



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0382GA-1 for Barrow County Board of Education

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This application describes a technology-based solution to access educational resources, mentors, experts, and online educational activities in a collaborative learning environment. It aims to increase access to rigorous and engaging instructional content by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing exposure across core content by connecting to various business and community sectors;</li> <li>Expanding their foreign language program;</li> <li>Infusing digital media instruction in teaching and learning;</li> <li>Providing Ipads to participating teachers and students;</li> </ul> <p>There are many activities cited to increase the capacity of teachers and leaders by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creating hi-tech on-line collaborative forums between teachers and various stakeholders, particularly in higher education;</li> <li>Providing professional development through the University of Georgia's college of education;</li> <li>Expand teacher certification (unsure how this will be accomplished; no details provided)</li> </ul> <p>Also activities cited to include data-use are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Making personal student growth data available to students and teachers through a mobile Ap.</li> </ul> <p>While a technology-based approach provides many opportunities for personalization for students and teachers, the vision lacks coherence to fully understand how all the pieces fit together to result in an increase in student performance and improved teaching. Rather, the activities read like a random list, instead of a well-aligned strategy. It is also unclear how this approach intends to connect to the overall district strategic plan or current instructional programs.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application lists approximately 15 schools; which were selected by default as they wanted to include all schools. There is no demographic break down for the schools, however the vision mentions that the overall low-income population is 61%. Unsure of the size of each school.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is not enough detail to understand the implementation or timing of the plan. It mentions full implementation during the first year for all students, but it is not clear how that will be accomplished, and how it will be monitored and adjusted, and thus, shared to expand successful practices system-wide. Not understanding implementation, there does not seem to be potential for strategic, system-wide scaling.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Summative assessments included in the application show an acceptable increase over time, given that the baseline begins at a relatively high rate in most grades and subjects, ranging from the mid-80 percentile up to beginning 90<sup>th</sup> percentile. This data is not disaggregated by specific grade-levels, but rather collapsed into grades 3-8 and then high school end of course by subject; making it difficult to target specific needs or strengths. Additionally, there is no low-income sub-group, which would be important for targeting where high-need is traditionally found. There are some subjects, such as grade 3-8 science, where African American students are not targeted to increase to the same level as their White counter-parts. The same holds true across data provided for gap analyses; African American/White gap remains wider than with other groups.</p> <p>Graduation rate is appropriately increased over time; however, African American targets are almost ten percentage points below their White counterparts.</p> <p>College enrollment increases appropriately over time. However, given the high baseline rate cited previously in core subjects, one would expect the baseline rate to start above 57% for "all", and increase beyond 68%. It is unclear why African American students baseline data perform below White students and are projected to achieve at a lower rate than White students, yet they are projected to have higher college enrollment rates in the baseline year than White students.</p>		

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

	Available	Score

(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	6
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application lists a number of honors earned by the school district that acknowledge their strong and innovative technology-based program. Note that the honors are related to technology accomplishments, not academic achievement.</p> <p>The district illustrates successfully decreasing the drop-out rate between 2007 and 2011, moving from 4.7% to 2.%; a significant drop given the low numbers. While it cites an increase in graduation rate, the 75.4% cited in the text does not match the chart provided for baseline data, which displays 67.3%. There is mention of the state changing the calculation; however, there are no confirmed numbers from the state, as cited in the application. There is no explanation of how these trends were calculated; if not by cohort, their meaning is less significant.</p> <p>The application highlights gap trends between white and minority students that narrow over time. However, that data is hard to interpret as it aggregates grades 3 to 8 in each subject, which can wash out effects. Nevertheless, it does illustrate a positive gap closing trend. Also illustrated is an increase in aggregated math performance for grades 3-8 over the state; Georgia had an 82% pass rate, while Barrow had 85%.</p> <p>The final chart shows a number of increased trends in various subjects over three years. However, it is unclear what years are captured, and the pass rates in all subjects displayed are extremely low. For example, the highest improvement is in U.S. History, moving from 7.8% to 19.5%. One of the lowest is American literature, moving from -1 to 1.9%. One potential explanation would be the Y axis is scaled differently; however, there is no explanation to that end.</p> <p>In sum, there are some positive trends and honors cited, but improvement is spotty, and not easy to discern given the aggregation of the data over multiple years in one data point</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>School-level personnel salaries are posted on the district website annually. Also annually, the superintendent posts a video that provides clear explanations by line item on the budget. Regarding data transparency, the district mentions sharing state data results, and that detailed test scores are available to the public, although there is no mention how often or how they are shared.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	3
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Barrow county is a charter school district approved by the state department of education. The application describes governance structures via school committees that exist in each school. These committees have a direct liaison to the district and board of education. There is no mention of how state or district policies support charters in terms of funding buildings, or how their policies provide flexibility over people, money, or time, which is crucial for personalizing education. While charters tend to operate under more flexibility than traditional school districts, that assumption is all that can be discerned from the application regarding flexibility or autonomy.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A video summarizing the program was created to inform stakeholders about the project, and a survey was posted online to solicit stakeholder feedback. Principals communicated program plans to their staff, and links to the video and survey were provided to district staff to solicit their comments. Confirmation was obtained that at least 70% of school staff at each facility was willing to support and participate in the program. There was no mention of parents or community members specifically in the engagement process, or face to face meetings beyond the district.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application explains the selection of a technology-based solution to provide personalized instruction to students. Software programs are cited that allow instruction to be adjusted to student achievement levels, yet the district is seeking ways to more personalize that solution by giving students more options to control choices. The creation of an online collaborative community will allow the district to create more interactive teaching and learning forums.</p> <p>The description of how the numerous online course subjects and the online forum fit together is absent. How will instruction be sequenced logically, and how will it connect to state standards? How will students move from individual practice to guided learning?</p> <p>Although the application references free internet access for students in need, it is unclear how big that need is, and what will be provided to meet that goal. Also, no staff or training needs are identified as a part of the plan, or how partnerships will be formed for the online community, or vetted for quality.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application explains that an important motivation factor for student engagement is providing “learning for a purpose.” To help connect what is learned in the K-12 system to college, the district will leverage online forums with higher education partners. The same is described for connecting students to professionals in the field for project-based learning lessons. Essentially, students select course pathways based on their interests, and then have available a host of engaging options to enhance their experience to include:</p>		

- Courses designed and supported by researchers and professionals in the field
- Participation in film-making projects
- Marine-based activities, some taught underwater, by the Georgia Aquarium and Georgia Tech
- Global outreach programs that include a telescope project in Australia and a project through Porsche originating in Germany

These are just a few examples of activities described in the application, which also outlines numerous resources to support teachers on these various projects.

The application includes a long list of supports provided to students and to inform the community, which include support for study habits, scholarships, and a community “in-reach” program to invite various professionals to collaborate with students and teachers.

The plan is infused with many opportunities for personalizing student learning. While there is mention of a data dashboard that will share “high quality data with multiple stakeholders”, it is unclear what type of data will be shared. There is little mention of how high-need students will be supported, other than assistance with study habits.

While this plan mentions a number of engaging and interesting projects and learning opportunities for students that are greatly enhanced by technology, it is unclear how quality will be vetted, and how these resources will be carefully aligned to ensure a coherent educational program throughout grade levels that will prepare students for college.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	14
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The application states that teachers will be trained on methods to assign and grade technology products. To address the district’s identified weakness in math and special education, the application proposes to have 64 teachers dual certified in special education and math; both certifications for each teacher. Additionally, the University of Georgia College of Education will work with teachers on using technology and collaborative learning tools, and will produce instructional videos that will be posted on the district’s portal.</p> <p>Teachers will also gain support from each other in co-developing lessons, and will participate in summer internships to gain updates in science and mathematics. The application also lists a number of activities to support teachers in project or problem-based learning.</p> <p>Leaders will be supported by the Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement to help build a pipeline of strong leaders. That work is outlined in phases with the first being a needs assessment, second the development of Barrow county leader standards and competencies, third will pilot the program, and finally prepare for sustainability through support by visiting consultants.</p> <p>The use of data to identify and differentiate supports or training is not mentioned, nor is the use of leader or teacher evaluations.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	4

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>Application describes how central office will be organized to support the work, starting with the creation of a Director position to lead the work, and a description of all the positions that will report to the director. The positions appear to cover the scope of the plan, including programmers, data specialists, and student support services.</p> <p>The application describes the need to revise several policies for this project in areas such as internet use, copyright use, and branding for example, to accommodate collaboration with various partners.</p> <p>Most changes are projected to occur at the school level, which will be supported by a leadership team to assist with implementation, and to connect to governance teams and central office staff.</p> <p>The application mentions the need to expand training for teachers of students in special education, and to provide more tools to improve outcomes of high need students. Also mentioned is the development of aps to assist students in special education and ELL students.</p> <p>The only mention of leadership support is in the form of professional development on leadership and teaching, but it does not reference how or what type of autonomy or flexibility will be granted to leaders or how they will be able to use people, money, or time.</p> <p>There is no mention of how students will progress from grade to grade, or how they will demonstrate mastery to move on to each transition level.</p>		

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>Accessible use of technology is referenced throughout this application. The program aims to extend its technology-based course options from math and science to their entire core curriculum. To support students with limited internet access, all participating students beginning in the fourth grade will have access to an iPad that they can take home to complete school work.</p> <p>To support teachers, students, and parents on how to use the technology and to support them, there are a range of services and tutorials available on their online portal. It is unclear how those supports will be delivered in homes with limited access; perhaps through the student iPads. Meetings designed to solicit feedback from both technicians and stakeholders are also cited as a support mechanism.</p> <p>The current data system the district is using does not current have data export capabilities. However, the district is pursuing that capability for the future, and mentioned that their Barrow Dashboard App will pull data from a warehouse to share with students, which will include their personalized learning plans.</p> <p>The application mentions that their system, Infinite Campus, is fully interoperable with the other district data systems, including human resource and instructional improvement systems.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Application states that grant funds will seed a Continuous Improvement Center (CIC) to connect all the various project pieces in one place. The CIC will be staffed with The Findings Group, an independent evaluation firm specializing in K-16 educational evaluation. CIC team members are cited as being integral to coordinating with the multiple stakeholders involved with this project, although no details are provided regarding how often they will meet, or how information or feedback will be shared or managed. There is a chart outlining the types of data that will be collected to gain information on lagging and leading indicators, although time is not always clearly delineated. Some measures do not mention collection frequency, others say "frequent" without explanation of what that means, and only a few are detailed, like "quarterly." Given the spotty detail, it is difficult to judge whether this monitoring plan will provide timely and adequate feedback on the plan's progress. A thorough explanation on how progress will be communicated is found in the next section, which highlights a number of communication modes and venues. Overall, a concerted effort to pull all the data elements under one department through the creation of the CIC, who will provide external evaluation support and expertise, is a plus.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Communication of progress results are cited to be executed through media venues, at board and governance meetings, through newsletters, and video and other media outlets like the district website. The application also references the use of social media to share the experiences of the students, as a means to have them serve as program "ambassadors."</p> <p>Progress will also be reported through an annual "state of the system" report by the superintendent, and stakeholder groups will create dashboards (not clear what data will be included) for various stakeholder groups, and quarterly stakeholder meetings will be convened to interpret data and make recommendations based on feedback.</p> <p>Parents are not mentioned frequently, except that they will have access to many of the web-based venues. It is unclear whether parents are included in the quarterly stakeholder meetings.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Approximately 12 performance measures are listed, and an explanation for selection of each measure is provided. These measures include age appropriate assessments, which cover both cognitive and non-cognitive measures. Many of these measurements are collected on an annual basis. It was unclear which of these measures are intended to provide more immediate leading information.</p> <p>The application mentions that several of their measurements are under transition by the state, thus, citing the potential need to develop or include other assessments, perhaps in the form of instructionally-based rubrics to support program evaluation.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application describes program evaluation through several mechanisms. One is to have the manager of each of the 12 project areas monitor progress against that area's budget and projected outcomes through a monthly report. The report will track status using color coding. Additionally, the outside evaluation group will work with instructional personnel to monitor student progress, and teacher and leader development. Reports are to be made available to teacher and student advisory committees who will in turn respond to recommendations for improvement. Video reporting summary evaluation outcomes will be posted online for all stakeholders to review, and on-line forms will be made available for public comment. While this is thorough, it is unclear how often the external evaluation team will monitor and report progress, or exactly what type of areas will be monitored. Additionally, it is unclear if there are more immediate feedback mechanisms, such as immediately after teacher training sessions.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The budget is described in narrative and in table-format. Some categories are described in detail and others are not. For travel, the application explains that fees are higher the first two years for increased training, but there is no indication how many people would be covered under that category. Equipment costs are detailed and clear. Each category clarifies whether it is an ongoing or one-time cost. The Green Screen project budget and several other unique project budgets are extremely clear and detailed.</p> <p>Did not see mention of other fund support from other sources.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>To sustain the partnerships developed through this proposed program, the application cites that the partnerships will be maintained past the grant in exchange for scheduling services. Products developed from the project are also cited as a permanent product with ongoing use past the grant. There is no mention of how the project will be sustained monetarily, nor mention of support from the state or local government leaders. Also no details on how equipment will be maintained and updated, or how personnel will be maintained.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	2
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The competitive priority section mentions the importance of the project creating a collaborative environment through online sources to bring additional expertise and resources to teachers, students, and their families. There is no mention of any partnerships, although other sections in the application highlight numerous partnership activities with higher education institutions.</p> <p>There are no indicators identified, no results cited, no tracking or monitoring mechanisms mentioned, no discussion of improved results, or any mention of how capacity would be built in staff.</p> <p>There is some suggestion of scaling through the creation of the portal and building an online community, although it is not directly referenced. The application does mention the goal of improving achievement for special education students, and for English Language Learners.</p> <p>Overall, this section describes how collaboration can be formed to support students, both at school and at home, but it does not address many other criteria required for competitive preference priority.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application describes a program designed to create meaningful and innovative instructional options for students through the development of various online tools and resources. The programs described are intended to increase student achievement, particularly in weak performance areas identified by data, and to personalize instruction, with an emphasis on making it relevant to students, and to today's technology needs.</p> <p>There are many resources to train leaders and teachers, which come together from various resources, including higher education institutions, and using web-based technology.</p> <p>The application cites several means to monitor program and student progress, using a number of monitoring mechanisms at the project level, evaluation from an external research firm, and through various summative and formative assessments.</p>		

Total	210	105
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	3
<p>Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The optional budget is designed to solve the issue of internet access for students that have limited internet access at home. The multi-pronged solution involves allotting an iPad for each student to use at home, and to install a Wi-Fi bubble in an area that will increase and improve internet access in areas where it is currently problematic. The application states that the project can move forward without the bubble, but adding it will significantly increase cover age to their high needs population.</p> <p>It is unclear how the enclosed budget maps to the above described activity. While it mentions Ipads and a Wi-Fi bubble, there is no line item for equipment. If there is no equipment associated with the Wi-Fi bubble, it is unclear what other expenses are associated with its installation. There is also a line item for a position to oversee instructional alignment within the project, but there is no explanation in the narrative on how it ties to the internet access problem identified in the narrative. In sum, the rationale is strong, but the budget does not match the rationale.</p>		



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0382GA-2 for Barrow County Board of Education

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presents a comprehensive and coherent reform vision situated in a research report published for the NSF that focused on cyberinfrastructure for education and learning for the future (CELF). The applicant provides a brief yet clear context for its vision, succinctly explaining the district's establishment as Georgia's first K-12 Research District for the purpose of investigating next-generation teaching and learning environments beyond the bandwidth barrier. The applicant establishes its strong collaborations and partnerships with public institutions of higher education and its direct connection to Peachnet, Georgia's state run research and education computer network.</p> <p>The premise of the proposed grant activity is continuation of and expansion of the applicant's earlier work begun with the Georgia Institute of Technology to develop the Direct To Discovery (D2D) collaborative teaching model. The model's initial efforts were funded by a \$1.7 million dollar grant from the Governor's Innovation Fund to establish a pilot program in 16 middle and high school STEM classrooms. The applicant presents a bold vision to expand implementation of Direct to Discovery across the entire core curriculum in elementary, middle and high schools by expanding collaboration with Georgia Tech to 20 partners, establishing 20 partnerships with University of Georgia, and establishing 10 partnerships at Georgia State University.</p> <p>The applicant clearly details the Direct to Discovery model which requires a high-tech collaborative teaching environment by establishing long-term partnerships between classroom teachers and university content experts. Together the classroom teacher and content expert craft course enhancements and co-teach the course. The applicant contends that the Direct to Discovery model expands student choices and provides new options for personalized learning.</p> <p>While the Direct to Discovery model is the central focus of the proposed work designed to accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning, and increase equity through personalized student support grounded in tasks based on student academic interests, it is not the sole focus. The applicant has taken a comprehensive approach to include other elements. Recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers and principals is addressed by including professional development for support teachers and staff, the proposed development of a school leaders pipeline. Personalized learning solutions are evident in the applicant's proposed establishment of a Direct to Discovery TV Web Channel, emphasis on creation of original student digital media, and provision of an iPad to each participating student, teacher, administrator, and content expert.</p> <p>A clear and credible approach is presented to accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning, and increase equity through personalized student support through the applicant's plan to make data available to each student through a mobile app Dashboard the applicant proposes to develop, with versions created for teachers, students, administrators, and content experts. The applicant acknowledges it has a 61% free and reduced lunch rate, and thus proposes to ensure that every student has the Internet services required to assure equity of access across the entire district.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant is a charter district comprised of 8 charter elementary schools, 4 charter middle schools, and 2 charter high schools, each with its own governance team. All 14 schools in the district will fully participate, and letters of support from the governance teams are provided. The applicant provides a list of the names of the 14 participating schools.</p> <p>The applicant does not provide the total number of participating students, the total number of participating students from low-income families, participating students who are high-need students, and participating educators. Additionally, the applicant does not describe the process used that led to the decision that all 14 schools in the charter district would actively participate.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	1
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposes a start-up date when the 2014 school year begins, but a high quality plan for scale up and reform beyond the charter district's schools is not provided by the applicant. The expansion of the Direct to Discovery model to all core curriculum areas and all grade levels in the district supports the applicant's goal of creating the next-generation, highly collaborative teaching and learning environment. The applicant does not provide a high-quality plan detailing how the proposed project would be scaled up or how it would help the applicant reach its outcome goals.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant projects that its proposed activities will accelerate learning so that the number of non-met targets will be reduced by 50% in five years. Achievement gaps data is presented based on the subgroup pass rates on the College and Career Ready Performance Index (CCRPI). The applicant explains that Georgia does not yet have a full state data set that allows the ability to set baselines based on value-added modeling, but it does acknowledge that it fully intends to integrate the value-added modeling into the proposed Barrow Data Dashboard when it is possible. Graduation rates are provided by the applicant as an estimate since the state is moving to a five year cohort. The graduation rate targets are the four year cohorts. While the applicant acknowledges it did not include some subgroups due to their small number, it is not clear how the decision was made or what the minimum number was to be included.</p> <p>In most cases, the applicant projects pass rates to increase 3-6% for all summative assessments across the span of the grant project. In Table (A)(4)(a), it is not clear why there are two bands of percentages indicated, both labeled Grades 3-8 CRCT Pass Rate for Science with different numbers in each. The greatest increases are projected for Blacks and for high school End of Course exams. The greatest achievement gaps are for Blacks and students with disabilities, but the applicant has projected decreases in the gaps for all areas but one. It is not clear why the applicant projects a widening achievement gap for Blacks on the Grades 3-8 CRCT English/Language Arts exam.</p> <p>The applicant has projected a substantial improvement in graduation rates for Blacks (increasing from 57.7% in 2010-11 to 73.9% in 2015-16), Hispanics (increasing from 55.6% in 2010-11 to 82.2% in 2015-16), Whites (increasing from 65.9% in 2010-11 to 81% in 2015-16), and students with disabilities (increasing from 23.9% in 2010-11 to 57.7% in 2015-16). The applicant proposes steady increases in the college enrollment rate, increasing two to three percentage points each year the grant is implemented.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant presents ambitious yet achievable goals for overall groups, as well as specific subgroups, for each participating grade band.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	12
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant clearly demonstrates its record of successes by detailing recognitions on a state and national level. Of particular note is the recognition of the superintendent as State Superintendent of the Year and an award as "Top Ten Savvy Superintendents in the Nation" by eSchool magazine. The district has also been recognized for its leadership and accomplishments in teaching, learning and technology initiatives. For example, it was designated the number one large American school district with the fullest implementation of technology benchmarks in digital education by the National School Boards Association.</p> <p>The district clearly demonstrates its ability to effectively improve student learning outcomes and close achievement gaps by raising student achievement, high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates. The applicant provides clear evidence of its success in reducing the dropout rate to only 2.3% in 2011. The district has responded to data indicating subgroup achievement gaps for its English Language Learners, particularly among Hispanic and Asian students, by hiring a Language Evaluation/Minority Family Engagement Specialist, providing resources to families of these students through a Family Academy, and increasing the numbers of teachers with an ESOL endorsement. On a system-wide level, the district has focused on RTI and differentiated instruction as a means of closing the achievement gap for students with disabilities. Finally, the applicant notes challenges students have encountered in math pass rates, but presents evidence that clearly shows a steady improvement since 2008, resulting in math pass rates at elementary and middle schools that have surpassed the state average since 2010.</p> <p>The applicant does not indicate its success in increasing college enrollment rates of its students nor does it address the criterion related to low performing schools. Making available student performance data is also not addressed by the applicant.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant demonstrates a high level of transparency in its processes, practices, and investments. Annual reports are generated and posted on the district website and each school's website which provide the actual personnel salaries at the school level for all instructional and support staff, actual personnel at the school level for instructional staff only, and actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only. The superintendent produces a detailed video discussion of each budget line item, including non-personnel expenditures, that is posted throughout the year on the district's website. The district also posts detailed analysis of students' test scores.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant is a fully operational charter school district. It was approved by the state department of education in 2010. Each school has its own governance committee, and each grade cluster of schools has a governance committee. A district-wide committee functions as the liaison between the schools and the Barrow Board of Education, the entity with the authority and responsibility to manage and operate all 14 schools. The existing structures utilized by the charter school district will facilitate the necessary actions and autonomy required to implement the proposed personalized learning environments described.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant demonstrates a high level of stakeholder engagement, support, and participation. For purposes of preparing the grant application, the district created an executive summary and a short 3 minute video to inform stakeholders. Additionally, an online survey was administered to provide information and comments to the planning committee. Principals met with their school teams and shared information and feedback with the planning committee. All employees received an email with the links to video, survey, and the executive summary and all materials were posted on the district and individual school websites. Governance teams, which include parents and teachers, at each site were also involved in development of and approval of the proposal. The applicant provides letters of support from governance teams, institutions of higher education, local banks, and city mayors. This criterion was awarded full points given the numerous strategies and approached employed by the applicant to engage all stakeholders in development and revision of the proposal, as well as the broad support evidenced by letters of support from various external stakeholders.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant acknowledges challenges it has identified, as well as needs and gaps in the district. These include the need to do more personalized instruction. The applicant currently uses Classworks to address this need, but it acknowledges that Classworks does not provide students with options or alternatives to design their own pathways. Another vendor solution utilized by the applicant is Education 2020, also known as e2020, but it requires students to use the vendor's website. The applicant proposes to respond to these needs and gaps by creating an entire online community, expanding online courses, developing online summer capacity building workshops, and providing free access to the Internet for every student. The applicant fails to provide a high-quality plan for an analysis that identifies specific goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	7
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

While the applicant details many of the projects and activities it proposes to implement, it fails to present a high-quality plan that identifies specific goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

The applicant builds its approach on the premise that students must engage in learning for a personal purpose, and one way this would be accomplished is through collaborative partnerships between teachers and content experts through development of course enhancements or project-based learning experiences presented through 3 or 4 interactive video conferences in a semester which would result in students or student teams creating a media-based project created on the iPad. The applicant's plan to link students directly with researchers, scientists, and graduate students provides opportunities to deepen student learning while also broadening their access to diverse opinions, ideas and perspectives, and participating in teamwork and critical thinking processes in an online and digital environment. While the applicant's current focus has been on STEM classrooms, it proposes to expand to all grade levels and content areas by increasing numbers of fully participating researchers at Georgia Tech to 20, utilizing resources and professional development programs and staff at University of Georgia to provide collaborative outreach, and partnering with Georgia State for 10 staff to provide outreach services, and co-design green-screen studios. The partners extend beyond higher education to health experts in the Georgia Partnership for TeleHealth, Georgia Aquarium, and 10 global outreach programs. Motivation of students is considered in the use of digital media deliverables for course assignments and broadcasting of those projects on monitors within schools.

The applicant proposes the Direct to Discovery online portal as a central place where students could request homework assistance, access resources, meet in student work groups and think tanks, teacher interest groups, provide access to online courses, the Barrow Digital Dashboard, and iBooks and assistance videos.

It is not clear how the applicant would provide frequently updated individual student data to monitor progress or how this information would be available to parents or students to manage and track student learning. The applicant does not present adequate information concerning how learning recommendations would be linked to a student's personalized learning needs. The accommodations and strategies necessary for high-need students to achieve success are not addressed.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The proposed Direct to Discovery model will allow teachers and students throughout the district to actively partner with over 70 scientists, masters teachers, content experts, and cultural exchange partners from all over the world as they participate together in project-based learning and course enhancements, while also providing new opportunities and connections for local community support agencies and individual parent volunteers.

The applicant links it plan to help educators improve instruction and increase capacity to support student progress by targeting two identified needs - math achievement and gaps for students with disabilities. The applicant proposes funding for 64 teachers to gain dual certification in special education and core content areas for middle school and high school, with primary emphasis on math. The applicant will partner with University of Georgia to develop instructional videos related to digital resources and collaborative learning tools that can be accessed on the proposed portal. Teachers will also participate in summer fellowships focused on expanding content knowledge in science and math. Teachers will work with one colleague, a University of GA professor and one graduate student to design lesson plans, video lessons, and create professional development guides. All resources will be posted on the proposed portal.

The applicant proposes a partnership with the Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement to develop comprehensive leader standards and competencies, develop effective models of leader development, and develop a cadre of coaches and mentors.

Of particular concern is the applicant's failure to directly address how it proposes to regularly and intentionally measure student progress and use data of student progress to inform practice. The applicant also does not indicate how the teacher and principal evaluation system would inform the project.

The applicant refers to student choices, personalized learning, and options, but it is unclear how the proposed project is particularly responsive to students with disabilities or Blacks, the two subgroups with the greatest achievement gaps. It is not clear how students with limited experiences with technology will be supported to learn using the digital and technological tools or how accommodations would be made for students preferring other options to demonstrate mastery. Lastly, the connection between the proposed activities and alignment with college- and career-ready standards and graduation requirements is not clearly drawn.

The applicant does not provide the elements of a high-quality plan, including goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	6

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes one new department to be headed by a Director of Strategic Development responsible for oversight and implementation of the proposed project and future proposals. Other proposed employees in the new department include a project manager, media production manager, two programmers, a portal administrator, and administrative support.

The applicant proposes creation of leadership teams at each school to work with the charter school governance teams and central office staff, but it does not describe their decision-making power or indicate who would comprise the teams or how members would be identified. It is not clear how often teams would meet or mechanisms that would be used to communicate or inform governance or LEA staff.

While the applicant often mentions the criteria, it does not adequately address how its proposal will give students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic; give students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways-other than digital media; and provide learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners. Since the applicant focused attention on its specific needs for students with disabilities and English learners, simply mentioning development of specialized apps for high needs students is not adequate response.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes that each student, beginning in the 4th grade, will have an iPad and will complete at least one enhanced core curriculum class each year. Students will be allowed to take the iPads home.

The applicant provides technical support through technicians, how-to videos, and discussion groups and interest groups moderated by technicians and software and curriculum experts.

The applicant uses Infinite Campus Student Information System. While interoperable with other systems and open interface mechanisms, it does not provide parents and students the ability to export information in an open data format for use in other systems. The vendor has announced intentions to release a fully functional learning management system in the next four years. The Barrow Dashboard App proposed for development in this project would allow export of data in standard open data format.

While the applicant presents an interesting approach, all required elements of the high-quality plan are not provided.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	8
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposes creation of a Continuous Improvement Center using grant funds to be staffed by an independent research and evaluation organization specializing in K-16 educational evaluation. The applicant provides a list of continuous improvement questions that would guide the process, along with a logic model that includes inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impact. Continuous improvement measures identified by the applicant include annual graduation rates, annual post-secondary enrollment, student achievement on the CRCT and EOCT measures in all subject areas and grade levels, ALSQ data gathered each semester for all middle and high school students, Engagement survey data gathered each semester for all elementary students, classroom walkthrough data, self-assessments of teachers, educator focus groups, and others.</p> <p>The applicant does not indicate how the proposed Continuous Improvement Center would monitor, measure, and publicly share information regarding the proposed project. Additionally, rather than presenting a high-quality plan, the applicant seems to defer this requirement by simply proposing creation of the Center with activities, timelines, activities and rationale, deliverables, and responsible parties to be later defined.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposes use of press releases to local media, public discussion at board and school governance team meetings, the use of newsletters and communication to parents, and video and other media on the district website. The applicant proposes an annual synthesis of data reported to stakeholders. Additionally, quarterly stakeholder meetings are proposed, along with development of dashboards and static reports to be used by various stakeholder groups. It is not clear how the applicant proposes to communicate with and engage internal stakeholders, including teachers, students, administrators, and LEA staff throughout the project.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant explains that Georgia is currently transitioning in many of its assessment systems, including its Leader Keys (LKES) and Teacher Keys (TKES) which will be implemented statewide in 2013-14. The applicant provides a rationale for using CRCT scores for a measure of college- and career readiness in the grades 4-8 band. In grades 9-12, one of three measures will be used, including SAT/ACT scores, minimum industry standards of the ASSET/COMPASS assessment, and the Georgia Student Health Survey as a measure of positivity and attitude.</p> <p>For Prek-3 students, the applicant does not propose at least one age-appropriate non-cognitive indicator of growth.</p> <p>Because most of the measures identified by the applicant are summative assessments, it is not clear how the applicant will gather and analyze formative data that can inform its implementation or provide indicators of progress or effectiveness across time as the proposed project is implemented.</p> <p>The applicant fails to provide a rationale for its selection of each performance measure. The applicant does not describe how the identified performance measures will provide rigorous, timely and formative leading information that can inform the grant's activities or identify areas of concern.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposes 12 key project areas that will be monitored by the project manager. The project manager will create monthly reports that will be made available to all stakeholders on the district portal. An executive summary report will also be delivered monthly to the Board. Student outcomes and performance measures will be monitored by the Continuous Improvement Center, as well as teacher and leader professional development. Reports will be shared with each school's governance committee and with the Board at the end of each grading cycle. An annual video will highlight and summarize progress reports and initiatives of the project throughout the year. Public suggestions and comments can be made via online forms. While the applicant identifies approaches to inform stakeholders and evaluate the effectiveness of activities, required elements of the high quality plan are not included. The applicant does not identify timelines, specific activities and rationale for each, deliverables, and responsible parties for all proposed activities.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The applicant requests \$20-30 million to serve nearly 11,000 students in its district. A detailed budget narrative is provided organized around 12 proposed projects, as well as yearly personnel, fringe, equipment, supplies, contractual, stipends, and other expenses. The indirect cost rate is figured at 1.14%. No other funds are proposed to support the projects. A separate budget is provided for each of the 12 proposed projects. The applicant explains that some costs are much greater in year one and year two to establish and begin projects, purchase hardware, and train teachers.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	3
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:  
Sustainable end results of the project are identified by the applicant, including portal development, establishment and expansion of collaborative relationships with higher education, creation of online courses with media intensive resources, and numerous online supports and resources developed by teachers, parents, and community experts and leaders for high needs students. The applicant does not address how it will absorb costs for equipment upgrades, maintenance and repairs or identify funding for personnel costs and other costs that would continue after the grant period ends.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	1

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:  
The applicant addresses this competitive priority by focusing on the needs of students with disabilities and English language learners, particularly with regard to the need to increase math achievement of all students. No formal public-private partnerships are proposed and the required elements of the competitive preference priority are not adequately addressed. The intent of the competitive preference priority was to emphasize integration of public and private resources in a partnership to support the school's resources by providing additional family and student supports that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs, with highest priority to high-needs students.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:  
The applicant meets the absolute priority. The primary focus of this proposal was creation of learning environments that utilize digital media, technological tools and online platforms to personalize learning and connect teachers and content specialists as teams to create project-based learning in common core subjects in 14 schools in a charter school district.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>118</b>
--------------	------------	------------

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	4

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:  
The applicant proposes \$2.2 million to install a wireless Wi-Fi bubble for Winder, Georgia and the immediate surrounding area to provide Internet, Internet2, and resources access for 65% of its high needs population across all grade levels with almost total coverage for students attending the lowest performing schools. While the applicant provides a brief rationale, a high quality plan for implementation of the installation is not presented, and it is not clear how ongoing costs would be sustained when the grant period ends.



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0382GA-3 for Barrow County Board of Education

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score

(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p><i>The applicant has put forth an ambitious reform agenda that is based on a clear, instructionally-relevant premise that the use of technology to engage students in authentic learning experiences will lead to greater achievement (2). The proposal has the potential for deepening student learning and for delivering personalized instruction based on student academic interests (2). This reviewer has concerns about how comprehensive this program is because much of the organizational context of the program is underspecified and so it is not clear that the full programmatic impacts and all of the contingencies that this kind of revolutionary change in the educational system will entail have been fully considered. This reviewer, while impressed with the boldness and clear articulation in the proposal (1), has concerns about its credibility. Its connection to the relevant research literature is inconsistent, which may indicate an oversimplification of the very real and substantive organizational challenges that this kind of reform can raise.</i></p> <p>Total 5/10.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	2
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant proposes to use all of the schools in their district in this project and has listed those schools (2). This reviewer was unable to locate details about the school composition as required for this criteria and finds that the approach to implementation is underspecified for a project of this size and complexity involving a major cultural and infrastructural change across the entire district.</p> <p>Total 2/10</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
<p><i>Since the applicant has proposed to transition all of their schools simultaneously, the issue of scaling across schools is less dramatic. The applicant is clear about how their approach will lead to improved student outcomes (2). However, the issues of organizational change and implementation across technology, curriculum, and human capital are significant and the application does not contain much detail to allow this reviewer to provide greater credit in this area. For example, while the application presents a bold portrait that leverages the teachers described as "digital natives" there is little discussion of other teachers that may be employed who would not fit this classification. The applicant provides no discussion of them at all let alone the substantive issues involved in retraining such a workforce.</i></p> <p>Total 2/10.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	6
(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:		
<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px;"> <p>The applicant has produced evidence of goals for achieving improved student outcomes. These goals are based on a formula where the applicant reverse engineers the interim progress steps from the final goal by estimating reductions in number of students who do not meet the goal. This approach is novel and this reviewer finds it worthy of consideration (2). Further, the applicant's goals for different subgroups reflects good understanding of the relative performance that different groups are likely to make within this project period (2). This reviewer finds the goal distribution credible while also ambitious, yet achievable, for reducing achievement gaps (2). What is less clear in this application is the likelihood of success. While the goals portion of this application is comparatively strong, so much detail is missing that would expand on the high level goals that a full credit cannot be given by this reviewer. More elaborated goal statements would have received more credit.</p> <p>Total 6/10.</p> </div>		

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	3
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p><i>The applicant has presented evidence of important technological and philosophical approaches to improvement and the reduction of dropout rates that have been manifest in recent years (3). The application does not provide sufficient evidence in other achievement measures, in reforms targeted at low performing schools, and in making student performance data available to students, educators, and other stakeholders as required by this solicitation.</i></p> <p>Total 3/15</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:		

*The applicant presents an important discussion of its efforts to make salary and other information available to stakeholders (3). The descriptions presented are cursory and require researching web links, which reviewers are unable to do as part of the review process.*

*Total 3/5.*

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	5
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

*The applicant has presented a description of autonomy and ability to execute its own reform plan without interference from the state. (5). There is no information provided about the ways in which the state regulatory structure addresses personalized learning and how state test mandates will impact efforts to develop personalized learning programs.*

*Total 5/10*

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	2
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant discusses some of the work done to provide opportunities for stakeholder engagement and describes reports that will follow and provide more detail (2 points). The application has not provided detailed evidence of the engagement process and there are not letters of support from the broader community of stakeholders to include elected officials and organizations representing constituent groups, which would lead to greater credit.

Total 1/10

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided a response to this section, but little evidence of an analysis of needs and gaps as required by this solicitation.

Total 1/5

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	5

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

*The applicant presents a broad vision of instructional reform that uses technology and involves personalized choice (2). The applicant's approach touches on many important curricular areas, including Science, technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) and discusses how technology can be used to make students producers of knowledge rather than simply passive consumers (3). While broad, the application is light on specific details, does not reference any research literature in these often complex curricular areas and the substantive logistical challenges associated with delivering integrated content in ambitious and new ways is not presented. Further, there are many references to partnerships to help deliver this program's promises in the area of college and career goals. However, there are no letters of support or discussion of them in the track record on delivering results so these components cannot be given credit towards college and career goals.*

*Total 5/20*

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

*The applicant provides a bold vision of reform based upon new concepts such as "digital native teachers" and collaboration between students and teachers and scientists. This is an important step in designing future educational environments that take advantage of technology's possibilities (2). The proposal, however, is weak in specifics that connect to the history and current state of much of today's educational practice. The applicant has not demonstrated that beyond bandwidth and commitment that they currently have the kind of advanced teaching corps, successful partnerships, and other elements of this important criteria in this section of the proposal. While there are some research references in this section (and no bibliographic detail this reviewer could find) there is no compelling argument in this proposal that indicates an understanding of the very significant logistical challenges associated with this kind of program.*

*Total 2/20*

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

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant recognizes the significant organizational challenges that a program such as this will place at the central office and has outlined some important positions to be established and how these positions would relate (1). The remaining presentation, however, is general. It does not provide detailed descriptions of organizational functions to support instructional change with little detail about the school leadership teams and how these school-level personnel will connect to new district structures. It also does not describe the large-scale curricular organizations to provide students multiple paths through the material towards college and career success.</p> <p>Total 1/15</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	4
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant discusses their district infrastructure and some of the important technological components necessary to deliver high-quality personalized instruction throughout their proposal (4). However, the transformation that this district is proposing is broad and would include the range of grades and subjects so that the level of infrastructure that is called for is also broad. This proposal, however, is weak on details in this regard. It does not provide evidence of the infrastructure needed in schools and departments and how these different components will interact and the staffing structures they require. The applicant does not address how material/content will be made accessible to all parties regardless of income and technical capacity.</p> <p>Total 4/1</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant discusses the creation of an office of continuous improvement that will integrate different organizational functions and monitor leading indicators (3 points). The application provides detail on the kinds of indicators that will be collected (leading and lagging) and how they can be used indifferent analyses (3 points). Further, the application presents a logic model that describes the applicant's theory of action and plan that guides their work (3 points). Even if it is an over simplification of what may occur in practice, this part of the plan provides evidence the applicant is guided by some important principles that can be reviewed and discussed beyond the specific assurances in the text (1 point). The application does not, however, discuss in any detail the existing organizational structures that have responsibility for the areas that should improve and how those organizations and positions relate to this ambitious reform program and its need for an adaptable and continuously improving organization.</p> <p>Total 10/15</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant presents some strategies for communication and engagement (3). These strategies reach different parts of the broader stakeholder community. Since there is little discussion of community and other groups beyond those few partner organizations, the applicant likely has additional work to do in building support and communications channels necessary for success.</p> <p>Total 3/5</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant provides an impressive array of performance measures that are both cognitive and non-cognitive (2 points). Further, the applicant recognizes the importance of differentiating these indicators by age range (1 point). As with other parts of this proposal, there are key elements that raise concern. For example, the concept of effective teachers and principals is discussed in this section and there is no detail on how the applicant would construct such a measure. This is a critical element that will permeate the entire project and for which certain designs could raise major questions about how the program might proceed.</p> <p>Total 3/5.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant has presented evidence of the beginning of an evaluation approach (2), but has not identified methods or potential evaluation contractors. The description of color coding of evaluation reports is helpful, but would be much more substantive in the context of an evaluation plan that describes approaches of data collection and criteria for success.</p> <p>Total 2/5.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	4
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:  <i>The applicant proves a budget organized by project areas that totals at the high end of the funding range for districts of the size that the applicant falls into the lower end of. The budget details personnel and equipment costs as well as a substantial investment to contractors (4). The presentation is not adequate in terms of knowing whether the requested funds are reasonable. There are no other funds specified from state or other Federal programs.</i>  Total 4/10		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	1
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:  <i>The applicant has produced a discussion of sustainability (1), but the plan is not in this reviewer's opinion, a high-quality plan. After the Federal funds are exhausted, it is unclear how this program would be sustained without additional commitments and investments.</i>  Total 1/10		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	1
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: The applicant has provided a response to this section, but not presented evidence of public-private partnerships that will provide additional supports to families or other stakeholders.  Total 1/10		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: <i>The applicant has minimally met this requirement. It is an ambitious proposal and one that leaves many important design and implementation details unsaid. Still, it does present an approach targeted for personalized learning.</i>		

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>65</b>
--------------	------------	-----------

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	1
Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments: <i>The applicant has produced a supplemental budget that will add to its work with core populations (1 point). This reviewer finds this additional proposal is not a clear, discrete, and innovative solution that can be replicated in schools across the nation. It does not present a clear rationale. And, it is not a high-quality plan. As such, it is difficult to award greater credit.</i>  Total 1/15		

