



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #01170H-1 for Reynoldsburg City School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>a. The district's proposal is strongly grounded in the four core assurance areas. The vision articulated makes frequent reference to these areas and the successful implementation goals (meet or exceed college-ready standards, students show at least one year's growth each year, and student graduate with credentials that are aligned with their individual goals) are strongly grounded in the core assurance areas.</p> <p>b. A major component of the district's approach involved blended learning and choice. The proposal references past and ongoing collaboration efforts (including TLA and Johns Hopkins) that have focused on accelerating learning in areas of student interest. An example is the increased number of students taking pre-calculus and calculus.</p> <p>This entire section includes subsections related to each of the core assurance areas. Within each the proposal includes evidence of past work and future vision as related to the assurance areas and the absolute priority. Past success includes work with ACT and Common Core Standards, early work with value-added data systems to inform instruction, and using these data to improve the effectiveness of school and low-performing educators.</p> <p>Reference is made to rewarding high-performing teachers. However, it's not clear how this relates to improving access to effective teachers. Instead, it would seem to focus on those who are already high performing.</p> <p>c. The information presented in section A1 deals with general topics and innovations (such as "deepening learning" and a "local focus") which gives some idea of what the classroom experiences will be like for students. However, this information is not detailed and does not connect these innovations to personalized learning directly.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Section A2 presents the plan for an executive leadership team that will oversee and manage project activities. This team includes several district administrators as well as building staff and parents.</p> <p>a. The district plans to include all students and all schools in its project. These will be divided up by cohorts with regard to timing of adoption. A readiness assessment will be used to determine when schools begin to implement reforms. This readiness tool is included and represents a well-detailed plan for which schools will implement and when. Also included is a current status table showing the baseline level of implementation of many of the plan goals. This information shows that the district is already moving forward and suggests a high probability of successful implementation district wide.</p> <p>b. A list of school is not provided though this is reasonable given the process for selection described in the narrative. A timeline is included for their selection.</p> <p>Section A2b includes a table of district-level demographics. This includes numbers of low-income and high-need students.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district plans to use all schools and all students as part of its project. Part of its stated plan includes a scale-up to full implementation with additional schools implementing based on readiness.</p> <p>Much of the information included in this section deals with how lessons learned by the district will be shared with other districts and other schools. While valuable, this is not in response to the selection criteria.</p>		

The district will use its readiness tool and a four-star system to determine whether or not a particular goal is at full implementation and being successful. Included are tables showing the current status of various goals based on the required criteria of a high-quality plan (goal, activity and rationale, timeline, deliverable, and responsible parties). This process is already well-developed and serves to suggest that the district will be successful in achieving full implementation.

A plan is provided (partly in section A3 but mostly in later sections such as C1 and C2) that if followed shows the district has considered how it will reach its goals (including specific timelines, deliverables, etc.).

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The goal of every sub-group achieving 95% proficiency in every sub group is likely not achievable. Many sub-groups already have high rates of achievement (e.g, 80%+) but some such as students with disabilities are much lower and will be hard to get to 95%. For most sub-groups this is an ambitious and achievable goal. This same issue holds for the goal of 95% of all students showing more than one year of growth. This is not likely achievable.

b. Some of the achievement gap goals are very ambitious and not likely achievable. In some cases it is expected that gaps will swing eight, 15, or nearly 30pts in a two-year period. This is not likely achievable.

c. Graduation rates are already very high and the goals of increasing them even more are achievable and ambitious (approaching the 95% threshold).

d. Subgroup goals were not disaggregate for college enrollment. Only a general goal was included for each year. This goal is not especially ambitious (current 43% moving to 69% after the grant) given the already high rate of high school graduation.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal repeatedly references "student/parent choice" in terms of school as evidence of past success or dedication to reform. However, providing choice in terms of school does not represent a record of past success. Creating opportunities for students to explore topics of interest or pursue more challenging material could result in greater learning, but it does not do so on its own.

The proposal references past opportunities related to college/career academies and elementary STEM options as examples of past reform efforts.

a. Data are presented which show 100% of state performance indicators have been met for the past three years. In past years the district has exceeded state growth targets (one year of growth per year) and has shown progress in increasing graduation rates (90.7% up from 82,5%). However, achievement gaps goals were not met for the last two years. Still, this represents a strong track record of success.

b. The proposal references Ashton middle school as an example of a lower-performing school that has ben reformed: 10pt increase in performance index and now meeting 100% of its indicators. Although not a district that has any low-performing schools as defined, the district has a record or increased performance in its lowest-performing schools.

c. The proposal states that student data are available "24/7" through an online portal. However, it does not state which data these are of what (if any) efforts are undertaken to communicate these data (or how to interpret them). No reference is made to how these data are communicated in a way that informs instruction and learning.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal states that school expenditures and all personnel salaries are already reported on the district website (made public). It further notes that if funded for this project, the district would add an additional layer of transparency so that the public could track grant / project-related revenue and expenses. These efforts demonstrate a commitment and dedication to transparency.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal states that State laws not only allow but encourage policies related to personalized learning. These include permissive policies that allow for practices such as credit flexibility. In this area students are able to earn credit through completing a course or otherwise demonstrating mastery. State policy with regard to digital learning also promotes and creates the ability to individualize student learning.</p> <p>Even if current policies did not exist for the district to implement its plan, the State also has a "innovative school zone" policy which could allow the district (or specific schools) to be exempted from some state requirements in order to implement innovative reforms. This indicates that the flexibility exists to implement the district's plan.</p> <p>The district is in a Race to the Top state that has already agreed to implement statewide reforms related to the core assurance areas.</p>		

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	13
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>a. The proposal references a range of meetings and communication efforts that were undertaken as the proposal was drafted. For example, both parent and student advisory groups to the superintendent provided feedback that was incorporated into the draft regarding blended learning. The proposal itself originated from a Reynoldsburg Reach campaign that involved a range of stakeholders including the teacher union. Meetings were also held at every school where teachers were able to offer feedback on the proposal. Detail regarding the way these comments and/or feedback were collected to assure engagement was not provided.</p> <p>The teachers' union executive board reviewed and provided comments on a draft of the proposal. However, even though the proposal was signed by the president of the teachers' union, it's not clear that the members of the union (the teachers themselves) have voiced support for the project. Letters from some school principals are included, but the rate or approval from the teaching staff for the proposal was not stated.</p> <p>b. Letters of support are included from principals, some parents, institutions of higher education and some community groups.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section includes several tables which outline the current status, activity, rationale, timeline, deliverable, and responsible party for each of their innovations. Each of these innovations are in turn aligned with specific selection criteria under C1. Overall a great amount of detail and information is included. However, much of the content appears as if the district took what it was already doing or planning to do and then tried to fit it into the RTT criteria / model. The result is that some of the information provided does not directly address selection criteria. See the following for examples:</p> <p>a. The connection between choice and personalized learning is still not clear. What is clear from the information presented under a(i) is that students will be given a wider range of opportunities under the district's plan. It is not as clear how this is tied to students seeing learning as key to their success.</p> <p>Much of the plan includes attention to individual learning and career plans. This includes use of career- and interest-based assessments as well as opportunities to allow students to connect what they learn with their own interests. These culminate at the high school level with capstone courses which allow for in-depth exploration of a rigorous topic of student that is also focused on the student's interest.</p> <p>The plan for how students will receive exposure to diverse cultures is not as clear or detailed. Activities are more general than in other areas. Goals are in line but the plan is not well described.</p> <p>It's not clear how an emphasis on STEM addresses outcomes such as goal-setting, perseverance, etc. the proposal references a plan to move toward a competency model which is in line with the absolute priority, but it does not address the other critical dispositions outlined in C1av.</p>		

b. Evidence provided under b(i) includes several examples of ideas or programs (such as Khan Academy or eSTEM) that are in place or will be implemented. However, these individual ideas do not represent a plan for how all students will have access to personalized instruction. Instead, they represent piecemeal, individual services as opposed to a program.

It's unclear why so much attention is focused on what programs are already in place. Presenting what the district already does does not in itself represent a plan for how all students will receive individualized programming.

For section b(ii) the evidence provided takes the form of narrative saying that a variety of high-quality practices are used. Specifics are few and what specifics are provided deal with high schools. Little information is included in this section related to elementary.

Section b(iii) also suffers from a lack of specifics regarding how the goal will be achieved. For example, one activity involves readiness planning and alignment with ACT standards. But it is not clear how this will be accomplished. Activities are not specific enough to make a high quality plan.

Section b(iv) does provide a plan for providing ongoing feedback to students (e.g., standards-based report cards) but it is again very piecemeal. What is presented is not an overall plan but rather examples of ideas and individual interventions.

The district references RtI with regard to high need students. However, RtI is not a remediation model. It is an all student model. The actions included in the plan for this component focus on status updates and locating resources. This does not explain how high need students will have access to programming.

c. Section c does not provide a high quality plan. Although the components are listed, nothing provided is a specific action step. The only activity listed is that each school will prepare a plan. This plan is part of the review criteria.

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

20

11

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Much of the information provided in the first few pages of narrative deals with what the district has done in the past - citing individual examples of programs. This information does not equate to a high quality plan. Individual partners (e.g., EDWorks, Metro Early College High School, etc) are listed along with their description and services they provide, but none of this is linked to what will happen in the district in order to assure staff training as connected to the implementation of personalized learning. Some information is included for what these outside groups will do for / in the district, but this does not represent a high quality plan.

The district provides more specific information in the tables. As related to a(i) the district plans to implement individual school professional development plans. However, this does not go far enough. Information is not included for what will happen beyond general statements such as "plan and execute a summer institute" and "develop communication plans". This information does not show how all teachers will receive training. This is not a high quality plan.

Information under a(ii) relates to what will happen (such as co-taught classrooms), not to how teachers will be trained to make it happen. The activities, rationale, etc do not relate to how teachers will be trained to deliver adapting and delivering content based on student needs.

Information provided under a(iii) is closer to a high quality plan as it directly includes activities (training in how to use students growth and progress data to improve instruction) directly related to the selection criteria.

The only activities included under a(iv) are that the district will develop, adopt, and provide training related to a performance management system. This is not a high quality plan as to how staff will be trained in how to use educator effectiveness data.

b.

The information in b(i) deals mostly with access. No information or plan is included for how teachers will be trained in how to use the information available to inform instruction.

Section b(ii) references expanding MOOCs and hybrid course offerings. No reference is made to hardware access.

Section b(iii) includes a plan for the development of a system to aid in the use of data and resources in informing instruction.

c.

No information is included in c(i) that relates to training or the use of educator effectiveness information in such a way that will lead to school improvement. Information provided relates to the philosophy of leadership in the district and is not in

response to selection criteria.

Information provided under c(ii) is very general and does not explain how school leaders will have access to training in how to implement continuous improvement.

d.

The only action steps included in section d are "reward high-performing teachers" and "reward high-performing principals" plus other general activities such as "develop, implement recruitment tools". These do not represent high quality plans. There is no information included on how the district will assure that more students are taught by high-quality teachers. No plan is presented.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	6
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The information provided in section D1 is very general. It is not clear from what is provided that a high quality plan exists to assure that district structures facilitate personalized learning.</p> <p>a. No information is provided beyond the basic philosophy of district administration regarding how the administrative structure is designed to support personalized learning.</p> <p>b. The proposal states that principals have a strong degree of control and autonomy over their schedules and curriculum. Based on what is provided (particularly the alignment of the district's goals with state priority areas) it is likely that school leaders do have sufficient control to implement the proposed reforms.</p> <p>c. Though the proposal states that the district is moving toward a mastery-based system, no high-quality plan is provided. Standards-based report cards are references as an example, but these do not represent a plan for how students will make progress toward mastery.</p> <p>d. Aside from the various components that go into general course grades or performance ratings, no information is included regarding multiple opportunities to demonstrate mastery.</p> <p>Information related to part e deals only with a general statement about least restrictive environment and compliance with federal law. This does not represent a high quality plan.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>a. Reference is made to "bring your own device" and access to libraries and computer labs before and after school as examples of ensuring access to resources. However, the level of detail provided does not represent a high quality plan. It is not clear what will happen, when, how, or who will be responsible.</p> <p>d. The district operates a fix and repair ticket system for tech support and staff are able to request help from tech staff at their schools. This does not represent a high quality plan.</p> <p>c. Parents and students have access to a student information system 24/7 where they can access student scores, grades, etc. It's not clear how or where students and parents would receive training in how to use this resource.</p> <p>d. No information is included regarding access to human resource data, budget, etc. However, the availability of budget information was referenced in earlier sections of the proposal. It's not clear there is a plan for how LEAs will assure that these data are usable by stakeholders.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	8

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The information provided in section E1 includes a general overview of how continuous reflection will take place. It does not include sufficient detail on its own to represent a high quality plan. However, greater detail are provided in later E3 sections. Not provided is information regarding how the district will share information on the quality of its investment. A detailed research plan by an external evaluator is included, but this is not in response to the selection criteria. No information is included regarding the sharing of investment effectiveness. This overall section is too general to represent a high quality plan of ongoing revision and improvement.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
---	----------	----------

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The section on E2 relates mostly to standing committees of the district and does not address a specific plan for ongoing engagement and revision. Some information is included regarding an outside academic evaluation and advisory committee as a source of data, but this doesn't represent engagement with internal stakeholders.

The R3 committee is referenced as a venue through which information will be shared. But the sharing of information does not represent engagement. It's not clear how teachers or parents will be involved beyond general committees.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The tables presented regarding effective teachers and principals are not broken down by student subgroup. These tables also do not include grades prior to fourth.

Attendance is provided as an indicator of growth. This is not a sufficient measure of cognitive or non-cognitive growth in pre-k - 3rd grade students.

No performance measure is included for 4th - 8th grade college/career readiness. Only a measure of those students who earn credit for algebra 1 is included as an academic indicator.

The tables regarding college/career readiness and FAFSA completion are not disaggregate by subgroup.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The district includes a plan for partnering with Johns Hopkins researchers to implement an (included) plan to evaluate RTT efforts. This plan includes a range of data sources and methods and is also presented in a way that includes goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Costs are outlined in budget tables by year. Descriptions include if expenses are one-time costs or ongoing as well as to what section of the proposal they refer. Budget tables also include rows for non-RTT funds to be applied.

The budget is heavily weighed toward contractual support (\$3.6million - nearly 50% in the first year) compared to only \$700,000 for personnel. This does not seem reasonable given the need for staff who are trained and able to use the technology and new purchased resources to deliver personalized learning. Very few new instructional staff are included in the budget and what staffing is included is for teachers to serve on review teams. A significant amount of contractual support goes toward teacher training but this too will be delivered by all outside contractors.

Each component of the budget is presented in a table along with a column on "assumptions and description". This information includes some discussion of rationale. For example, some formulas are used to explain how costs were derived and descriptions are included for what a particular component includes.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal references that 88% of the budget is for one-time costs thereby suggesting that future support will not be needed to maintain the project.</p> <p>the proposal states that 1,482,800 will be "saved" through offsets. This is concerning as these offsets could include reductions in staffing which would harm the program.</p> <p>The proposal includes a general outline for an open-enrollment plan that will contribute to sustainability. Tables are further included which outline steps to be taken (and timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties) in order to assure future sustainability.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal references the Central Ohio Compact as evidence of a partnership where the district serves on the leadership team. This partnership has shared goals related to postsecondary degree attainment as well as pathways for adult learners and an overall alignment of and collaboration in programming.</p> <p>The proposed outcomes relate to the overall vision of the partnership (e.g., college attendance as a measure of progress toward large post-secondary completion rates).</p> <p>As with previous tables, the plan presented in this section relates mostly to work that has already been done (progress) and not to a plan for what will be done in the future (if funded). By its own evaluation, much of this work is not already in place. This leaves a void with regard to what will actually be done in order for the district to accomplish its stated goals. Information provided is relevant to those goals but it is not specific enough to demonstrate the district has a high quality plan.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The vast majority of this proposal presented information related to what the district has already done or already has in place. Although this is certainly relevant, it left out some detail regarding what would actually be done with a new source of funds in order to achieve a personalized learning environment. At times it wasn't clear what would be done with new sources of funds as opposed to what was done well with previous grants. Still, the information provided was sufficient to demonstrate a proposal related to personalized learning.</p>		

Total	210	149
--------------	------------	------------

Race to the Top - District



Technical Review Form

Application #0117OH-2 for Reynoldsburg City School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) The applicant presents a sound plan with vision for educational reform that describes the support efforts in an urban public school district near Ohio. The applicant includes data on a sound plan that customizes instruction for each child by increasing choices for parents and students, integrating personalized digital learning, employing an adaptive data analysis system, and expanding college and real-world experiences for all students with a regional education partnership.</p> <p>The applicant describes how professional development will provide training and support Battelle’s Center for Analytics and Public Health will collaborate with Reynoldsburg educators and additional partners to develop a data-driven analytics platform. This platform will allow for data analysis with the development of a formal logic model and decision tree that maps various triggers for action at the student, classroom, or school-wide levels with an array of educational intervention opportunities and community services that are available and responsive to the needs of students.</p> <p>(b) There is a sound approach to increase student achievement and personalized student support with an already implemented Reynoldsburg Race to Results (R3) that will ensure that students meet or exceed college-ready State Standards, exhibit at least a grade growth each year, and graduate from high school with recognized credentials that demonstrate career readiness. The overall plan addresses the identification of students’ needs for blended learning, and collective impact connecting schools, communities, programs and resources with locally data-drive educational targets from early childhood to career readiness.</p> <p>(c) There is a good plan describing the learning experience for teachers and students that includes digital content, direct instruction, laboratory experiential learning, three-hour daily meetings with capstone teachers and content experts as needed. The rest of the day is customized to the individual student’s needs and could include academic support, additional college work, internships and service learning projects. Formative and performance based assessments will be provided to students.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) The proposed project will serve 14 schools district-wide; reform initiatives will use a cohort model based on each school’s readiness. Cohort 1 will consist of three schools that are piloting blended learning, have strong partnerships and are high –performing schools. Cohort 1 will reach full implementation in year one. Schools in Cohort 2, 3 and 4 will be determined by the R3 School Readiness Assessment. Seven of the fourteen schools have completed school identity and choice implementation.</p> <p>There is a good implementation plan that includes a description of the current status of each area of work, goals, activities, rationale for activities, timelines, deliverables and individuals responsible for delivery.</p> <p>(b, c) The applicant provides the list of schools that will be participating in the project and it reflects a good plan, describing the participation of 14 schools. A detailed account of student demographics is provided with the number of students participating in each of the target schools.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides an excellent plan that describes the district wide reform and change desired at the target schools. The proposal includes plans to scale successes throughout Ohio and existing networks across the country and describes plans for disseminating successful strategies in partnership with Battelle, OSLN, Metro Early College High School (Metro) and Columbus State

The proposed theory of change is that every student can achieve if provided with educational opportunities that cater to their academic interests and learning styles. The applicant includes a sound plan demonstrating a theory of change supported by logic models with a schedule for implementation, deliverables and organizational capacity.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The applicant describes an excellent plan to improve student outcomes based on district-wide goals that are realistic and attainable. The goal targets are focused on formative and summative assessments where at least 95 percent of every subgroup will pass the State achievements tests in every subject at every grade level by the end of the grant period.

b) The proposal describes the expectation that students in every grade level will exhibit more than a year's growth in a year's time in both reading and math.

c) The applicant's vision will likely result in higher graduation rates that will climb to greater than 95 percent for all subgroups.

d) The proposed project demonstrates the vision that college enrollment rates will climb to greater than 70 percent given the interventions and activities proposed by the applicant.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

1) The applicant describes how schools increased the percentage of State performance indicators from 86.7 percent four years ago to 100 percent in 2011 and has maintained that performance for three consecutive years. The proposal contains tables demonstrating academic performance, measures and description of improvement over four years.

(a) The applicant provides good data supporting the increased academic performance for all students in the target area. The high school academy design was a response to community-wide concerns that building a second high school would result in a "haves and have-nots" divide. Detailed are provided with data on strategies to close the achievement gaps and increase college enrollment.

(b) The proposal contains good descriptions of the applicant achievement in underperforming schools relative to the district. The applicant provides an example where five years ago, Reynoldsburg's Hannah Ashton Middle School met 42 percent of student performance indicators on the State report card. As a result of various strategies and interventions, the school overall achievement and growth data began to improve. By the 2010-11 school years, Hannah Ashton met 100 percent of indicators.

(c) The applicant provides good supportive data concerning individual student performance data available 24/7 to students and their families via online student information systems and grade books. Periodic snapshots of student performance also are provided to families through quarterly report cards and mid-quarter progress reports. There is a good information system in order to report student performance that is published on district websites and Ohio Department of Education. Performance and improvement strategies are reported publicly by each school at Reynoldsburg Board of Education meetings.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 (a, b, c, d) The applicant has a good plan that describes a high degree of fiscal transparency. The treasurer’s office publishes annual data detailing school level expenditures. The report includes actual personnel salaries for all instructional and support staff, actual personnel salaries for instructional staff only, actual personnel salaries for teachers only and actual non-personnel salaries. This information is available at the district’s website.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant provides convincing evidence of successful conditions and autonomy in the state. Ohio allows and encourages personalized learning environments among its 614 public school districts and hundreds of private and public charter schools.

 The state has offered flexibility to students that meet and exceed State standards through more personalized modalities of instruction through alternative schooling options, such as Independent Study.

 Credit Flexibility Policy means that students may earn high school graduation credit by demonstrating subject area competency by completing traditional coursework, testing out or otherwise demonstrating mastery of course content for credit.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 (a) The applicant provides a good description on how meaningful engagement of stakeholders, defined as students, parents, teachers, administrators, staff, community, district have participated with input and have actively worked on strategies to support student achievement. The stakeholders were included in planning sessions and their feedback was considered and in some cases incorporated into the final plan of the program. For example, the significant support for blended learning strategies that incorporate supervised curriculum with the use of technology and provides some element of control over time, place, path or pace of learning was unanimous by parents and students.

 (i) The proposal contains good evidence that design teams comprising Reynoldsburg teachers, represented by the Reynoldsburg Education Association (REA), the local affiliation of the Ohio Education Association and National Education Association, conducted further research and made comprehensive recommendations to the superintendent calling for the development of a K-12 STEM pipeline and interest-based academies at the high school. The fact the teachers association was engaged in and provided recommendations shows support for the program.

 (ii) Not applicable.

 (b) The applicant identifies the organizations and institutions that have supported the proposed project. The list includes state and local educational agencies, professional and community organizations, and colleges and universities and letters of support are included in the Appendix. The parent advisory committee participated in a needs assessment that identified strengths and gaps in the district’s current partnerships for nonacademic support of students. As a result of the needs assessment, partnerships with an additional mental health/addiction agency and a youth development agency have been initiated at the high-school and middle-school level, respectively.

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

	Available	Score

(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	16
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a good plan that meets the criteria for personalized learning. The plan is tied to four key innovations: Educational Choice, Blended Learning, Data Analysis and Collective Impact and the proposal describes how learning will be achieved by implementing instructional strategies that will provide academic support to all participating students by providing a rigorous college preparatory curriculum and aligned to career-ready standards.</p> <p>Collective efforts involving students, parents and educators will align activities and strategies with identified career interests that will provide meaningful applications to learning. Goal setting and advisement support will help students structure their goals and monitor their progress. Other skills will be addressed such as teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving.</p> <p>Weakness</p> <p>The applicant does not provide clear information how it will address diversity of cultures in the program. In some cases it is not clear if data provided addresses the criteria. The applicant does not indicate what kind of assistance will be available to teach or assist students in the operation of new technology to track their progress.</p>		

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	11
--	-----------	-----------

<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a well-designed plan that uses formative assessments that will indicate individual student needs. The feedback obtained will drive the plan for instruction that will determine the areas of academic support needed. Support will be provided in the form of training, coaching, co-teaching and professional learning communities with expertise aligned to educators' specific gaps and the goals of each participating school.</p> <p>Professional development opportunities for educators and staff and are provided outside of contract hours, with voluntary participation incentivized by nominal stipends. Participation has been high, and teachers have invested a substantial amount of unpaid personal time to ensure success in innovations. To implement this plan within four years, educators have requested that more opportunities be provided during their contract time; in addition to external experts the applicant is pursuing the creation of a training center for availability of in-house coaches in a cost-effective manner.</p> <p>Other valuable strategies are presented such as the Learning Accelerator, co-developed with district leadership, will implement large-scale blending-learning with support for professional development structures, educators roles and assignments, product and service procurement, technology infrastructure and financing at no cost to the district. Educational elements such as blended classrooms, classroom organization and management, selection of digital content, assessment and data use, organization and reorganization of student groups, along with technical data system training will be provided in traditional classroom and distance learning modalities.</p> <p>Weakness</p> <p>The applicant does not clearly address how it will engage teachers and what training will teachers receive to increase the number of highly qualified teachers. Details are missing. The applicant does not provide details on what type of training the teachers will receive, who will be providing the training, where will the training take place and how often and if there will be any costs to the teachers or the school system. The applicant does not provide a high-quality plan in this section.</p>		
--	--	--

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	9

<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a)The applicant provides a plan with some information on of the organization and governance structure, indicating how the</p>		
---	--	--

central office will provide support in alignment of standards, data analysis and teacher evaluation and the Board of Education approved curriculum matches the State academic standards.

(b) There is a good plan to provide leadership at the participating schools; School principals have autonomy over schedules within the school day, while the Board determines the length of the school day. Calendars are designed by a committee of administrators, staff and parents in compliance with the State requirements for the number of school hours each school year.

(c, d) The applicant provides details on how student will earn credit for mastery system, and many other of the skills such as work habits, effort, homework, attendance and participation are evaluated separately and reported to the parents as "Characteristics of a Successful Learner". Another example is provided, at Hannah Ashton Middle School, personalized digital content allows students to progress at their own pace.

(e) The applicant describes how educators are able to set mastery thresholds for progression through content material and to assign supplemental digital content for students who have gaps in their knowledge or who learn differently. Academic support is provided to students with disabilities and English Language learners..

WEAKNESS:

(a) The applicant does not provide sufficient information on how the organization will provide support and services to all participating schools; for example more details on the structure to describe the consortium decision process for implementation of the project.

(b) The proposal does not contain information on school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school-level budgets.

(c) The applicant does not clearly show evidence students will have the opportunity to earn credits through evidence of mastery rather than time in class.

(d) The applicant does not clearly show students can show mastery of standards in various and different ways. The topic is mentioned in the narrative but not clarified.

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

10

8

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The applicant provides a good plan that comprises the use of personalized digital content, all participating students will have 24/7 access to personalized digital content to support their learning and are coordinated with school activities and curriculum. Community points of access include the Columbus Metropolitan Library's Reynoldsburg Branch, which has a dynamic and well-used Homework Help Center with computer access and instructional support. The school library will make available e-readers and tablet computers available for student check-out and take home.

(b, c) Parents, educators and other stakeholders already have access to Pearson's PowerSchool, a student information system where students and parents can access assignments, scores, grades, comments and information on progress toward each academic standard. Elementary school parents and educators use the Oasis system and educators use the Learning Management system to house assignments, learning resources and assessments.

(d) The applicant describes the use of PowerSchool, an interoperable data system that includes human resources data, student information data, budget data, and instructional improvement system data. There is a good plan to handle troubleshooting by an established e-mail, ticket system, and in person when necessary.

Weakness

The applicant indicates technical assistance will be available but does not indicate in what way will the assistance be provided or what will be the turn around time will be once assistance is requested. In addition, no alternative to this assistance is indicated should there be a problem with the previously assistance be down.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presents a good approach to continuously improve its plans with a systematic strategy called Design-Development Research. The methods used will develop and test innovations that foster alignment and coordination of support for improving teaching and learning. The strategies include timely and regular feedback to monitor progress and goal attainment. The collaborative nature of design research positions practitioners as co-designers of solutions to problems, which can facilitate other educators' adoption. The applicant has methods in place for timely and regular feedback. This timely feedback will provide information on on-going progress or lack of it to the administration to make corrections and improvements. With constant monitoring at various levels, immediate feedback to administrators, improvement over kinks in the program are insured.</p> <p>The proposal contains a good plan for continuous improvement that will monitor five key elements: personalization of student learning, student engagement in learning process, teacher and leader professional development, technology usage, and community engagement in student learning. The applicant will communicate its continuous improvement progress and status on a quarterly and annual basis to stakeholders and the general public and a social media site where non-sensitive information will be available to report progress and status of the project. The applicant uses PowerSchool, is available to stakeholders that will show where the investments have been used in professional and staff development, technology and services.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is good evidence that the applicant has a good plan to have the Consortium meet quarterly throughout the project and will continue engagement with national networks and organizations as the district finds local solutions to problems that are challenging in the implementations of high-quality personalized learning. The Communications Committee will design materials to be shared with local stakeholders as well as surveys, focus groups and informal discussions to retrieve additional, complementary input from educators and the Teacher's Advisory Committee will meet monthly with school representatives from the Reynolds Education Association that will leverage activities with the Business Advisory Committee, Students Advisory Committee with continuous reports to the Board. An external evaluator is included.</p> <p>Weakness</p> <p>It is not clear how teachers will be engaged beyond receiving information.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a good plan that uses a summative and formative approach that will ensure continuous improvement and evaluation and will have access to the most recent and relevant data concerning student outcomes as they align to performance measures. The proposal includes 12 performance measures, addressing the performance measures for all applicants, for pre-K to 3, 4-8 and 9-12 grades. The components of the program indicate the goals can be achieved as they clearly related to the stated goals. The goals of the program are very ambitious but are obtainable with the measures to achieve them included in the application.</p> <p>WEAKNESS:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide the number of participating students who are on track to college and career-readiness for grades 4 -8 at the target schools</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has a good plan that will employ a systematic research process to conduct evaluations, and will employ an</p>		

internal team who will work with Johns Hopkins researchers to conduct evaluations. The evaluations will employ qualitative, quantitative and mixed-methods data collection and analysis. A table is provided that delineates program goals, activities, methods, timelines, deliverables and person responsible.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>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 one-time expenditures are clearly identified. The applicant provides a narrative indicating where most of the cost of the program is placed. Development of the district budget also provides for considerable public input. The development of the district's annual budget is always conducted at a series of school board meetings and workshops which are open to the public. Once developed, a detailed explanation of the proposed budget is mailed to every home in the district as well as posted on the districts website.</p> <p>Weakness</p> <p>The applicant shows a large portion of the budget will go to contractual engagements but does not provide information as to why this is necessary.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	3
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant indicates an increase in new students will bring in extra funding for the program. In addition, the applicant indicates much of the program will be able to be absorbed by the budget of the institution.</p> <p>Weakness</p> <p>The applicant does not provide a high-quality plan for sustainability of the program once federal dollars are finished. The applicant appears to rely mostly on communication with the community and possible absorption of the program by the standing school budget. No new sources of funding are clearly identified.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant meets this Competitive Preference Priority by including a cohesive plan indicating that Reynoldsburg is part of a coherent and sustainable partnership among central Ohio stakeholders that have established clear education and workforce development goals in support of the area's economic development partnership.</p> <p>The project Columbus 2020 created by the Education Partnership was the Central Ohio Compact, which outlines a shared vision, status report, community assets, data to be measured, a strategy framework and next steps. There is evidence of alignment between representatives of education, businesses, and economic development organizations that include K-12 with four school districts and two career and technical schools, Columbus State Community College and the Ohio State University.</p>		

Educational agencies and business partnerships are working collaboratively, such as regional educational services center, access to the statewide college access network, local P-16 partnership and the Ohio Board of Regents and the Columbus Partnership represented by business leaders.

The applicant has provided an excellent plan and identified educational strategies to reach one goal: 60 percent of the region's adults earning a postsecondary certificate or degree by 2025. This is an ambitious goal because the five participating counties would have to double their collective rate of degree and certificate attainment.

A set of strategies include raising the students college and career aspirations, aligning curriculum and academic support services to provide all students with the knowledge and skills needed for postsecondary studies; and provide alternate pathways for adult learners who need more postsecondary credentials or wish to transition to new careers. Veterans will be able to explore alternative pathways to degrees and certificates through innovative design and delivery.

The applicant includes data on implementation, tracking and monitoring project process and progress and describes the infrastructure to select, implement and evaluate the proposed project. The proposal includes how the applicant will routinely assess the progress in implementing its plan to maximize impact and resolve challenges and problems. The performance measures and project goals are ambitious yet attainable due to the proposed services and activities delineated by the applicant.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:		
<p>Through the application the applicant demonstrates a solid evidence 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.</p>		

Total	210	177
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District Technical Review Form

Application #0117OH-3 for Reynoldsburg City School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant describes work in progress (R3 and other strategies) aimed at improving student achievement through a series of flexible learning options that are personalized to student interests and a robust arsenal of assessment techniques. Cites success in improving student outcomes for low-performing populations as well as having cut expenses. Proposal includes information on merit pay for teachers and improved professional development as well as improved teacher education programs, all as part of a comprehensive reform vision that describes how learning environments are revised to work as flexible compendia of blended and multiple types of school and community based learning.

Proposal provides a comprehensive and coherent reform vision for these reasons.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Proposal does a comprehensive job of describing how its approach will support high-quality implementation, and how cohorts will be used to include, ultimately, the entire district. Student demographics are described as required along with a protocol for identifying specific triggers for academic interventions. More information regarding participating educators would be welcome. This weakness impacted the score for this criterion.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a high-quality and comprehensive plan for describing partnerships and how the district is using a cadre of trained teachers to train colleagues in the district and throughout the state and national networks, as part of a scaled-up effort, as well as a school-to-college protocol with Columbus State.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	9
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a plan for an assessment-driven protocol that cites ambitious yet achievable annual goals (related to state targets) through a series of innovations including expanded educational choice, emphasis on blended learning, using data to assess effectiveness of educational interventions and improved community collaboration. Specifics for baseline and grant years are provided in tabular form, and sub-groups are identified clearly.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	11

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant shows many indicators of growth in student achievement, although they do not seem to have achieved an A. It appears that the applicant has made strides in achieving equity so that all students have access to the programs of their choice.

The data provided regarding college enrollment is spotty inasmuch as the prior recording system did not take into account students who opted for out of state IHEs. The applicant has a plan in place to improve the quality of its data on this measure in the future. They also assert that many students are currently enrolled in dual status at both high school and college.

Applicant notes that none of its schools are low performing, but that some are underperforming. An example is given of a middle school which went from a score in the 90s to meeting 100 percent of indicators and being rated as the top performing middle school in the state.

(c) Parents are provided with 24/7 online student data as well as a standards-based report card and timely notification regarding assessment data.

Although the district does not appear to have lowest achieving schools, they have demonstrated evidence of improving student achievement while increasing equity.

Applicant has shown improvement in several areas related to the criterion, but has not as yet achieved a clear record of

success.		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant makes available various types of financial information via a website, including actual salaries. The school board publishes both contracts and its check book prior to all meetings. An additional initiative to keep track of grant funds, if awarded, has been approved by the school board, and now awaits approval from the state auditor. The applicant demonstrates increasing transparency, although what they call "expenditures per pupil" does not necessarily identify actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level, although numbers for non-personnel expenses are provided by school.</p> <p>The applicant demonstrates increasing transparency with respect to processes, practices and investments with an area, as identified above, that could be improved.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>Applicant asserts and demonstrates multiple examples of the state's support for its vision and plan through sufficient autonomy, including flexible schedules, blended learning, and customization of learning/education. Applicant cites state law that supports innovation and waives rules that would impede innovation. Personalized learning environments appear to be successfully supported in terms of regulations in this venue.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	13
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant has made a consistent effort to involve all stakeholders in the design of its plan, including the REA, and has given evidence that actual implementation of that input has begun, although actual percentage of teachers in support does not appear to be identified from the teachers' bargaining unit.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	17
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant has a high-quality plan with respect to effective learning strategies for a sequenced and personalized set of instructional goals accompanied by ongoing and regular feedback. Applicant recognizes and discloses areas that need improvement in its current protocol. It provides a rating of various criteria to be addressed with evidence and goals as well as timelines, identification of deliverables, and identification of responsible parties in addressing those goals. Evidences are clearly described, including mastery of critical academic content, often digital, frequent feedback for all, including high-need students. A system is described (EDUCATION ELEMENTS Hybrid Learning Mgt. System) that will provide parents and teachers with a visual rating of student progress regarding all content standards.</p> <p>b(c) Mechanisms for training and support of students using tools and resources section needs additional detail for clarity.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	16
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>C2-a: Applicant reports training efforts for staff, some of which is compensated, and some of which has been done on a voluntary basis. In each case, educator effectiveness is expected to improve as a result of educator training and resources to improve feedback to students with respect to academic achievement and college and career-ready standards. Limited information is provided regarding the use of a staff evaluation system; more would be welcome. As a result, this proposal in its present form does not meet the criterion for having presented a high quality plan for Teaching and Leading.</p> <p>C2-b: The applicant has provided a high-quality plan with respect to this criterion of implementing a personalized learning environment for students that includes alignment with college and career standards and providing ongoing assessment of</p>		

student needs and achievement.. The proposal provides a rating of various aspects of this work along with a plan for improvement on each measure

C2-c: Limited information is provided regarding the use of a staff evaluation system; more would be welcome. As a result, this proposal in its present form does not meet the criterion for having presented a high quality plan for Teaching and Leading.

C2-d: The proposal cites financial incentives for compensating principals and teachers with performance awards for meeting goals defined by the Board. The goals are somewhat ambiguous, and not always linked to student growth or achievement. Limited information is provided regarding hard-to-staff schools, subjects or specialty areas. As a result, the applicant has not provided a high quality plan for this criterion.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	10
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has a good plan to support implementation of their proposal, with some modifications to be made to the academic calendar, addition of four school days, and revision of transportation and starting times. The principal has considerable leeway in assigning FTEs, but are somewhat constrained by an agreement with the teachers' union that employees will not be laid off.</p> <p>D1-a: Little information is provided regarding the central office. As a result, this proposal does not meet the criterion of providing a high quality plan with respect to this requirement.</p> <p>D1-b: The applicant offers principals considerable autonomy, however, imore nformation regarding school leadership teams would be welcome. As a result, this proposal does not meet the criterion of providing a high quality plan with respect to this requirement.</p> <p>D1-c and d: While applicant appears to be making good progress regarding demonstration of mastery of standards at multiple times, this demonstration does not appear to be offered in multiple ways; rather, reteaching weak areas occurs until 70% mastery, for example, is achieved.</p> <p>D1-E: Applicant supports IDEA, SECTION 504 and ADA, but additional information would be welcome regarding exactly how resources and instructional practices work for disabled students, and especially ELLs. Applicant states that they provide support to the latter, but does not explain how.</p> <p>As a result, without more clarity regarding activities and the rationales to accompany them, the applicant has not provided a plan which reaches the standard of "high quality" at this time.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant has a high-quality plan to provide access to content and tools both during the school day and after three, including technical support at all levels. Multiple digital tools are cited to support project implementation, many of which are already in progress. Applicant has a plan for improving systems to house data streams and generate reports to inform parents, educators, and students.</p> <p>Technical support section needs additional detail in order to provide clarity.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	13
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant has a high quality approach to assessing progress in multiple ways, including with stakeholders, Feedback from</p>		

stakeholders and data on teaching and learning will be used for continuous improvement. The applicant describes a self-directed improvement process for stakeholders that includes reflection and ownership, and outlines a schedule for monthly meetings to document challenges and adaptations. Formative assessments will be ongoing, and Johns Hopkins will provide summative assessment.

Additional detail regarding how "reflection and ownership" can be ensured to produce ongoing corrections is needed for clarity;

Additional detail regarding how a summative assessment by Johns Hopkins will inform improvements during the grant would be helpful.

The proposal represents a high-quality plan that provides for continuous improvement toward project goals, based on timely and regular feedback that will be shared regarding progress and investments.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
---	----------	----------

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant cites a communication committee that has had success in the past with respect to engaging with stakeholders. Multiple additional committees and bodies will play a role in providing ongoing communication internally and externally. A high quality plan for ongoing communication is provided, with the notation that some teachers are concerned that the district's plan is a strategy to increase class size or reduce instructional staff numbers.

How "engagement" will be developed is not clear, as communication is only the first part of this criterion.

For this reason, this plan has not achieved the standard of "high quality" at this time, as actual engagement with internal and external stakeholders need clarification.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provides sufficient information regarding performance measures and assessments to be used; specific information regarding numbers and percentages is included.

As a result, this section represents a high-quality plan that provides measures that are ambitious and achievable.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant has a high-quality plan to evaluate the effectiveness of its funded activities, including formative and summative mixed methods of data analysis.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant identifies needed funds and provides information on one-time costs, as well as savings that may be generated by investment of grant funding; state and local funding is described, including a strategy to generate income from an open enrollment program in which students at a distance can enroll, thus producing income for the district. This strategy has generated approximately one million dollars more than was projected for the current school year.

It appears that the budget applies a large amount of money to outside sources for a summative evaluation. For this reason, such a large expenditure would not support implementation of the proposal, but only inform any "after-grant" corrections.

Principal/ principle are confused in the narrative.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	9
---	-----------	----------

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided a high quality plan for sustaining the project's goals with targets and reported income that has already been collected from additional sources, such as private business, and monies for supporting city-wide wifi will be absorbed by the general operating budget.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	9

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes its association with Central Ohio Compact that includes educational entities and economic and business organizations. Strategic principles have been identified and the members have become involved with the Pathways to Prosperity Network to align high school and community college experiences so that students graduate with viable career credentials and work toward post-secondary education. Measures are identified to analyze outcomes. Additional communities and districts have been included, making this a section that supports the competitive preference priority.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Applicant has provided a comprehensive plan to address personalized learning environments, supports for students and educators, and a focus on college and career ready standards through improvement of teaching and learning as well as access for students to effective educators.

Total	210	177
--------------	------------	------------