



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0237CO-1 for Thompson School District

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant has set forth a comprehensive reform vision. The applicant builds on its work in the core educational assurances. The district intends on implementing the Common Core Standards while simultaneously, incorporating the components of the Thompson to Life curriculum. However, the applicant does not specifically address the data systems that are going to be used to measure student growth. In addition, the applicant does not mention the approach that is going to be used to turn around lowest performing schools.</p> <p>The articulates a clear approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement. The applicant identifies the first part as the comprehensive PreK-12 system of support for intervention that is called the Life and Learning Hub. The applicant explains that this part of the plan will provide learning advocates and interventionists who work with staff, parents, and students. The applicant details the second component as the Personalized Learning Pathways. The applicant explains that there will be interventionists that will be able to provide personalized approaches to adjust students' academic pathways. The applicant notes that the third part of the plan is the Community Exchange. The applicant explains they will develop relationships with community partners such as community colleges, businesses, and other community businesses.</p> <p>The applicant describes what the classroom experience will be like for the students participating in personalized learning environments. The applicant explains that some classrooms will be more digitally-based and blended. The applicant explains that the teachers will experience greater autonomy in instructional design in order to facilitate innovation and creativity. The applicant has set forth a comprehensive reform vision, however, the applicant did not provide sufficient details explaining the classroom experience. In addition, the applicant did not specifically address data systems that will be used to measure student growth nor the methods that will be used to turn around low-performing schools. As a result, the applicant receives a a low-medium score of 4 out of 10.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant's approach to implementing its reform proposal will support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation of that proposal. The applicant provides a list of schools that will participate in the project. The applicant believes that in order to be successful in the long-term, they must start in the beginning with their elementary schools. The applicant describes that the total number of students in their early childhood/elementary programs totaled above 50% of students from low-income families. The applicant identifies a comprehensive list of the schools. The applicant selected 20 elementary schools, five middle schools, and one high school and Pre-K school based on the percentage of students being from low-income families. The applicant provides the total number of participating students, participating students from low-income families, participating students who are high needs, and participating educators. Each school that was selected was included on the list with adequate information provided. The applicant's approach to implementing its reform proposal will support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation of that proposal, however, the applicant provided vague documentation on the process used to select the schools. As a result, the applicant receives a low-high score of 8 out of 10.</p>		
<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant details numerous grade band specific activities. For the activities, the applicant indicated the person responsible. The activities are in logical order and cover necessary areas for implementation. The applicant identifies the</p>		

Hub as being main driving force of the LEA-wide reform. The Life and Learning Hub is an information systems warehouse that will catalog student assets and augment a student's progress so we begin to see academic improvement along the way, as well as, an increasing vision of career and academic goals. This hub seems as if it would be very beneficial to students, parents, and teachers. Included in the theory of change, the applicant mentions annual presentations of learning and professional learning communities. Both of these approaches would be suffice in instituting change within the system. The applicant failed to comprehensively address the approach that would be used to scale up the model to schools not participating in the program. The applicant receives a score of 7 out of 10.

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

**10**

**7**

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

The applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning. The applicant outlines goals in which the students are expected to increase at least three percentage points in each of the tested areas. The applicant provides rationale for selecting the measure and determining growth. The applicant describes that the Transitional Colorado Assessment Program will be administered to students in grades three through ten. The applicant explains that they will use the Median Growth Percentile data from the TCAP assessments making the annual goals ambitious yet achievable. In addition, the applicant outlines the achievable goal of increasing the overall graduation rate by approximately 11% by the year 17-18. However, the applicant did not mention the college enrollment rates. The applicant did not provide system in which they can track the actual number of students that enroll in two or four-year universities. The applicant has provided a focused approach to targeting specific grade levels because summative assessment data shows that there is a need for improvement. In addition, the applicant outlines a need to decrease the gap associated with Hispanics and males. The applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals, however, the applicant did not address college enrollment rates nor provide a variety of performance targets. As a result, the applicant receives a medium score of 7 out of the 10.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>

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

The applicant provides some documentation to illustrate a clear track record of success. The applicant addresses the important areas in order to improve student outcomes – data warehousing, personalized learning, and engaging stakeholders. In addition, the applicant has implemented a diagnostic assessment that addresses low performance in the elementary grade level. The applicant explains that it will follow a three-pronged approach of the Thompson Life Plan including the Support Hub, Personalized Learning Pathways, and the Community Exchange. The applicant explains that they will provide early intervention, interim forms of assessment, and consistent forms of communications with parents. However, the applicant did not provide evidence addressing the college enrollment rate.

The applicant describes reform approaches that have been implemented in order to turn around low performing schools. The applicant describes that they will embed age-appropriate college and career readiness discussions starting in PreK. The applicant continues by indicating they will personalize the learning process to align more with student interests. The applicant did not provide in depth information to provide a clearer picture of how these programs are going to specifically turn around low-performing schools.

The applicant will make performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation. The applicant details that they will make data available to teachers using Schoology. The applicant will make data available to parents by posting information to district websites and using the Parent Portal and Infinite Campus systems. The applicant does an inadequate job of explaining exactly the purpose of each of the data systems. It is unclear how each of the programs are specifically link to improving participation, instruction, and services. The applicant does not provide adequate information describing their approach to turning around low-performing schools.

Because the data presented is unclear, it difficult to determine a clear record of success. It appears as if majority of the schools have a growth percentile rank that is equal to or exceeds the state's growth percentile rank. The applicant only presents data from a three-year period, instead of a four-year period. In addition, the applicant does not explain in detail the systems that are used for sharing data and how each of these programs specifically link to improving participation, instruction, and service. As a result of these omissions, the applicant receives a medium score of 8 out of 15.

<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant provides information that outlines where the salaries can be found. In addition, the applicant lists a couple of surveys that personnel participate in throughout the year. The applicant provides a picture of the webpage that used to communicate this information. The webpage serves as adequate evidence to increase transparency in LEA processes. In addition, the applicant outlines that public budget sessions are used as a form of communication as well. The applicant receives 5 out of 5.</p>		
<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant provides evidence of sufficient autonomy and some evidence of successful conditions under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments. The applicant has identified successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State requirements. The applicant has addressed the need of decreasing dropout rates and increasing graduation rate through implementation of ICAP (SB 09-256). The Individual Career and Academic Plans provides an opportunity for multiple stakeholder, including the student, parent, and teacher, to assist the student in creating academic and career goals. The applicant mentions that a teacher and principal evaluation system has been developed (SB 10-191). This evaluation system will be assessing specific strengths and weaknesses of teachers and principals. The applicant did not include requirements that were associated with the change of the curriculum. In addition, the applicant did not provide sufficient information on the successful conditions that were outlined. The applicant provides evidence of sufficient autonomy and some evidence of successful conditions under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments, however, the applicant did not provide sufficient information on the successful conditions and did not include requirements that were associated with the change in curriculum. As a result, the applicant receives a medium score of 7 out of 10.</p>		
<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant provides meaningful stakeholder engagement throughout the development of the proposal and meaningful stakeholder support. The applicant provides a good proposal that outlines how stakeholders were engaged throughout this process. The applicant outlines the process that was followed for incorporating stakeholders during the development of the proposal. The applicant details the Vision 2020 process in eliciting information from a variety of stakeholders. This process provided opportunities for stakeholders to provide meaningful feedback. The applicant addresses including feedback from teachers. However, it was not clear as to whether or not the teachers supported the proposal. The applicant did not provide details outlining specific support from student organizations, early learning programs, parents or parent organizations, or institutions of higher education. The applicant does not appear to have provided additional opportunities for these stakeholders to provide some input into the development of the proposal. The applicant provides meaningful stakeholder engagement throughout the development of the proposal and meaningful stakeholder support, however, the applicant did not provide additional opportunities for stakeholders to provide input and was unclear regarding obtaining teacher support. As a result, the applicant receives a medium score of 10 out of 15.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant propose a quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college-and-career-ready. The applicant proposes a plan for teaching and learning that is based on focusing the students' understanding that learning is key as early as Kindergarten. This plan will be strengthened once students get into the middle grades by the development of their Individual Career and Academic Plan. This plan appears to be a very effective construct to guide the students because it will allow the student to see progress every step of the way. The applicant did not provide details to support the mastery of critical academic content</p>		

and developing skills and traits. The applicant is investigating the possibilities of extending the learning of the students by incorporating options such as blended learning, digital classrooms, and on-site classrooms. This approach will provide students with many more opportunities for discovery and advancement. The Life and Learning Hub is the system in which the applicant will use to communicate frequently providing a system for consistent communication and documentation .However, the applicant failed to address other systems that will be in place when addressing the specific need of the personalized learning recommendations. The applicant did not provide data systems where performance data was provided to the teacher in a timely fashion that would have some kind of impact on the teaching strategies that could be used to make the student successful in the learning environment. The applicant references ICAP numerous times. The ICAP is an excellent way to monitor the students' growth and the progress to graduating and becoming college and career graduation requirements. This seems to be an excellent source of immediate feedback when the student is deciding what courses to take and what career to follow.

The applicant proposes a quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college-and-career-ready, however, the applicant did not provide details to support the mastery of critical academic content and developing skills and traits. In addition, the applicant did not provide specific data systems where performance data was provided to teacher in a timely fashion that would have an impact on the teaching strategies. In addition, the applicant failed to address other systems that will be in place when addressing the specific need of the personalized learning recommendations. As a result, the applicant receives a medium score of 10 out of 20.

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

**20**

**10**

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

The applicant provides multiple opportunities for teachers to continuously improve in the art of teaching. More specifically, the professional development opportunities that are provided are consistent with the approach to professional learning communities. The professional learning community is an excellent forum for supporting the implementation of personalized learning environments. The applicant provides an example of teachers being exposed to opportunities of meaningful professional development in the area of personalizing instruction in an effort to meet the students' needs. The applicant did not elaborate on these kinds of professional development opportunities. The applicant provides some noteworthy assessments and initiatives that are being used to measure student progress. The applicant provided limited information when describing these programs. The applicant did mention that they would be using Shell Center formative assessments merging into the learning management system. The applicant provides a description as to the approach with improving the effectiveness of teachers and principals. The applicant details that they are currently in their second year of using Bloomboard for teacher evaluation. The applicant did not provide additional information on the Bloomboard evaluation. The applicant also mentions that the system will be using the DuFour model of the teaching learning cycle. The applicant does not include some of the mandatory components a high-quality plan missing the timelines and deliverables. In addition, the applicant did not provide training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps. Due to these omissions, the applicant receives a score of 10 out of 20.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>

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

The applicant provides a weak plan to support project implementation. The applicant does not address the organization of the LEA central office or the governance structure. The applicant failed to adequately address governance structure of the organization such as Board of Education and other positions that comprises the leadership team. Also, the applicant did not outline the processes that are followed within this governance structure to provide a clear picture of how decisions are made. The applicant details that the current structure allows for schools to make site-based decisions through their own leadership team. This leadership team is comprised of staff, parent, and students, when appropriate. The applicant did not address personnel decisions and school-level budget. These are two components in which the applicant did not provide any explanation. However, the applicant indicated that the system is currently in the process of creating a feedback system to facilitate continuous improvement. The applicant mentions that the Task Force is currently searching for ways in which the students can earn credits through demonstrating mastery through capstone projects. This would be a good start, but

the applicant would need to provide multiple opportunities with earning credits based on mastery to meet the selection criteria. This concept would need to be explored in all three levels in order to provide a learning environment where the students are being challenged on a consistent basis. The applicant does not address the topic of giving students opportunities to demonstrate mastery of standards. The applicant identifies practices that guide personalized learning, however, the applicant provides either limited or no evidence to support their practices. The applicant receives a score of 3 out of 15.

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

**10**

**3**

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

The applicant did not clearly identify how the LEA and school infrastructure would support personalized learning. The applicant identifies a couple of ways the district is taking steps to ensure that all stakeholders have access to information. The most innovative approach is allowing the parents to have evening access to media center. This ensures that all parents have an opportunity to track their child's progress on ICAP. In addition, the applicant mentions that the website has a bilingual parent portal. This approach shows that the system is looking for ways to reach all of their parents. The applicant did not adequately address the technical support section. The applicant mentions the use of personal digital devices at two the schools. However, the applicant fails to elaborate and provide additional sources of technical support. The applicant does not provide sufficient details outlining the tools that parents and students will have available to them. The applicant does mention that tools and programs are being researched. The applicant refers to using open data systems such as Edmodo and Schoology to provide additional learning supports. In addition, the applicant mentions that they currently use Parent Portal as a tool to share information as an interoperable data system. As systems move forward, they will need to have the technological infrastructure and capabilities to educate and communicate with their students and parents. The applicant did not provide specific details as to how they will support parents and students. As a result, the applicant scores 3 out of 10.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>

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

The applicant identifies a few goals in the quality plan. The applicant identifies the responsible parties for implementing that project. There were five goals that revolved around continuous improvement. Most of the goals dealt with the implementation of Life and Learning Hub. This innovative approach to communication and data would be extremely good idea and be very beneficial to parents if this was implemented. The plan is appropriate and rigorous because a structure in place to support the continuous improvement process. This improvement process will be facilitated by the use of multiple surveys to consistently gather information from various stakeholders. However, the applicant did not include a timeline in the plan. The timeline is a key component to provide a frame of reference and progress of the plan. As a result, the applicant receives a 12 out of 15.

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

**5**

**5**

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

The applicant provides a systematic approach to communication and engagement when working with students, parents, and teachers. One of the most noteworthy ways of communication will be through the Personalized Learning Pathways. The PLP will provide intervention based on the Hub meetings in an effort to personalize learning for the student. It will also be an avenue for parents and teachers to provide feedback. This will provide feedback that will allow stakeholders to make appropriate decisions based on the performance of the student. The parents and teachers will be able to see strengths and weaknesses and provide necessary access to information. In addition, the Community Exchange will be a beneficial approach to communicating with the community. The Community Exchange will encourage an open door policy and provide opportunities schools to give informational presentations to the community. This could be an avenue to create more a positive perception towards the system. The applicant receives a 5 out of 5.

<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant provides some achievable targets within the performance measure portion of the plan. The applicant identifies that during 2013-2014 school year, 11% percent of the student population will be taught a teacher that is highly effective. This number increases five percent each year. This would seem to be an achievable goal. The applicant provides performance measures for each of the grade bands. However, the applicant does not provide a rationale for the performance measures. Some of the measures selected provide timely and formative feedback. For example, the Gold Diagnostic will provide timely feedback. However, the TCAP will not provide timely feedback being that is an annual assessment. The applicant did not address how they would improve the measure over time.</p> <p>The applicant identifies that the current goal for the number of students who are on college and career track is four the 13-14 school year. Then the applicant doubles the amount for each succeeding year. This is an ambitious goal being that during the baseline year, which is not identified, zero students were on the college and career track. In addition, the order of charts was hard to follow and the identification of the targets was confusing. The applicant receives a score of 2 out of 5.</p>		
<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant outlines a plan that has all of the required components including goals, activities, deliverables, and parties responsible. However, the one component that was omitted was the timeline for implementation. Missing this one component does not damage the credibility of the plan, however it something that should have been included to establish when each of the activities were expected to be completed. Three major components of this plan was incorporation of technology, provide additional staffing, and professional development. The applicant will evaluate these components through increased improvement on summative/formative assessments, graduation rates, and surveys. Each of these areas was included in most of the projects. The applicant includes various types of development within the plan, such as technology boot camps and Hub trainings. Some of the explanations were lacking documentation or support. The applicant receives a score of 4 out of 5.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant identifies all of the funds that will support the project. The largest cost of support this project is personnel. This is concerning based on the fact that district may not be able to sustain the success that was achieved during the grant cycle. The applicant indicates that even though majority of the funds will come from the grant, there will be some local assistance with providing professional development. The applicant describes the funds and how they would be used. The applicant justifies the need to purchase more technological devices due the customary textbooks being outdated. The applicant provides a thorough explanation of each of the major components of the budget proposal. The applicant outlines the items that will be a one-time expense and reoccurring expenses. The applicant provides a comprehensive budget. The budget outlines specific items and is outlined in each section based on the categories. This makes the budget easy to follow and interpret. The applicant provides a description of all of the funds. In addition, the applicant identifies the one-time expenditures.</p> <p>The applicant's budget is guided by three major themes; personnel, technology, and professional development. Each of these areas is appropriate in expecting success from teachers and students. Costs associated with personnel are justified given the rationale provided regarding the applicant's need to attract and develop its own personnel, and will prove to be very beneficial and essential in order to have excellent teaching in the classroom. The applicant also provides sufficient</p>		

rationale for the need to provide appropriate technology in order to provide students opportunities for exposure to curricula or experiences that might otherwise not be available. The applicant goes into details regarding some of the descriptions, including total revenue. However, the main concern is the large amount of funds being invested in personnel. Overall, the applicant details an adequate budget, but a large portion of the budget may not be continued after the project. The investment in personnel brings into question the long-term sustainability of this project. The applicant scores a 7 out of 10.

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

**10**

**4**

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant mentions a few good points that solidify that case of being able to sustain the project after the funding is complete. However, it remains a major concern with the amount funds being invested in additional people, rather than programs that current personnel can learn to utilize. The applicant references the field coordinator will establish a strong partnership with various businesses over the course of four years. However, the concern will be that the relationship may slowly erode if that position is not maintained after the grant period. In addition, the applicant details that currently the relationship between the district and the business community is not good. This lack of positive rapport with the business community decreases the chances that they will provide financial backing when it is needed. This section was lacking the appropriate components that should be included in a high quality plan as well. Taking in consideration the large amount of funds being spent on personnel and the missing components of a high-quality plan, the applicant receives a score of 4 out of 10.

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

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

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant identifies the appropriate grade-level bands through the nine desired outcomes for the students and families served.

1. The applicant provides a description of the partnership they have formed with private organizations. The applicant explains that they are partnering with Poudre Valley Health Systems and the Medical Center of the Rockies.
2. The applicant identifies nine population-level desired results. All of the desired results are appropriate in addressing academic needs and socio-emotional needs.
3. The applicant will track selected indicators. The applicant indicates it will develop a system for identifying, then merging student data for the most at-risk students. Once the area of concern has been identified, then the applicant will connect the student with the appropriate agency to provide services. However, the applicant did not address how they would use the data to target resources in order to improve results for targeted students. 3(c). The applicant did not adequately address how they would develop a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students. The applicant provides a very vague response to how it would partnership to integrate education and other services for participating students. 3(d) The applicant does not adequately address how they would improve results over time.
4. The applicant indicates that they selected three partners because they feel that there goals align the district's strategic plan. The applicant plans to align the work of the social-behavior aspects with their PBIS program.
- 5a. The applicant feels that their continuous and frequent assessments, counseling, and Learning advocate system will assist teachers in assessing the needs of the students. 5b. The applicant identifies assets such as personalized options, positive relationships fulfilling needs of future employees and offering real-life job experiences. 5c. The applicant proposes to establish a Community Exchange task force that includes teachers, students, parents, and administrators who will identify the implementation plan for project based needs. 5d. The applicant indicates that Task Force decision and movements will be reported to help parents understand the change process. The applicant outlines that the use of interim assessments and counseling will provide them with necessary information to assess the needs of the students.
6. The applicant identifies ambitious and achievable performance measures that include educational results and community supports.

The applicant provides ambiguous explanations in most of this section. The explanations were not supported with examples or evidence. The applicant does not address how they would improve results over time. In addition, they did not present strong evidence of how they would engage partnerships and families. As a result, the applicant receives a low score of 3 out 10.

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant comprehensively addressed how it would build on most of the core educational assurances. However, the applicant never elaborated specifically on the approach to turn around low-performing schools. In the area of adopting standards and assessments, the applicant addresses the transition from the former curriculum to the new with being assessed by PARCC. In addressing the data systems to measure student growth and success, the applicant includes the need to increase technology and to incorporate a system in which information would be readily available to parents and educators. The applicant outlines the approach of PLCs in which teachers and administrators will be able to develop and collaborate with one another on a consistent basis to discuss excellent teaching strategies and approaches. In addition, the applicant is committed to developing and retaining teachers through the multiple forms of professional development. Some of the evidence was strongly supported, however, not all of the information was clear. The applicant meets the minimum requirements for Absolute Priority 1 through the details provided in this application.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>119</b>
--------------	------------	------------



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0237CO-2 for Thompson School District

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

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>

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

(A)(1) The four assurance areas are not clearly addressed in this criterion.

(a) In its vision, Thompson has described how it will, "create and continuously improve replicable and sustainable projects and activities that embed the Common Core Standards." This part of Thompson's vision is aligned partially to core assurance (#1) adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy. Its vision also proposes to "add nearly 50 staff members to strengthen the core of Thompson's teaching and learning." This part of Thompson's vision is aligned partially to core assurance (#3) that states that the proposed reform should include recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers and principals. The other two core assurance areas (building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction, and turning around lowest-achieving schools) were not included in the applicant's narrative that addressed this criteria.

(b) Applicant provides a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement and deepening student learning (i.e. blended, project-based and personalized learning). The plan for "Community Exchange" makes sense

in an effort to increase equity through personalized student support. The Community Exchange will involve community partners to establish relationships that "provide enhanced feedback loops, just-in-time support, multiple tiered learning opportunities."

(c) Applicant stated that for this project, the classroom will look the same for some students as it has traditionally. For other students, their classroom will be embrace a blended learning setting. There will also be other students who will "transform beyond the four walls into the community." Although the applicant has somewhat described these classroom settings, the classroom experience for the student has not been clearly defined for all students. Because of this grant, the teachers will receive training in blended-learning and project-based learning.

Because all of the assurance areas were not adequately addressed, points were deducted.

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

**10**

**8**

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

(A)(2) Applicant has provided sufficient justification of why Thompson is proposing to implement its reform in predominately the elementary and middle schools.

(a) Applicant has provided justification for selecting the schools in the Thompson district that will participate, although some schools included on the list have a low percentage of high-need students. Evidence provided in the demographic table shows that collectively the applicant meets the RTT-D eligibility.

(b) Applicant has given a complete listing of the schools (all Early Childhood Pre-K programs, all 20 ES, all 5 MS, and 1 HS, which is the Alternative Education school), that will participate in this RTT-D proposal. It has a completed table that contains the geographic data for each school. The proposal states that collectively it meets the competition's eligibility requirement.

(c) Applicant has provided in the proposal the evidence that this criteria required (10,396 participating students; 1,422/13% high need students; 4,431/42.6% low-income families; 743 participating educators).

The applicant has described its approach to implementing its reform proposal (e.g., schools, grade bands, or subject areas) to support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation of that proposal. The applicant proposes to implement a reform in its Pre-K through middle schools, along with an alternative high school in the same district. The applicant addressed all of the criterion to some degree, but did not thoroughly describe the process that the applicant used to select schools to participate. Two points were deducted, but the score still fell into the high range.

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

**10**

**7**

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

(A)(3) The applicant has included elements of a high-quality plan. A table was provided in the proposal describing a four year time-line, activities, responsible parties, and deliverables such as the goals and deliverables to scale up the initiative in order to ensure sustainability of the program for future students who are enrolled in Thompson schools. Examples would be to continue to reach out to stakeholders and communicate scope of work; include initiative in the Boys and Girls after-school program; expand the Research Hub, a data system that reaches out to parents).

The applicant provided the components of a high-quality plan addressed to scale up the initiative, but the overall credibility of how the RTT-D grant would be scaled up to translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools was somewhat unclear. The applicant did not provide a logic model or theory of change of how its plan will improve student learning outcomes for all students. This criterion scored in the mid-range of points.

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

**10**

**6**

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

(A)(4) The applicant proposes in its vision to implement: 1) Research Hub Expansion; 2) Use of digital devices; 3) Promotion of Life Plan; 4) Additional staffing; 5) Establishment of Community Exchange.

(a) The applicant had ambitious goals and realistic targets (3% each year), but did not provide rationale of how the applicant came up with the annual range of targeted percentages.

(b) A feasible approach was presented to determine if there was a decrease in achievement gaps. For example, the applicant plans to measure the difference between the white students, which is the highest subgroup, and Hispanic

students who score "at or above" on the State TCAP assessment. The applicant has presented an ambitious plan to reduce the gap by 13% in reading and 11% in math for both 4th and 7th grades by SY 2017-18.

(c) The table in the application reveals that the applicant proposes ambitious targets for increasing graduation rates, but applicant fails to provide a rationale of how targets were determined.

(d) The criteria for college enrollment was not addressed in this application. The applicant stated that this data was not available, but indicators (i.e. ACT/SAT scores, AP course enrollment, counselor contact records, etc.) could have been a resource for projections used to support this criteria.

(e) This criteria was optional for 'Postsecondary Degree Attainment' and was not addressed. No points were subtracted.

Although the targets were ambitious, the Information provided by applicant for the selected criterion was not strongly supported with evidence to determine whether these targets would be achievable. Therefore, a mid-range score was awarded.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>(B)(1) Applicant has provided some evidence that several schools within the LEA have had success with areas addressed in this criterion.</p> <p>(a) Applicant states there have been improvements in ELL and Title I schools when using the SIOP approach model, and provided evidence in a table found in the Appendix of its application (e.g., 6 of 7 schools had equal or greater reading MGP scores than the district or state; 4 of 7 schools had an increase in their reading MGP score from 2012 to 2013; 3 of 7 schools had equal or greater writing MGP scores than that of the district or state; 4 of 7 schools had an increase in their writing MGP score from 2012 to 2013; 5 of 7 had equal or greater math MGP scores than that of the district and state; 6 of 7 had an increase in their writing MGP score from 2012 to 2013). The applicant stated that there has been success in increasing graduation rates and in the ACT scores, which is a state-required assessment.</p> <p>(b) There was insufficient evidence that Thompson has achieved ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools, and in fact, the applicant has stated otherwise. For example, The applicant states, "Thompson has experienced pockets of improvement in student learning with regard to the state assessments, but for the most part, those scores remain flat."</p> <p>(c) The applicant describes a current data system, a Parent Portal, and Infinite Campus system, but there was no evidence how student performance data has been made available to students, educators, and parents in the past four years, nor how this data has been used to improve participation, instruction, and services.</p> <p>The applicant has provided evidence that improvements have been made in the areas of sub-groups, such as ELL and Title I, but overall, the applicant provided insufficient evidence that it has had past successes in improving student learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps. A low-medium range score is awarded.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>(B)(2) Thompson has provided an extensive list of transparency measures it currently uses in its practices (e.g., Public budget sessions, District website postings of salaries, Information shared at public board meetings, participation in salary/benefit surveys).</p> <p>(a-d) Appendix F of the application provided a screenshot of web page and a link to access school-level expenditure data from State and local funds.</p> <p>The criterion was supported by sufficient evidence that the district uses multiple ways to provide the information. Overall, there is sufficient evidence there is a high level of transparency. The total points were awarded.</p>		
<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>

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

(B)(3) The applicant has provided several examples of supporting evidence that it has in place successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the proposal.

Thompson's State, Colorado, has implemented standards for Individual Career and Academic Plans (ICAP) through passage of Colorado General Assembly Senate Bill 09-256. The applicant has also partnered with a higher education institute to help support ICAP. Applicant plans with RTT-D initiative to increase professional development for teachers on further developing and building ICAP systems across the participating schools.

The applicant states that The Colorado General Assembly's Senate Bill 10-191, which was related to teacher and principal evaluations, was "instrumental in bringing ICAP to reality." The proposal provided insufficient evidence for the reviewer to draw this same conclusion.

The applicant referred to two separate State laws that support the implementation of the proposal, and has demonstrated some evidence that there are successful conditions and sufficient autonomy to implement personalized environments. A mid-range score was awarded.

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

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

(B)(4) Applicant described meaningful stakeholder engagement throughout the development of the proposal. There was evidence that applicant developed a "roadmap" based on their Vision 2020 needs assessment. Applicant also provided data from a survey previously administered to its high school students by their teachers on what they wanted from their educational experiences. Although neither of these inputs were directly related to this grant proposal, it was an effective way to begin the process of meaningful stakeholder support for the proposal.

(a) A list of names of stakeholders were included in the application narrative.

It was written in the application that stakeholders were provided information about the grant at area meetings or through one-on-one meetings with organization leadership. The group of stakeholders were made up of organizations and businesses. Their role in this program would be to provide or receive direct services (Loveland Chamber of Commerce; Loveland Boys and Girls Club would receive staff salaries and supplies for after-school program; High Plains Environmental Center would provide project-based learning and personalized learning experiences for student, as well as support and provide assistance to special education students; Front Range Community College & Aims Community College would support concurrent enrollment, and personalized career and academic planning with students). There was no evidence provided of these meeting agendas or dates of these meetings, sign-in forms, etc., but several support letters from these entities were attached with clear details of the partnership's commitment to the proposal. It was stated that these organizations were offered to read the draft of the proposal, but the application narrative failed to describe how their input was received or how the proposal was changed because of the input that was provided from these organizations.

(i) Thompson has collective bargaining representation and signed the proposal, but no other evidence of direct engagement and support for the proposals from teachers in participating schools was provided.

(b) Application contained support letters from parents but no evidence that students were involved or gave input for this proposal or that the principals of each of the participating schools provided input on the development of the proposal. The Early Childhood Council provided a support letter. Their partnership with RTT-D should help with transitioning services from early childhood programs to the school setting.

Much of the criterion in the section was addressed, but there was not conclusive evidence to demonstrate that was sufficient input and buy-in, especially from teachers, during the development of this proposal; Therefore, a low-medium range score was awarded.

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

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

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

(C)(1) The applicant did not provide a strong high-quality plan to describe how all of its participating students will be provided a learning program for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready.

(a) The plan failed to describe adequate details of the strategies suggested, and it did not mention any strategies or plans for the high school alternative education students.

(i) Pre-K students would begin to build a Life Plan that would most likely allow them to understand how their learning is key to their successes in accomplishing their goals. The proposal narrative described how the parent and student would work with school counselors, and how this Life Plan will develop throughout the student's school years. The applicant failed to describe what strategies would be used for other than Pre-K students (i.e., ES, MS, and Alternative High School) to understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals.

(ii) Common Core standards and assessments would be used to identify strengths and weaknesses as well as measure progress towards goals. A quality plan was described for students who were in 3rd through 8th grades that identified how students and parents would pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards. The weakness in the plan does not address how alternative education students were going to identify and pursue learning goals.

(iii) This plan included a thoughtful approach for gifted students to be involved in deep learning experiences, as well as all students through 6th grade, who want to further their academic interests. Again, high school alternative students were not included in the plan design for experiencing deep learning.

(iv) Young students will have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning through methods such as Positive Behavior Intervention and Support program, and LIFE Plan/ICAP. The plan was weak in describing the details of how the PBIS and LIFE Plan/ICAP would bring diverse cultures together. There was no plan for this criteria at the high school alternative school.

(v) Students will have opportunities to master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving through the Thompson schools. The applicant did a poor job of describing the components of a high-quality plan for this criteria. There was no evidence of how internships would be designed, nor what personalized learning or project-based activities would look like.

(b) The applicant did not provide in its learning plan evidence to adequately address that parents and teachers will have the support to access a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals and ensure he or she can graduate on time and college- and career-ready; a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments; high-quality content, including digital learning content as appropriate, aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements; or, ongoing and regular feedback.

(i) Although the applicant states that students will have access to a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development, there was no evidence provided describing each of the components required of high quality-plan.

(ii) The applicant fails to identify a timeline, deliverables of the specific instructional approaches and environments, and person(s) responsible for the implementation of programs mentioned in the proposal (i.e., FHS Learning Lab, global digital learning, etc.).

(iii) The applicant fails to identify a timeline, deliverables of the specific high-quality content that will be used with the RTT-D initiative, and person(s) responsible for the implementation of programs mentioned in the proposal (i.e., FHS Learning Lab, global digital learning, etc.).

(iv) Applicant fails to define the components of a high-quality plan for ways that its initiative will provide ongoing and regular feedback.

(A) Although the applicant states that there will be a system established for frequently updating individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards, or college- and career-ready graduation requirements, it does not clearly identify the key goals of the proposed system, activities to be undertaken and the rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables and the parties responsible for implementing the activities - all components of a high-quality plan.

(B) Applicant did not address this criteria in its proposal (Personalized learning recommendations based on the student's current knowledge and skills, college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements, and available content, instructional approaches, and supports).

(v) Applicant states that it plans to work with ELA staff to make accommodations, but there is no clear description of high-quality strategies that will be used or any plans to improve teaching strategies in order to help ensure that high-need students are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

Because the criterion in this section lacked some or all of the components of a high-quality plan for preparing and improving learning for students, a mid- range score was awarded.

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

**20**

**7**

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

(a) Applicant has not provided a high-quality plan that supports its individual and collective capacity to teach and lead this RTT-D initiative.

(i) Applicant proposes to use a PLCs model to support teachers working together to align curriculum to common core standards, and the State's requirement of the individual Career and Academic plan. Although the PLC model is a viable choice for effective implementation of personalized learning environments, the proposal does not specifically address a plan for carrying out this PLC work.

(ii) Applicant proposes to use embedded formative assessments to elicit optimal learning approaches. There is not enough evidence or description of the proposed assessments to support that the training systems and practices that they have in place will provide opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches.

(iii) Applicant describes what it has done in the past to measure student progress toward meeting State standards, but does not clearly identify how the RTT-D initiative will regularly gather the data and use the data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators.

(iv) Applicant does not provide a clear description of its district's teacher/principal evaluation system, nor has it provided a high-quality plan on how they will receive feedback or support recommendations and interventions as needed for improvement.

(b) Applicant does not provide sufficient evidence to understand how participating educators have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

(i) Applicant supplies information related to a former project on how teachers were provided actionable information that helped them identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests. The application does not make reference to how it plans to add or expand current resources with RTT-D initiative.

(ii) Applicant describes what high-quality learning resources and embedded formative assessments that it plans to use to provide efficient data through the Hub for teacher evaluation systems and connect with resources. The applicant also explains that it plans to do more training with principals for inter-reliability evaluation measures. There was not enough detail provided in the narrative to understand how feedback will be obtained and used to create and share the resources.

(iii) Applicant supplies information related to a former project where a gap analysis was performed to identify instructional and learning resources that respond to individual student academic needs and interests. The application does not make reference to how it plans to improve the feedback about the effectiveness of the resources in meeting student needs during the RTT-D project.

(c) Applicant does not give sufficient description of how the DuFour model for PLC work will be designed to support training, policies, tools, data, and resources that will enable a way to structure an effective learning environment.

(i) Applicant does not address the district's teacher evaluation system or how it will take steps to improve, individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate, for the purpose of

continuous school improvement.

(ii) Applicant does not address the training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps.

(d) Applicant did not provide sufficient evidence for its plan to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals, including hard-to-staff schools, subjects, and specialty areas. Applicant describes what has been done in the past to address services to special education students, and how professional development training dollars have been used to help teachers become effective, but there are no details provided as to how the RTT-D grant will improve teachers.

The proposal narrative for this section is underdeveloped. The applicant appears to base its plan on several science-based approaches (DuFour PLC team work, data-driven professional development, which focuses on school leadership and student achievement), but the proposal does not explain how these approaches would be utilized in relation to the continuous improvement process. Therefore, this criterion section received a mid-range score.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>

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

(D)(1) The applicant has described partial elements of a high-quality plan to meet this criteria. There was no evidence of any policies and rules associated with Thompson implementing a personalized learning environment for its students. Although the proposal describes some of the practices in place, it provides weak evidence that there is an infrastructure established to fully support RTT-D grant implementation.

(a) There was no evidence of components included in a high-quality plan to show how the central office supports the services of schools (i.e., goals, timelines, deliverables, responsible parties, objectives, etc.). The applicant describes how principals and other administrative staff provide direct services to the schools, but applicant does not address how the governance structure works at the central office.

(b) The applicant was more specific in describing CCEL's high quality plan to continue its leadership meetings monthly. The application states that the leadership teams are provided sufficient flexibility and autonomy over the schools to do such things as change the calendars and schedules. The applicant does not address the autonomy level for managing school-level budgets.

(c) Applicant states that a 'Task Force' wants to address giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit, based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic, but there was not given enough supporting evidence to assess this criteria.

(d) Applicant does not provide enough evidence to know that there is a high-quality plan in place to ensure that students will be given the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways.

(e) Applicant states that more educators have been put in areas to serve special education and bilingual students, but it is unclear what is planned for the RTT-D initiative for this criteria.

This section scored in the low range.

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
---	-----------	----------

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

(D)(2) The applicant has not provided sufficient evidence that a high-quality plan has been put in place to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system with the support and resources when and where they are needed.

(a) Applicant states that CCEL provides participating students, parents, educators and other stakeholders access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources by posting them on the website, providing the information in other languages, and utilizing the parent portal to provide the information. The applicant says that parents can gain this access from the public libraries if they don't have Internet at home, but there is no evidence that public libraries are a viable

solution to the community's access. There was not evidence of a high-quality plan of components such as the timeline, responsible party, etc. to ensure that all will have access to support this criteria content.

(b) Applicant has not provided sufficient evidence that CCEL have appropriate levels of technical support. Stating that two of the schools (one of which is not a participating school in this RTT-D proposal) have personal digital devices and that "important information" is posted to the website, is not an adequate strategy for meeting this criteria.

(c) Applicant states that "parents and students will have access to test scores, attendance, etc. through an electronic data system," which is an appropriate method, but there is not enough details or definite plans to implement an open data system. Stating that some schools may use "Schoology" and others may use something such as "Edmodo", is not sufficient in describing a high-quality plan for using information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format, and to use the data in other electronic learning systems.

(d) The proposal has not outlined a high-quality plan that included comprehensive policies and infrastructure for schools to use interoperable data systems. Although the applicant is not sure of the system that will be implemented, the proposal lacked additional details and the policies that support the plan.

The applicant has provided limited evidence that would describe how the technology infrastructure and district policies have been considered for implementation of the RTT-D grant program. Without a strong technology infrastructure, it is unlikely that the goals of this grant will be met. Therefore, a low-range score was awarded.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>(E)(1) The applicant has proposed a plan to demonstrate CCEL's improvement process. In a table, the applicant has provided a list of proposed programs, the rationale, activities, measure, deliverables, and responsible parties. The plan lacks a steadfast focus on how the programs will be monitored to determine progress. The table was easy to read, but it is difficult to determine what the intent was in describing the process for timely and regular feedback on progress toward the project goals. Because of this, a high-medium range score was awarded.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>(E)(2) The applicant has included in the table its description of a plan for monitoring continuous improvement of its program. The content of the table is unclear in describing how there will be ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders for the purpose of making continuous improvement to the program. There is some explanation in the narrative that describes what elements of the program it would monitor, evaluate, and make improvements, but the applicant fails to address this criteria sufficiently to understand that there is a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve its plans. A low score was awarded.</p> <p>The proposal lacked a clear plan of how it was going to make stakeholder communication stronger with RTT-D grant implementation. The applicant has stated that communication with stakeholders has not been strong in the past; there is some explanation in the narrative that describes what elements of the program it would monitor, evaluate, and make improvements, but the applicant fails to address this criteria sufficiently to understand that there is a clear and high-quality approach to strengthening ongoing communication and engagement in its plans. Two points were awarded for this criterion.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>(E)(3) The applicant has completed the required charts with student data and projected targets for the years of the RTT-D grant period. There was no narrative that explained the rationale for determining how performance measures or targets were determined.</p> <p>The applicant proposes ambitious targets for teacher and principal effectiveness status. The applicant shows a target of 100% for teachers and principal to be considered effective or highly effective by the end of the grant period. It is difficult to determine if this is achievable; the baseline shows that in many schools, few teachers and principals already have this</p>		

status, and the RTT-D program does not contain evidence that a strong professional development program for teachers is planned. There is also no evidence in the proposal to describe the requirements for a teacher to reach effective status.

The applicant has a performance measure for PreK-3 populations that describes that it wants to increase the percent of students at or above "Widely Held Expectations(WHE) on the Gold Diagnostic in Cognitive Development. The baseline ranges from 77% to 91%. It is difficult to assess if the target to increase by approximately 4% is considered ambitious when the baseline is already in a high range.

The applicant includes academic performance measures and targets for different grade bands of students, including sub groups, and subjects that are assessed. This data is not broken down by different school sites. The targets seem to be ambitious (e.g. 11th grade reading baseline is 13.3% proficient and the target by the end of the grant is 80%), but without some rationale for determining these targets, it is difficult to determine if this is achievable.

The applicant provided the required data tables, but there was not a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve its plans, nor was there any rationale to determine the performance measures chosen and targets.

Subsequently, the reviewer did not have enough information to provide judgment to determine if the targets were ambitious or achievable. Therefore, a low score was given.

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

**5**

**1**

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

(E)(4) The applicant has not provided evidence that a high-quality plan has been designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the technology they are proposing to implement. There is no evidence how CCEL will monitor the professional development trainings for teachers and principals to determine if the outcomes are being reached or if adjustments need to be made. Although the applicant states in the narrative that the schools have "begun to examine ways of determining the success of digital devices," there was no evidence that the district has a model to follow or a theory of change that they plan to follow. A minimum number of points were awarded.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>

**(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

(F)(1) The applicant has identified funds that it plans to use as part of the RTT-D initiative.

(a) The applicant proposes to use predominately RTT-D funds to support the program with some help from local funding source for professional development. It is unclear what funds described in budgets would be considered supplanting versus supplementing. The applicant has stated in the proposal narrative that many of the reforms identified in the budget were already in place (i.e. STREAM opportunities, gifted and talented programs, advocates in the HUB, etc.), therefore, it is unclear if some of the RTT-D funds are supporting existing programs or for new costs.

(b) Applicant appears to have budgeted sufficient funding for personnel (program administrator, interventionist facilitators, learning advocates, support staff, coordinators for STREAM/STEM, clerical) and supplies (technology/personal learning devices) and costs related to professional development (stipends for summer workshops and substitutes for PD during instructional school year), but, the reviewer has insufficient evidence to determine if costs are reasonable and sufficient because it is unclear how the RTT-D initiative has been separated from other programs in the district.

(c) Applicant has provided rationale for funding, but it is concerning that the personnel costs are very high and unclear the role that each person will have directly related to this RTT-D initiative. For example, the budget lists a clerical assistant's salary, but there is no job description or narrative provided to understand their role in carrying out project goals. Other personnel position, such as a field coordinator, briefly describes their job responsibilities, but this role was not mentioned in the proposal as a position needed to carryout the goal for personalizing a learning environment. The applicant has identified one-time expenditures (data collection and retrieval system) versus multiple-year expenditures. It seems unlikely

that the districts will be able to maintain the ongoing operational costs of this project, especially in the category of personnel, once the RTT-D funding ends.

The applicant's budget, including the budget narrative and tables were provided. A mid-range score was awarded.

<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
---	-----------	----------

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

(F)(2) The proposal fails to produce a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant.

The applicant plans to use its evaluation results and data to sustain program components by supplying evidence to use in the support of passing a mill/bond that will give them more money post-grant to sustain program components. The proposal did not focus on a science-based model for either technology integration or professional development. The applicant stated in the proposal that there were issues with a high turn-over rate of teachers, which was a reason that a former project had not produced system-wide positive results, but there was nothing in this plan to address the strategies that would be used to maintain those teachers and sustain their employment in the district.

The proposal did make reference to past-project components that were being sustained, but there was not convincing evidence to think that a Mill/Bond would pass to help sustain this program. A low mid-range score was awarded for this criteria.

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

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

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

(1) Thompson provides names of partners and stakeholders in its narrative proposal (health system organizations, environmental businesses, community colleges, Boys and Girls Club, etc) that have the potential to help carry out the RTT-D goals, but there was little evidence of this support provided by the businesses and organizations. There were few letters of support presented to validate that these businesses and organizations have a commitment to the goals of the RTT-D project. A stronger plan of support describing the actual commitment of these partners and how they plan to recruit and fund students for their programs, or even Memorandum of Understandings that describe in details how the plan will be carried out is needed to score high on this criteria of the Absolute Priority section.

(2) Applicant proposes changes in middle school for at-risk students (i.e. more engaged and more successful in school); Hispanic students, and gifted and talented. The proposal briefly mentions the partnerships that will help assist with making the desired results, but the proposal is very shallow in describing any sort of comprehensive approach that will likely result in success.

(3) **(a)** Applicant proposes to track the indicators by matching data with Community Exchange partners' activities. A way to track survey results to identify the type of work or experiences a student has with the external community to determine their interests and level of engagement is also planned. This part of the criterion seems to be a feasible approach to personalizing at the student level. **(b)** Applicant's statement in the proposal to "use the results of surveys and assessments to make 'real time' adjustments to improve program offerings" does not adequately address how the adjustments will help such students they plan to target (i.e., ELL, at-risk and gifted and talented). **(c)** Applicant has a plan to increase "Community Exchange" work, but a timeline, or thoughts/ideas/strategies about how this will be accomplished is not described in this proposal. **(d)** There is weak evidence presented and insufficient amount of research cited in this proposal that indicates that the results will improve over time.

(4) Applicant proposes to use PBiS and other counseling approaches, but evidence relating to partnerships that will help with behavioral needs' services has not been established, or at least there is no evidence presented in proposal.

(5) **(a-b)** Applicant has identified the needs and assets, and discussed the partnerships, although a complete picture of how these needs and assets align with the partnership's goals and the family and community supports. **(c)** A Community Exchange and Coordinators seems to be a feasible way to create a decision-making process and infrastructure to select, implement, and evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating students. **(d)** The proposal addresses parents and families as part of their Hub initiative, but the proposal is weak in addressing the efforts and plans to engage parents and families in the proposed activities. **(e)** The Task Force and coordinator will be in charge of assessing the Community Exchange process. Task Force responsibilities and timeline, as well as job descriptions for the coordinator

would be helpful in determining if this implementation plan would likely lead to success.

(6) Applicant has provided a chart identifying how it will routinely assess the progress in implementing its plan to maximize impact and resolve challenges and problems.

Applicant has produced little evidence that the competitive preference priority criterion was met. The plan was weak in demonstrating how it would integrate public and private resources. Because the proposal had gaps in services and did not produce convincing evidence that it will build strong partnerships to help with carrying out goals of the RTT-D grant, a low-medium range score was awarded.

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

Throughout the proposal narrative, the applicant provided evidence that it wanted to build a reform initiative based on the core educational assurance areas. Some of the evidence was more strongly supported (focus on common core standards, personalized learning plans, data systems), while other areas (stakeholders involvement, parent engagement, teacher/principal effectiveness) were lacking the support needed for the reviewer to get a clear understanding of how the plan would be successful in personalizing learning environments that would lead to academic successes.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>94</b>
--------------	------------	-----------



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0237CO-3 for Thompson School District

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

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>

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

(a) The applicant, Thompson School District, describes a vision to build on the four core educational assurance areas with a focus on "Thompson to Life" (T2L). The implementation of the model begins with PreK and is designed to communicate and make appropriate and timely academic and behavioral adjustments to ensure students' school experience prepares them to enter adulthood with a career or continued education. The model consists of three components (Life and Learning Hub, Personalized Learning Pathways, and Community Exchange).

Students involved in the T2L reform initiative will be afforded the necessary skills needed to shift their learning experience to a personalized learning environment with the support of parents, teachers, and administrators.

Teachers involved in the T2L reform initiative will be afforded opportunities to receive training that will enhance student engagement while embedding a standards based curriculum, individualized instruction, and assessments in a classroom setting.

The Community Exchange component of T2L extends beyond the participating schools into the community to develop relationships with community partners (e.g. businesses, community colleagues, nonprofits, etc.).

(b) The applicant has provided general evidence supporting a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized learning. For example, through the Personalized Learning Pathways component, opportunities for blended, project-based learning and personalized learning will occur. However, there are no specifics of how this will occur. The Community Exchange component will provide multiple tiered learning opportunities (passion quests, internships). The applicant does not provide sufficient evidence to address how the teachers will be trained, how students' learning will be blended, or how parents will be involved. The applicant provides unclear details as to how the approach will accelerate student achievement.

(c) The applicant provides minimal evidence detailing the classroom experience (e.g. some classrooms will be the same; others will be digitally-based, etc.). There is little evidence that supports what the RTT-D grant will do to change the current classroom experience for teachers as a result of the Thompson to Life vision for personalized learning instruction.

Weaknesses: Two of the four core educational assurance areas were not addressed. The applicant did not address building data systems, or turning around low achieving schools. Additionally, there was very little evidence to support what the RTT-D grant will do to change the classroom experience for teachers while implementing the Thompson to Life (T2L) vision of personalized learning instruction.

Based on the evidence provided, this section score is a 7.

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

**10**

**8**

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

(a) The applicant's narrative has provided a description of the process that was used to select grade bands to participate. Based on the narrative, it is not clear how the applicant selected schools other than starting with PreK and expanding up to one high school.

(b) The applicant provided a detailed chart listing all of the schools that will participate in grant activities.

(c) The applicant provided the total number of participating students, participating students from low-income families, participating students who are high-need students and participating educators in the appropriate tables. The applicant provided a rationale for focusing on different grade bands outlining that the first component of the plan would start with PreK students and that this would be instrumental for the success of the plan.

Weakness: The percentage of participating high-need students is low. There was no clear rationale why the district is not including more high-needs students.

Based on the selection process, the selected schools have the necessary internal structures in place, including regularly occurring embedded professional development opportunities and strong administrative support for the initiative for personalized learning to implement their proposal, reflecting a score of 8.

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

**10**

**7**

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

The applicant has outlined a high quality plan to demonstrate how the reform proposal will be scaled up to support district wide change with the participating schools to improve outcomes for participating students. Through each component of the T2L model, various activities will occur. The first stage, Learning Hub, is where the student's Life Plan will begin. This plan will transition from school to school, grade to grade, and will be digitally monitored. Through the second component, Personalized Learning Pathways, student learning will be tailored to his or her needs and interests. Through the Community Exchange component, each student will receive personalized and project-based community opportunities to

help them accelerate in their career and college planning. The applicant mentioned feeder schools, but never addressed how they relate to the scale-up model. The applicant also provides a detailed chart of goals, timelines, activities/tasks and the responsible parties.

Weakness: The applicant's plan lacks evidence to support how it will scale up the proposed initiative into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools to produce outcomes.

Based on the evidence provided, this section scores a 7, because of insufficient evidence to support what will happen beyond the participating schools in the district.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

The applicant has outlined goals that demonstrate how the reform proposal is likely to result in improved outcomes for all students.

(a) The applicant sets proficiency goals to increase test scores over 5 years at a projected growth rate of 2%. A rationale for this method is not given; however, based on growth for the past two years, a 2% increase seems achievable and ambitious. As administrators and educators become more aware of specific areas in which each student needs support, students will have multiple opportunities and pathways to demonstrate mastery resulting in improved performance in all areas on summative assessments through the Individualized Learning Plan as indicated in the vision for the reform, thus attaining predicted increases (goals). The applicant provided goals that meet or exceed the state ESEA goals for each subject, in each applicable grade and subgroup.

(b) The applicant provides goals for decreasing the achievement gap among the various subgroups at a projected 1% decrease each year. Based on past data growth trends, a projected 1% decrease in the achievement gap is ambitious and achievable.

(c) The applicant provides goals to increase graduation rates at a projected 2% each year. Based on past data growth trends, a 2% increase in graduation rates is ambitious and achievable.

(d) There is no data presented for increasing college enrollment.

Based on the goals and rationale in this section, the applicant has set goals, except for college enrollment, resulting in a score of 7.

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

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

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

The applicant details information to demonstrate its effort to advance student learning and achievement over the last four years.

(a) Based upon the applicant's chart, the applicant demonstrated some success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement for participating schools. The applicant provided evidence that shows mean scores have remained the same, however, there have been gains in ELL and Title 1 Schools that used the SIOP approach to improving literacy. The district does not explain what the SIOP approach is.

(b) The applicant does not provide evidence of a track record of success for its lowest-achieving schools.

(c) The applicant provides evidence to indicate a record of success in presenting and communicating student performance data with students, parents, and educators through the Parent Portal, Schoology, meetings, Infinite Campus, and its website.

This section scores a 5, because there is a lack of evidence provided to demonstrate a track record of success in improving the lowest achieving schools. The applicant also does not provide information describing how it closed achievement gaps, high school graduation rates or college enrollment over the past four years.

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

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

a) The applicant explained that actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff are made public via the district's website and the U.S. Department of Education and the state.

(b) The applicant provided evidence that actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff are made public via the district's website and the U.S. Department of Education and the state.

(c) The applicant provided evidence that actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff are made public via the district's website and the U.S. Department of Education and the state.

(d) The applicant provided evidence that actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level are made public via district's website and public budget sessions.

Screenshots were provided in Appendix H.

Based on the evidence provided, the applicant demonstrated a high level of transparency and scores a 5.

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

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

The applicant has demonstrated evidence of successful conditions and autonomies to implement the proposed personalized learning environment. For example, under the state's reform agenda, the Colorado Department of Education partnered with the Colorado Department of Higher Education, the Colorado Community Colleges and with districts to support districts in the creation and completion of the Individual Career and Academic Plans (ICAP) Implementation Plan to ensure all students, grades 9-12, have access and assistance to personalized learning plans. Successful conditions of the state's reform agenda include implementation of rigorous college and career-ready standards in response to the need to aim higher in expectations for student learning. The applicant provided evidence supporting the district's implementation of ICAP and aligning ICAP to the state's Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness assessment. Under another state requirement a teacher and school leader evaluation instrument was developed and is being implemented in districts throughout the state.

Based on the conditions for personalized learning already in place through the state's reform agenda, the applicant demonstrates that the conditions and autonomies are in place to implement their proposal, resulting in a 10 score.

<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>
--	-----------	-----------

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

(a) The applicant included evidence of stakeholder engagement and support by providing a description of how students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools were engaged in the development of the proposal and how the proposal was revised based on their engagement and feedback. Surveys were administered to teacher and students. The applicant provided data from the results of the surveys. For example, of the student perception survey data, students in grades 3-5 were 72% positive and students in grades 6-12 were 69% positive. The teacher perception surveys showed a higher level of satisfaction with each component of the proposed system T2L. Because the applicant proposed to continue implementing programs already in place, it included perception survey data to demonstrate support from teachers and students.

(b) The applicant's letters of support from various key stakeholders is minimal. The applicant provided letters of support from the Chamber of Commerce and the Thompson to Life Task Force.

Weakness: The applicant does not present information on whether the LEAs have or do not have collective bargaining representation; therefore it is difficult to determine if the applicant has provided sufficient evidence of teacher support against this criterion. There were no letters of support from parents, unions, teachers, or other community members.

Based on the evidence, the applicant proves that there is some support to implement its proposal, resulting in a mid-range score of 10.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>a) The applicant attempts to provide a high quality plan that demonstrates that, with the support of parents, learning can be improved by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college and career-ready. The applicant describes how it will continue to imbed career and academic discussions throughout PreK to high school. By middle school, students will begin to develop their personal goals to transition to high school (e.g. the plan is designed to begin at Pre-K here students will start their Life Plan). The applicant does not address the identification and pursuit of learning and development goals linked to college and career standards or college and career graduation requirements to help students understand how to structure their learning needs. There are no specific learning needs discussed by the applicant. The applicant addressed access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning through internships, personalized learning, and project-based learning. There is evidence of professional learning community to train teachers to help students develop strategies for personalized learning environments. There is also evidence of teacher evaluation tools such as BloomBoard that allows descriptive feedback from principals and can archive teachers' artifacts.</p> <p>(b) The applicant helps educators identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student needs by embedding formative assessments and standards outlining where students are in their learning process. At an early age, students will begin to personalize their learning with a variety of high quality instructional approaches in multiple environments (e.g. blended classrooms, experienced-based classroom, global digital learning, and project based learning opportunities).</p> <p>(c) The applicant provides minimal evidence to ensure that mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning. The applicant mentions using advocates, interventionists, and counselors, but does not explain how they would train or support students.</p> <p>Weaknesses: The role of parents is not described to help ensure strategies are accomplished, or to help determine if individual student learning is appropriate to the child. While the applicant included all the components of a plan, there were many areas that were unclear or not fully described.</p> <p>This section receives a score of 7.</p>		
<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12</b>
<p><b>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant does not provide a high quality plan that demonstrates that participating educators will engage in training, and in professional teams or communities, that support the effective implementation of personalized learning.</p>		

(a) Teachers, coaches, and principals will be provided training through Professional Learning Communities (PLC) on how to create a focus on collaborative learning, monitoring students' progress through common short cycle assessments, RTI protocols, and problems solving techniques. Also, professional learning community training will focus on how to use tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

(b) Teachers and leaders will use tools such as BloomBoard to track student data, provide feedback, and archive teachers' artifacts. Educators will receive training through the PLC on how to use digital content, tools, and resources. The applicant provides a description of how it will use optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs through formative assessments, standards outlining where students are, teacher perception surveys, and teacher evaluation systems.

(c) The applicant provides minimal evidence that shows how school leaders and school leadership teams will take steps to improve, individual and educator effectiveness and school culture and climate for the purpose of continuous improvement.

d) There is a lack of evidence to demonstrate that the applicant has a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals.

Weaknesses: The applicant does not present a high quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers. The applicant does not provide information demonstrating how it will support school leaders and leadership teams while implementing the proposal.

Based on the evidence provided in this plan, the applicant does not fully comply due to incomplete elements, resulting in a score of 12.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>a) The applicant provides information on how the LEA organizes its central office to provide support and services to all participating schools. The district provides instructional coaches through Title 1 Funds. Other details are minimal.</p> <p>(b) The applicant provides school leadership teams in participating schools with sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school-level budgets through monthly meetings with school administrators.</p> <p>(c) The applicant gives students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery through capstone projects, but this is only in high school.</p> <p>(d) The applicant explains that it is currently identifying ways to give gives students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times.</p> <p>(e) The applicant provides learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners by increasing its ELA and special education staff.</p> <p>Based on the evidence provided in this section to support project implementation through comprehensive policies, practices, and rules to facilitate personalized learning the applicant does not have a high quality plan. The plan lacks details such as timelines, deliverables, and key personnel responsible for implementation. The plan provided minimal evidence resulting in a low range score 3.</p>		

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>(a) The applicant will ensure that all participating students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders, regardless of income, have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation by using school libraries, two public libraries, providing adaptive approaches for students with special needs, and the district's website.</p> <p>(b) The applicant ensures that students, parents, educators and other stakeholders have appropriate levels of technical support through a range of strategies such as using personal digital devices, posting information on the website, and increasing technology use.</p> <p>(c) The applicant allows parents and students to export their information in an open data format and to use the data in other electronic learning systems, such as Schoology and Edmodo.</p> <p>(d) The applicant ensures that LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems through the Parent Portal.</p> <p>Based on the evidence provided in this section to support project implementation through comprehensive policies, practices, and rules that facilitates personalized learning, the applicant does not include a high quality plan. The plan lacks details such as timelines, deliverables, and key personnel responsible for implementation.</p> <p>The plan provided minimal evidence resulting in a low range score of 2.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant describes a plan for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. The applicant does not address key goals. The applicant provides evidence of project level activities, rationale for the activities, deliverables, and responsible parties. Data will be collected and analyzed to provide feedback. The plan addresses how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by the Race to the Top – District grant. The chart provides descriptive details outlining specific activities such as: professional development targeted for teachers, support for teachers as they work to become more effective, deeper and more thorough approaches to teaching, and TOSAs professional presenters.</p> <p>Based on the evidence provided for a plan to implement a continuous improvement process that provides regular feedback on progress toward project goals, the applicant did not fully explain its goals resulting in a middle range score of 8.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant provides a high quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders through various means of communication. The applicant indicates that communication is embedded through the relationships upon which they are building. Surveys will be used to supplement ongoing summative and formative assessment data, and from that data improvements and adjustments will be made to the website and through blogs to notify parents. The applicant also provides evidence to ensure the line of communication and engagement among partnerships, advisory boards, teachers, and coordinators remains open.</p> <p>Based on the evidence provided for a high quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement the applicant includes all components of a high-quality plan and described in detail how the plan will be carried out, resulting in a high range score of 5.</p>		

<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant outlines ambitious and achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for each required and proposed performance measure. The targets for each year will be utilized to inform planning and performance management for the RTT-D reform efforts throughout each level of implementation: classroom, school, and district. Measures that are described by the applicant are critical to making every student outcome visible and holding schools accountable for those outcomes. They are actionable at the school level meaning that school leaders, teachers and staff can use them to make changes that will have demonstrated impact. The applicant provided evidence to demonstrate how it will monitor the implementation process. Through surveys the applicant will be able to provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action to reveal the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern. The applicant will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress by analyzing data from the surveys and examining targeted professional development activities.</p> <p>Based on the evidence provided for performance measures the applicant has proposed measures that are ambitious and attainable overall and by subgroups. The applicant described in detail the rationale and how the data will be used to improve the measure over a period of time, resulting in a high range score of 5.</p>		
<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant provides a high-quality plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities by continuing to monitor and determine measures of effectiveness through assessment and engagement. To determine effectiveness, the applicant provides evidence of records of professional development sessions, additional staff, and personnel. The applicant plans to collect feedback data from each professional development session. Some feedback will be immediate (e.g. intercessions, or the technology boot camps). The applicant will require teachers to participate in summer camps to examine comparisons of achievement and growth targets on summative and formative assessments. Current and future evaluation initiatives are specified that will allow for continuous improvement and adjustment of the reform plan.</p> <p>Based on the evidence provided for a high quality plan for evaluating effectiveness of investments, the applicant has fully addressed the selection criterion, resulting in a high range score of 5.</p>		

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>(a) The applicant identifies all funds that will support the project. The major cost items in the grant are technology, staffing and professional staff.</p> <p>(b) The proposed project budgets are reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the proposal. However, there is a concern about the personnel costs. From year to year the personnel costs change, and there is no rationale provided to explain the fluctuations. Additionally, the annual costs for personnel do not seem to tie back to the cost description and justification. The applicant also plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, but does not consistently identify what for what costs it will make this request.</p> <p>Based on the evidence provided for the budget, there are concerns about personnel and indirect costs, resulting in a score of 7.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not include a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. The applicant explains that the proposal was created to leverage and align with funding from other grant sources (EARSS, 21st Century and Colorado Legacy Foundation Integration Grant for Teacher Effectiveness). The applicant indicates that it will implement a process to renew and update programs that were ended due to lost funding. The plan includes support from State and local government leaders, and addresses how the applicant will evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes to inform a post-grant budget, and it includes an estimated budget for the three years beyond the grant period.

Based on the evidence provided for the sustainability of project goals, the applicant does not include components of a high quality plan, such as timelines, deliverables, or key personnel responsible, resulting in a score of 4.

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has outlined in its narrative some partnerships that will address students' social and emotional needs. These partnerships include The Boys and Girls Club and the High Plains Environmental Center (HPEC).

1. The applicant includes selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all children within in the LEA and at the student level for the participating students by providing a chart that contains the population group, the type of result, and the desired results.
2. The applicant presented a chart that provides data on participating students, with special emphasis on students facing significant challenges, such as students with disabilities, English learners, and students affected by poverty, family instability, or other child welfare issues. The chart indicates the subgroup's performance on assessments and their proportion of the total population in the school.
3. The applicant has developed a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students to other high-need students and communities in the district over time.
4. The applicant plans to use assessments to monitor improved results over time.

The applicant provided information in the narrative, but did not directly address the priority. So many of the components for this criterion cannot be found, resulting in a score of 2.

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has presented a reform initiative that will build on the core educational assurance areas as a personalized learning environment is implemented. The initiative uses collaborative, data-based strategies and 21st century tools such as online learning platforms, computers, and learning strategies to deliver instruction and supports tailored to the needs and goals of students, with the aim of enabling all students to graduate college and career ready. For example, each student will have an Individualized Learning Plan throughout their school career. Each component of the T2L model is aimed to monitor this plan throughout a student's school career.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>119</b>
--------------	------------	------------

