforms will be.

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
|--|-----------|----------|

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

a. The applicant provides an excellent chart showing, year by year, the expected summative assessment goals of the program. The goals stated on the chart are ambitious.

b. The applicant provides an excellent chart showing the expected goals in closing achievement gaps between all students and students falling behind. The applicant indicates they utilized a point differential in the percentage reaching proficiency or above between subgroups and the comparison group. The applicant shows the plan will provide targeted instruction and focus on accelerating learning for struggling students. The section is well documented. The components of the section are specific competencies, competency-based instruction and assessment, and professional development that is competency-based as well

c. The applicant provides flow charts showing graduation rates for the past four years. In contrast, the applicant also provides a chart with the expected gains and goals in graduation rates of the target schools. The chart also shows the at-risk populations, low-income students and students with disabilities graduate at significantly lower rate than the rest of the population. The chart also shows in every group of some 250 students in any given grade, some 50 students are failing to graduate.

d. The applicant provides a chart showing the college enrollment rates of the target population. The applicant indicates college enrollment will be calculated as the ratio between college-enrolled students and their graduating classmates.

WEAKNESS

The applicant provides information on the goals of the program in detail but does not clearly document exactly how the project will achieve the goals or what deliverables will be in place to achieve the goals. In addition, the applicant does not state how it will address low college enrollment of the target population. It is also unclear if the

goals will be attainable with the information provided.

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

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 10 |
| <p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>1a. The applicant shows it has taken steps to raise the levels of gains in education for all students. The applicant provides detailed charts showing performance on summative assessments of proficiency status and growth according to baseline data.</p> <p>For example, the applicant indicates the approach to a solution taken by the district included efforts that resulted over the span of ten years; the school was de-tracked and became a member of the Coalition of Essential Schools. It created small learning communities, established interdisciplinary teams at all grade levels designed to facilitate personalized learning, and began implementing more project-based and multi-disciplinary methods.</p> <p>b. The applicant provides information showing the system has a history of dealing with low-achieving schools. The applicant provides an excellent chart showing the specific methodology the applicant implemented to determine achievement gaps. The information provided shows the applicant used point differential in the percentage reaching proficiency or above between subgroups and the comparison group or base group. The original and present goal is equitable learning that prepares students for postsecondary success. The positive results of these initial steps were developed through a joint effort of community, educators and also student input.</p> <p>c. The applicant provides flow charts showing graduation rates for the past four years. In contrast, the applicant also provides a chart with the expected gains and goals in graduation rates of the target schools. The chart also shows the at-risk populations, low-income students and students with disabilities graduate at significantly lower rate than the rest of the population. The chart also shows in every group of some 250 students in any given grade, some 50 students are failing to graduate</p> <p>d. The applicant provides a chart showing the college enrollment rates of the target population. The applicant indicates college enrollment will be calculated as the ratio between college-enrolled students and their graduating classmates. The information provides indicates the applicant is aware of issues in graduation and college enrollment needing to be addressed.</p> <p>WEAKNESS</p> <p>The applicant provides information on previous efforts but does not clearly show evidence of a solid track of success. The applicant does not show a clear record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching. There is very little information on what success has been achieved in dealing persistently lowest-achieving schools</p> | | |
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 3 |

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

B2 a, b, c, d.

The applicant provides a narrative of the plan showing how the district makes salaries, budget and expenditures transparent and available to all stake holders and the general public. For example, the applicant indicates each year the district publishes the per-pupil expenditures, remediation funding, professional development expenditures and other basic educational expenditures as part of its annual accountability report. This information is posted on the Maine Schools Department of Education Website available to all interested parties. In addition, copies of the full financial audit are available upon request. The district publishes actual salaries of staff member and other information related to the operation of the state school system. In addition, the information is provided in the budget narrative of the application.

Weakness

The applicant provides general information but does not make clear if the information district wide or individual school

level. The applicant does not demonstrate if the information systems are user-friendly and easily accessible to interested parties not technologically knowledgeable.

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

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

B3 The applicant clearly demonstrates autonomy and support from all quarters to implement personalized learning environment in its project related to Race to the Top. For example, the applicant shows the state of Maine does not prescribe any specific curricula or textbooks; rather Maine sets guidelines and standards and then leaves it up to the individual school districts to determine how to meet those standards. This gives individual district plenty of leeway to apply local directives. As a result, Maine has adopted the Common Core State Standards and was able to embraced personalized learning in its strategic plan.

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

15

13

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

ai. The applicant provides evidence that during a two year period a number of teachers, students and staff attended and conducted numerous school visitations or attended conferences and workshops to better understand how to implement a proficiency-based system to put the plan together. In addition, the applicant indicates over 330 parents and community members attended a series of community dinners and forums to discuss the program and receive suggestions. The applicant provides a very detailed narrative with a list of stakeholders involved in the planning and monitoring of the program. For example, the applicant indicates a Race to the Top planning team was created to develop a high quality application. The team served as information distributors as well, as each draft was developed team members shared information back with their constituent groups.

i. The applicant provides evidence of support from teachers' unions. The applicant shows the union is supportive on a conceptual level of student-centered learning; however the applicant indicates contract changes will still need to be negotiated in the coming years to implement the effort successfully. The union has agree to work with the school board in reshaping contractual policies to support student-centered learning while the school board, community council, and maintaining fair practice for teachers. The administration is committed to working with the local union to meet the needs of both staff and students, and provide flexibility in the scheduling while maintaining equity in job distribution.

b. The applicant provides a number of letters of support from civic leaders, government entities and other organizations, such as the school board, in the documentation of the grant application. The applicant provides solid evidence it has the support of the community.

Weakness

The applicant does not make it clear if the community, parents, teachers and staff were involved in structuring the program or had input in the program at onset of the creation of the program.

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

| | Available | Score |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 14 |

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides an extensive narrative detailing a plan on how it will handle student-centered personalized learning and assessment of progress. The applicant provides evidence of a plan they have selected making sure students understand what the goal of the program is and what they can expect. The applicant shows when fully implemented, the project will assess every student who enters the district to establish their current college and career readiness score. If the student possesses grade level skills in each of the core areas, they will move

forward on the traditional path. Students who are performing below baseline will enter on a personal support discipline, and students will be placed at the appropriate skill level allowing them to grow outside of the traditional courses. In addition, the applicant will develop learning targets for every course. Students will be expected to meet college and career ready standards within in each course. A data system will be developed that will allow all stakeholders access to individual student mastery data at any given point in time to further engage all stakeholders. The applicant provides details showing competency-based teaching and learning includes developing curriculum, instruction, and assessment resources that are grounded in meaningful competencies that align with the Common Core State Standards of the program.

The applicant indicates as part the project the district developed a Student Data System that ties mastery of specific skills or knowledge to the data base. This will provide an excellent tool for the program to assess progress, specific weaknesses and unwarranted results. The system is well- designed to gather post unit assessment data and provided up to the minute information on progress and variations in results. Through the creation of the Learner-Centered Organizational Model the district has been able to create a plan that will promote an individual learning environment where students can understand their long term goals and aspirations through the development of the e-portfolio and adjoining support systems. Students also have a clear definition of learning expectations within each unit of study as they connect their learning to learning guides and support rubrics.

Students and families will receive training that will help them to access the information available on the internet. Each student will be required to participate in a series of high quality training and guidance opportunities. This will begin with an introduction to the data system and basic requirements for completion or graduation from each secondary site. Training will be offered at various times during the school year and the summer for all interested parties, including parents and staff. The training for students will be grade appropriate and will help students to develop professional skills, and post-secondary educational skills. Students will be required to take an interest inventory as well as a learning style and or multiple intelligence survey. These items will provide critical information to the student as well as the district when providing support to these students. Extended Learning Opportunities create a menu of options from which each student, with support, can choose the pathway that is most appropriate for them. The applicant provides a list of goals of the program, expected outcomes and resources required for the achievement of the goals.

WEAKNESS

The applicant does not document who will be the responsible parties for the implementation of the various portions of the plan in this section. In addition, the applicant does not provide a clear timeline for accomplishing critical components of the plan or relevant milestones.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

C2 The applicant provides evidence that the district has a good plan and the plan will have series of professional development opportunities that will enable every staff member to identify learning targets for each class they teach. A similar process will be used to develop common unit assessments that will be used to measure student mastery of college and career ready standards. For example, the graduation requirements will be revised so that students must meet minimal levels of competency in reading, writing, and math for graduation.

The applicant will be developing common year end, competency-based course placement, semester, and unit assessments to follow a similar professional development pattern. The goal of the applicant is to select the most appropriate assessment techniques that will allow students to demonstrate comprehensive mastery of college and career ready standards.

The applicant also shows the hiring of a coordinator of extended learning will provide some specific training for teachers on how to plan for a Learner-Centered lesson. The shift for many teachers is the move away from the delivery stance where the focus is on presenting information and moving on to a Learner-Centered stance where the focus is on moving students form current level of knowledge or skills to a mastery level. In a Learner-Centered System the teacher will be recognized for their ability to move students to mastery of a predetermined set of knowledge and skills. Mastery will be determined by how well students perform on the post unit assessments as well as the year end assessment. Each post assessment in this system is considered to be comprehensive and fills the needs of the application.

The applicant indicates the curriculum has been designed for student to receive instruction on key ideas multiple

times throughout the year. The administrative team will be a constant checks and balances on the program's development. This team can look at data to determine the effectiveness of teachers and student mastery on large targets. The applicant indicates from this level, professional development can be identified and provided to underperforming teachers or teacher groups. Also student interventions can be addressed from this level.

The applicant indicates a close monitoring of teacher performance is built in the program. Teacher evaluation will consider both professional practices as well as student performance data. In addition, the district office will conduct the administrator evaluation. The district has adopted an administrator evaluation that addresses both student achievement and professional practices. This evaluation addresses implementation of the curriculum assessment and instruction components of project implementation as well as professional leadership. The process will increase the number of highly qualified teachers in the school system. As a result more students will have more highly qualified teachers.

Weakness

The applicant indicates it will select the most appropriate assessment techniques but does not provide information as to what is expected from the assessment technique, what choices are available nor when will they make the decision.

The applicant indicates teacher training will be provided to assist in creating student centered class environment but does not provide a time schedule, what will the training be like nor how often the training will be provided. The question is when will this training take place, how often will the training opportunity will be provided.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points) | 15 | 10 |

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- D1.
- a. The applicant provides general explanation on how it will implement and support the project with documented procedures. Systems in place to support student learning include: common collaborative planning time for all teachers; regular administrative team time that is focused on Professional Learning Community models and continuous learning; this model is then brought back to all school by building administrators; targeted district literacy goal that leads to school, team, and individual goals. Teachers may spend part of their day “teaching” digital classes and content, an excellent approach to help students with new technology. Staff may have staggered start and end times to their day with some coming in later and staying past the “traditional” school day to provide extra support and interventions to our under-achieving students who need more supports in order to reach competency.
 - b. The applicant provides an excellent plan to manage and coordinate efforts to carry out the over-all plan. This includes efforts to raise shared leadership; the plan will develop a cohesive organization of groups that will create aligned bonds and work together to implement the initiative. This organization will include adult and student leadership teams in all schools, curriculum teams, an Oversight Team to manage the work, and a district community council - all in support of the school board. As a matter of course, the district leadership has also sought input from our labor unions, community leaders, business leaders and town leaders in the visioning process for the educational direction of our schools. This type of communication has systematically continued in the process of developing the plan for this Race to the Top district grant
 - c. The applicant provides information indicating numerous components of the program give students the opportunity to earn credit on demonstrated mastery of subjects. The applicant shows a system will also be created to track student achievements and success of the program. This system will include an electronic way of recording, charting, and reporting student progress. Data teams will be established in each school to review the data pertinent to each student. The applicant indicates during the first year of the grant the program will continue to investigate tracking systems that are supportive of competency-based teaching and learning.

d. The applicant’s plan shows students will be able to demonstrate mastery in multiple ways through integrate competencies into viable learning pathways. This includes competencies students must demonstrate in order to participate in extended learning opportunities experiences as well as a framework and protocols that enable students to demonstrate achievement of competencies through work completed during offsite experiences. This allows us to offer a system of anytime, anywhere learning for all students.

e. The applicant shows Goal # 5 is to build an infrastructure to manage resources in support of student-centered learning. To do this, the applicant indicates the program will develop a tiered system of interventions in reading, writing, and math to provide targeted instruction for students who need additional resources and supports to master competencies. These students will include English-learners and students with disability. The applicant shows teachers will need various resources and flexible methods for learning essential knowledge about competency-based teaching and assessment, as well as time to practice applying these skills and knowledge in supportive contexts to all students.

Weakness

The applicant indicates in general terms policies need to change but does not provide a significant and documented plan as to the program will make the change. The section needs more specific details on the steps the program will take to achieve change.

| | | |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
|---|-----------|----------|

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a The applicant shows they have taken positive steps to insure all stakeholders will have access to modern tools to insure the program will be successful. For example, the applicant indicates all grade 4-12 students are provided a Google Chromebook laptop which parents can also use at home since the students will be able to taken the equipment home. One of the benefits has been to ensure that our low income students have much the same access to technology, the Internet, and other resources as the rest of the student body. The applicant indicates parents will be able to use the laptops to gain knowledge of the student’s progress and other issues. The applicant has components in the program to provide parents with knowledge of how to use the laptop and the internet.

b. The applicant provides evidence of a plan to make technology available to alstakeholders. The applicant provides information showing how it will provide training to all stakeholders to utilize technology to access information. The applicant assures all students will have access to this technology and training. For example, the applicant will be working to train stakeholders to access information that is age-appropriate for them. The applicant indicates student unit mastery data is critical tool in building personalized learning environments in and out of the classroom. To facilitate the experience, the district will utilize data to support student growth in each target classroom. Databases of student work and electronic portfolios will become the norm in the program.

c. The applicant indicates it will develop a system to record, track, and report attainment and mastery of competencies. The data bank will be available to all stakeholders through the school system web page. The district will verify that stakeholders can access the data with guidance and independent of the trainer. In addition, Parents will have access to their child’s mastery data. This will help them to define the areas of need for their student. Each campus will set aside a parent computer access center. This center will provide computer access to parents when the building is open.

d. The applicant provides information indicating a data system meeting all the needs of the program will be available. The applicant indicates the data system is accessible through an Internet portal, which enables more personalized teaching, learning and assessment. A responsive infrastructure including policies, procedures, technology and support services to support personalized learning implementing data-informed advising and intake processes to aid subsets of students and families will be the final product.

Weakness

The applicant indicates the program will develop a system to record, track, and report attainment and mastery of

competencies though a variety of interrelated assessments but it does not identify what the assessments are, what will be assess or who is responsible for this section of the plan.

In addition, the applicant notes the program will promote the development of a cohesive data system and in another section it says the data system has been already implemented.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-----------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 10 |
| <p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>E1. The applicant provides a plan to integrate continuous monitoring and improvement of the program. The plan shows the program will depend to a large degree upon the ability to manage, track, and report the outcomes and progress of the finished work - specifically, student achievement and educational outcomes. To accomplish this, the applicant will implement a feedback loop managed by the District Community Council. The District Community Council will be the group in charged with overseeing and managing the work. The feedback loop will begin with the collection and analysis of three types of data: 1) artifacts and deliverables that will be produced as part of the plan, 2) student achievement data, and 3) feedback from key stakeholders, including, students, staff, parents, administrators, and community members that will be collected by the community council and school leadership teams. The council will review the data quarterly and use this information to make necessary adjustments to the work plan. The applicant shows twice a year, the council will analyze and review achievement data and report progress to the school board, and school leadership teams. The District Community Council will post progress and outcomes quarterly on the district website.</p> <p>WEAKNESS</p> <p>The applicant provides a very detailed plan of data collection but in the narrative, the applicant does not provide an explanation as to what will the program do with the data, who is responsible to make changes if the data shows unwarranted results or problems. In other words, what will happen after the data is collected is not clear. The applicant does not provide a high quality plan for this section.</p> | | |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 5 |
| <p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>E2. The applicant provides details of the high-quality communication plan in place. The applicant indicates the district leadership has sought input from labor unions, community leaders, business leaders and town leaders in the genesis process for the new educational direction of the schools. The communication process has remained in place and continues in the process of developing the plan for Race to the Top district grant. The school board has directed the work that has been completed within the district and they have been instrumental in moving forward in pursuing opportunities for increased options for the target students. A system is in place to review programs and curriculum with school board, teacher, union and administrative input. This will continue with added participation of the community through the District Community Council as the program progresses. This system of review and reflection allows the program to make adjustments and change direction as necessary to meet the educational goals.</p> | | |
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points) | 5 | 5 |
| <p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>E3. The applicant has a high-quality approach to continuously improve its plans. The applicant has all the necessary components in place, particularly progress data to make continuous changes, if needed, to achieve the goals of the program. The goals are ambitious as noted by the expected increases in gains. The goals are achievable because the applicant has in place the necessary data system to keep track of progress. The applicant provides narrative and charts clearly showing how the program plans to measure performance by groups and subgroups. The data collected will provide formative results of the program. For example, the applicant shows tables the district has posted the student performance measures that are going to be used monitor success in the project. Each measure can or will be effectively connected to college and career level mastery. The table addresses state level, district level, and classroom level assessments. The assessments have been selected because they can be used to effectively measure student progress towards college and career level mastery. The</p> | | |

applicant identifies the number of student served by high effective teachers at all grades. At the state level the High School Proficiency Exam has been selected. These assessments have been selected because they are the center of the state accountability system. Data can be used in ELA and Mathematics to determine if a student has earned base level proficiency and can also be used to measure success between sub-groups. In addition, the applicant has also selected Middle School Criterion Reference Exams. These assessments have been selected because they are the center of the state accountability system. The applicant indicates the measures will also provide an early warning system should unwarranted results appear during the life of the program. Appropriate measures can then be taken for corrections. Data can be used in ELA and Mathematics to determine if a student has earned base level proficiency and can be used to measure success between sub-groups. In addition the applicant provides charts showing grade, assessment and the reasoning behind the selection for the assessment model.

| | | |
|--|----------|----------|
| (E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points) | 5 | 0 |
|--|----------|----------|

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:
Weakness
E4. The applicant does not address this section.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:
F1. The budget is reasonable, cost-effective and adequate to support the project. The applicant provides a well-documented budget narrative. The budget appears well organized and adequate to support planned services and activities. Costs are reasonable in relation to the objectives and scope of the project.
Expenditures and personnel responsible for the budget are clearly identified. The information provided by the applicant includes professional development expenditures and other basic educational expenditures as part of its annual accountability report. The applicant identifies one-time expenses within the budget narrative. For example, the applicant indicates a one-time expense of \$20,000 to outfit the classrooms with furniture and equipment and an annual outlay of \$13,000 for materials and supplies. The applicant provides charts with adequate details and narrative justifying expenditures.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:
F2. The applicant provides anarrative indicating the program will search for other funding sources once the federal money is gone. The applicant indicate some expenses will be assumend by the school system and they expect the business community to come to the assistance of the program.
Weakness
F2 The applicant does not provide a specific high-quality plan for sustainability once federal money is gone.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|------------------|--------------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points) | 10 | 8 |

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:
The applicant provides a high-quality plan to meet the competitive preference priority. The applicant adequately addresses all segments of the requirements. The projected goals are ambitious and attainable with excellent details of the plan. The

applicant provides details in various sections of the application showing it will seek involvement from parents and community leaders to identify need, shortcomings and successful aspects of the program.

Students at all target schools will be provided access to many opportunities to education anywhere, anytime to increase their freedom to learn. The applicant clearly shows the district will develop a data base that will define the enrichment opportunities. The site coordinators, school PTA's and school to career, including agriculture will also support in the effort. Once the program is ready every student will have the opportunity to attend afterschool programs. Program interventions will focus on the students with the greatest need. The after school staff will actively recruit students to participate in the project. The District will be responsible to develop a consortium of community partners that would include several dozen businesses and community organizations who will serve as the center of the school to career resource pool. The applicant provides an excellent section on how the program created community partnership and identified the main role players in the partnerships. The applicant provides chart identifying desired results and goals. This district is going to set up the afterschool programs at each of the school sites. The afterschool programs are going to track three items and that includes the number of students who receive targeted remediation and the rate of mastery attained by the participants. As part of the school to career component the district identified that a student internet portfolio would serve as a monitoring and advisory tool for middle school and high school students and their families. Through the use of the student data system and the electronic portfolio every student will be identified as meeting mastery in every course. Structures have been built and will be implemented in a way that every student has the opportunity to meet college and career ready expectations. The applicant does an excellent job in documenting this section.

Weakness

The applicant does not show evidence that it plans to develop a solid strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students of the program to other in-need students and other areas of the school community.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

| | Available | Score |
|----------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | | Met |

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant clearly shows it has the absolute priority at the front of the structure of the program to increase the quality of education and services for the target population. Through the application the applicant demonstrates a persistence willingness to employ the latest technology and research to improve and enhance the learning environment within the target schools. The application indicates a transparency of objectives and goals and a desire to involve parents, educators, teachers and the community as a group in the creation of the program, implementation and responsibility to the students. The applicant shows ingenuity and energy in it approach to increase success in the educational experience of the target population. The priority is met.

| | | |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Total | 210 | 150 |
|--------------|------------|------------|



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

Application #0089ME-3 for Maine School Administrative District #60

A. Vision (40 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| | | |

| | | |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
| <p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant has used current literature to inform proposal; provides a narrative regarding students and staff to describe plans to develop competency-based and student-center learning as a community wide endeavor. Plans include PreK - grade 12, and are cited as being systemic and inclusive with multiple pathways for student success.</p> <p>Tabular information is difficult to interpret because of formatting.</p> <p>Applicant cites a commitment to flexible learning protocols and authentic work that matters. Applicant plans to create a "Noble University" for professional development of teachers to improve instructional mastery and student performance. It will no longer be assumed that teachers will implement learning from workshops; they will have to apply them in a competency-based framework.</p> <p>Applicant cites "one to world" computing to shift the focus to students in a learning community with 24 hour support. Support from public will be built by including community in governance and shared-decision making. Apparently, this has not occurred as yet.</p> <p>Data will be used to inform instruction. Much of current data is not translated into a useful tool at this time. A new framework of standards and competency based instruction will be implemented with interventions in reading, writing and math, with flexible scheduling and mentoring and support for students. Cites Boston Day and Evening Academy where student application of skills results in higher rigor and achievement, but does not provide a clearly articulated, HIGH-QUALITY plan for how emulating this success will take place in their own venue.</p> | | |
| (A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
| <p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>High quality approach is articulated for all, including schools that will participate (all). District is small and all will be included, however formatting of the tabular information provided makes it difficult to glean important information regarding different groups who will participate.</p> | | |
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
| <p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Cites a standard-based program for both students and teachers.</p> <p>Reprise of Noble University and extended learning options.</p> <p>One-to-world computing cited again. Natural resources will be emphasized with an agriculture program through which students will demonstrate a range of 21st Century skills. Free PreK program will be instituted where Head Start is not available, and use data to drive instruction throughout.</p> <p>All schools will participate, so scaling up is not an option; application has a good start on a HIGH-QUALITY plan with some evidence of success in prior endeavors to elevate student achievement, however, more detail regarding how the plan will improve student learning outcomes would be welcome. A data stream will inform instruction, but more detail about what that instruction will look like would strengthen the proposal.</p> | | |
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
| <p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant vision will benefit student learning, although Interviews indicate that a majority of their high school dropouts are not from low income households, nor do they have IEPs. The majority have failed one or more courses. Having students apply learning is expected to increase student achievement and mitigate failure. Proposal is not clear: at first it indicates that the majority of dropouts are not from low income households; later the proposal states that at-risk students graduate at significantly lower rate than the general population. As a result, it is hard to discern if goals are ambitious or achievable.</p> | | |

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

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| | | |

| | | |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points) | 15 | 9 |
| <p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant expresses work toward improving student achievement, but a clear record of success has yet to be achieved. Applicant cites its work toward reform as "remaining incomplete". Asserts that community events held to encourage community engagement have been very positive. Cites a 'hunger' for change among teachers and administrators. Through a planning grant they have explored competency-based learning and shared governance with community, business, and educational staff.</p> <p>Additional specificity of plans would be welcome. The Strategic Plan Framework that is offered appears to be a scan, and is difficult to read.</p> <p>Applicant describes ways in which student data have been shared with parents but the conversations appear to be preliminary; as a result, applicant appears to have learned what parents want in broad terms, but specific strategies for achieving significant reforms for low-achieving schools would be welcome.</p> | | |
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points) | 5 | 4 |
| <p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant cites that public comment is not required by state law, but is considered important for the grant. While public comment is available to individuals, it is not clear how these issues are shared with those who do not attend meetings. There is a website, but does it cite these issues?</p> <p>The budget goes through a two step process for approval, and expenditures, including salaries are available. Transparency regarding financial issues is supported by mailing of the budget to each household.</p> | | |
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points) | 10 | 9 |
| <p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>State has adopted CCSS; nothing in proposal is contrary; state adopts standards and leaves it up to the LEA to implement appropriate measures. As a result, it is expected that the state will be supportive of this initiative, and this support should provide the successful conditions required by the grant.</p> | | |
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points) | 15 | 7 |
| <p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant cites various events used to help communities understand how a competency-based system would work. Strategies to build support appear to be largely in the future. As a result, meaningful stakeholder engagement in iterations of the proposal and any revisions is not clear in the proposal.</p> | | |

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

| | Available | Score |
|---|------------------|--------------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20 | 10 |
| <p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant notes that the proposal represents a blueprint for developing a competency based system, systems for managing resources, and a plan for garnering public support. Desired outcomes are identified. United Way is cited as a critical partner. Goals and desired outcomes are identified; systems do not appear to be in place at this time, but are planned. Although proposal cites a director of extended learning opportunities and pilot ELO programs, additional specificity regarding those personnel and systems would be helpful. Applicant cites that these plans will require care and efficiency, but how they will operate is not clear.</p> <p>Applicant shares a conceptual framework for new competency based graduation requirements, service learning, divided high school experiences and benchmarks to be accompanied by exemplars, gathering of student "voice", and revised system of teacher evaluation, this work does not appear to be underway, but in the planning process. As a result, the plan appears somewhat preliminary rather than having reached the benchmark of HIGH-QUALITY at this point.</p> | | |

| | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|
| (C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points) | 20 | 12 |
| <p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This proposal linked C1 and C2. Reviewer comments are on the prior screen.</p> <p>In general, the proposal cites many laudable objectives, including a system of observations and evaluations for teachers and principals with the objective of improving student performance; however, other aspects of the proposal, such as developing systems to look at graduation requirements, for example, appear still to be in the state of preparing a high-quality plan if funded.</p> <p>WITH RESPECT TO C2, THE APPLICANT HAS A HIGH QUALITY PLAN FOR A TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEM THAT WILL INCREASE THE NUMBER OF STUDENTS WHO RECEIVE INSTRUCTION FROM EFFECTIVE EDUCATORS.</p> | | |

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points) | 15 | 8 |
| <p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant cites the need to change collective bargaining agreement, but how this will take place is not clear. Applicant cites need to make multiple changes in policies, but it is not always clear how these changes will be effected, although a change in board policy to permit physical education credit for off-site activities. Applicant cites small size as an advantage in effecting change.</p> <p>District has benefited from the state's policy of giving laptops to every student. and cites a robust infrastructure to support giving this access to all students. However, the planned activities to create shared governance, for example, appear to be in the consideration stage. As a result, the plan is moving toward HIGH-QUALITY status, but has yet to achieve the specificity that would be required to meet that standard at this time.</p> | | |
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 5 |
| <p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant cites a full continuum of supports for disadvantaged and disabled students. Applicant asserts that their special education program is recognized as one of the best in the southern part of the state, but does not describe how this recognition was established.</p> | | |

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15 | 8 |
| <p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A plan for implementing a feedback loop is cited with plan for review. A plan for tracking student achievement will also be created with the wish to investigate Educat8 software; curriculum teams will likely be able to see graphics depicting continua of competency; more specificity would be welcome. While the applicant appears to be moving in the direction of creating a HIGH-QUALITY plan, important specific aspects of such a plan, such as developing a system to track student achievement, appear to be future endeavors.</p> | | |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points) | 5 | 3 |
| <p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Proposal linked E1 and E2 together.</p> <p>Proposal offers a high-quality plan for ongoing communication with stakeholders. Achievement data and other deliverables will be examined and shared with a District Community Council. Greater specificity would be welcome for ongoing</p> | | |

communication and engagement; at present the proposal only lists the possible use of strategies -- for example, of some software and a report card that would be generated by the third year of the grant.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:
 Tabular display of performance measures makes it difficult to interpret information being provided. Assessments cited appear to meet the criteria for being achievable in this section, but formatting issues make it difficult to be sure. Post-grant projections might be construed as less than ambitious.

| | | |
|--|----------|----------|
| (E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points) | 5 | 0 |
|--|----------|----------|

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 This section was not found.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

| | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|----------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10 | 5 |

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:
 With respect to the budget and budget narrative and tables: Narrative provides information regarding different foci of the proposal and monies allocated to each. More information regarding any other funds that might be used would be helpful, as would greater clarification regarding what funds would be one-time investments, vs. ongoing ones. Additional sustainability information would be welcome as well.

| | | |
|---|-----------|----------|
| (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points) | 10 | 6 |
|---|-----------|----------|

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 In most respects, applicant provides a high quality plan. Applicant reports support from school board and a high degree of engagement from community throughout the district, as well as from students. Applicant expects some potential obstacles from existing policies, beliefs and finances. Applicant believes they can do a better job of asset managing, and foresees some traditional teaching jobs morphing into other positions such as data manager and types of coordinators. Applicant plans to take advantage of the state's permissive funding for PreK. At the same time, applicant cites challenges related to resistance to change; while applicant plans to use communication to offset this challenge, greater clarity would be welcome regarding how this would be structured and assessed.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:
 Applicant has met the competitive preference priority with respect to partnership designed to benefit schools with high need students. Applicant cites a partnership with United Way that will continue to support this work. Expanding the partnership is expected to address early education and home strategies for literacy. Assessments are identified for some goals for students in K-2. Intended outcomes are cited, although additional specificity for some of them would be welcome. For example, "empowering parents to be their child's best teacher" is a worthy outcome, but although offering parent education might be appropriate, measuring success with a preschool parent survey may not provide meaningful assessment for this construct. Additional information regarding evaluation would be welcome.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

| | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|------------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | | Met |
| <p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: Applicant clearly states intended outcomes to provide more personalized and flexible learning environments for teaching and learning leading to college and career success.</p> | | |
| Total | 210 | 121 |