



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0793GA-1 for Clarke County School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The evidence in the narrative demonstrates a somewhat comprehensive and coherent reform vision addressing core educational assurance areas of college/career ready standards and building robust data systems, but not strong evidence of recruiting and ongoing support for effective teachers and principals or turning around lowest performing schools. The evidence is mixed regarding whether or not this is a “clear and credible approach to accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity to personalize student support grounded through individualized tasks.”</p> <p>The proposal presents an ambitious vision of constructing, from the ground up, a student learning management system intended to personalize instruction and streamline data collection, analysis, and reporting - PORTAL. Part of this system is materials development—ostensibly aligned with the common core curriculum. The applicants state that they are continuing Clarke County comprehensive school reform areas focusing on 4 core assurance areas as well as absolute priority 2.</p> <p>The vision is ambitious with large amounts of money and resources being directed toward the technical environment and devices. There is much less focus on the professional development, technology integration, family supports, etc. needed to be in place in order for the vision to be realized and successful.</p> <p>The plan is to combine the Student Information System and Statewide Longitudinal Data System data to get a more comprehensive student picture. In particular, utilization tracking of student use and success with particular learning objects will be conducted.</p> <p>The narrative notes that Georgia is developing college and career ready benchmarks and “exceeding the bar” indicators but it does not say when those will be available. There are no assessments in place at this time.</p> <p>Evidence is weak for core assurance 3. The grantees cite the “Teach to Learn” project—funded by the Georgia governor’s office of student achievement to bridge Georgia teacher education programs and the new teacher induction program with a focus on STEM. The impact is 12 college graduates, 12 math teachers who then affect 24 teachers’ classrooms.</p> <p>In terms of teacher and leader evaluation systems, the applicants have noted that the University of Georgia and the CCSE developed a system that aligned to Georgia’s new evaluation system. The evidence provided in this narrative does not seem to support a robust system for recruiting, rewarding and/or retaining effective teachers and principals – although CCSD is implementing a Professional Development School model in conjunction with the University of Georgia. Neither does it seem to support the school turnaround core assurance. The applicant states there are no low achieving schools but do site a local educational service agency turnaround plans for students with disabilities. There are no goals or performance measures indicated for this effort.</p> <p>Overall, there is a great deal of indeterminacy in the narrative. Many of the aspects are discussed with little specificity making it difficult to understand a) what exactly is being proposed, and B) what specific measures it plans to undertake to affect the desired outcomes.</p> <p>The narrative does not clearly articulate goals, objectives, etc., and the logic model seems to present different goals from those articulated in this section. It does provide a roadmap, but it is not clear whether this roadmap is actually what the project intends. Some of the outcomes are measurable/actionable. Others are not. In particular, the applicant does not provide evidence of, or a rationale for, why it needs to build, from the ground up, a student learning management system, versus draw upon and incorporate one that already exists.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does discuss the PORTAL Project’s implementation. It would seem that including 100% of CCSD schools—21 schools in a high poverty, diverse school district – would support high-quality LEA and school level implementation. The project will roll out gradually over 4 years. The partnerships, particularly the technical skill of partner TSAV, are a strength. School selection consisted of all schools with a nearly 80% poverty rate, 80% minority student population rate and 43 to 90% reduced price lunch rate. Clearly eligibility is met. Requirements for reporting of total number of participating students, also from low-income families, high need, participating educators are met. Note that numbers for minority students are not provided by school.

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

10

3

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a plan for developing and implementing the PORTAL system. A plan vision is presented, but plan/project goals are not evident in the narrative of this section and there is not reference to the logic model. The proposal does state, however, that all CCSD schools should be actively “utilizing” PORTAL at the end of the grant period. No definition of “utilizing,” or sense of level of utilization, is provided. As well, the applicants seem to exhort the benefits and impact of this model rather than provide evidence showing it has worked in other places or that it is emergently working in Georgia.

Scale up and LEA change are operationalized in a timeline that lists activities but, in most cases, not the rationales for those activities. Deliverables and responsible parties for implementation are only sometimes listed.

The logic model is confusing. The PORTAL goals listed here are not evident earlier in this section’s narrative. No objectives are identified for the goals and the output and outcomes have a number of excellent elements, but overall the approach seems very disjointed. The applicant indicates that this will be a replicable model for other districts in Georgia and, perhaps, in the United States. However, no specific evidence of how this could or would take place is provided and/or where the system will be at the end of Year 4.

Year 1 will consist of the parallel processes of refining the PORTAL system, gathering instructional resources, developing digital assessment search tools, and implementing hardware and software tools for utilization tracking. These are all largely technical activities outside of the gathering or developing of curricular materials. Year 1 is also slated to be a parallel process of professional learning on differentiation of instruction, personalization of the learning environment, integration of various standards, and software training related to the PORTAL. These activities will be conducted in multiple real and online spaces. Little specificity is provided, but these activities would seem to support attainment of the proposed outcome goals.

Year 2 suggests a pilot test into elementary schools and 2 high schools. This seems too slow. By year 3, nearly half of the schools will be utilizing this system; some selected randomly as the treatment group where teachers will receive professional learning. Formal evaluation of implementation will begin in Year 3, as well. This seems quite late. It is a strength that evaluation activities will take place throughout the entire grant and this will support attainment of outcome goals.

In Year 4, all 21 schools will sign on with ongoing refinements to the user interface and content. Very little is said about the instructional supports regarding the integration and implementation with current or emerging curricula. In addition nothing is said about the parent or community aspects of this that are discussed later on. In Figure 1, the project plan overview, the human elements are fairly glossed over. We aren’t seeing mention of professional development, parent training, etc. This lack of specificity about activities, deliverables, responsible parties, etc. would be evidence that this is not a high quality plan.

The project is shown to be scalable, but the evidence for meaningful reform for the district is scant. There is no evidence to show that by providing this system and the content and tools that it will provide, meaningful reform will result. It is a strength that the system will be able to accommodate key initiatives such as Response to Intervention.

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

10

4

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

In this section on implementation, the applicant states that the CCSD and its partners are “undertaking a number of activities that address Georgia’s RTTT vision, the four RTTD assurance areas, and achievement for student population.” The applicant asserts that there are data currently available about students and student progress, but that they are not useful because they are not utilizable and need to be fashioned into systems that will allow them to be utilized in real time. Their proposed PORTAL system is one solution to this problem.

The proposed activities would seem to support the applicant’s vision and could result in improved student learning and performance and, potentially, equity. Annual goals are presented in the charts depicting student scores on various assessments, but these projections are not contextualized in the narrative.

Student achievement data, evidence of decreasing achievement gaps, graduation rates, and college enrollment, are presented with data and activities that are supposed to advance each of these areas. A clear picture is not presented, however. CCSD wants to improve student performance using both the state performance target and an individual subgroup performance target to increase performance at roughly 10% each year, but it is only minimally clear how this is going to happen. The activities to meet the goals are appropriate, but they also do not represent the significant technical effort that is being proposed regarding development of the database.

The data on student performance is appropriate and tells the story of some very severe needs, but evidence of the story these data tell are not presented in the narrative and evidence of proposed activities to address key needs identified in the data is not present. For example, there is a great need to address the achievement of students with disabilities and, in many cases, Black students and English learners. Discussion of solutions is limited.

The data and information regarding decreasing achievement gaps needs more clarity. The table is not well labeled, so it is not clear how the numbers add up. For example, it is not clear whether the number of the column for 2016 to 2017 indicate the percent difference between White students and other subgroups. Similarly, it is not clear what the decreasing numbers mean in the columns following on whether 38% is an appropriate result, over time, of this intervention. Because this table is unclear and is not addressed in the narrative, the potential evidence it could offer is undermined.

The projected graduation rates for 2012 are tentative, which makes it difficult to understand baseline, potential trending. This shows no evidence of whether the applicant's vision will result in benefits to student learning and/or equity.

No data are available to offer baseline and potential trends of college enrollment and postsecondary degree attainment.

Overall, the applicant's likeliness to achieve improved student achievement and equity is only minimally demonstrated by the evidence provided and needs much more clarification and connection to the plan.

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	4

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In this section, CCRT data indicate that CCSD has been improving student achievement in grades 3 through 8 between 2009 and 2012 with language arts and science being the areas of least improvement. This is evidence through the percentages of students meeting or exceeding standards and, in particular, through the percentage of growth in CRCT scores. Table 5 demonstrates highest percentage of growth annually in math: 7%, 20%, 21%, 13%, 19%, and 25% between 2009 and 2012. In science, the lowest growth subject, percentages of annual growth for the same period are -3%, 10%, 4%, 6%, 20%, and 21%. There is no evidence of how this breaks down for students with disabilities, dual language learners, minorities and other subpopulations, which makes it impossible to determine whether or not the district shows success in decreasing achievement gaps.

The narrative states that CCSD made significant progress in 2010 and that the state of Georgia's Department of Education named CCSD "Georgia's number 1 Large Title 1 Distinguished School District for Closing the Achievement Gap." Georgia has not been tracking student progress, graduation, and college enrollment but CCSD is committed to creating a policy to track college enrollment as part of this project. Evidence is not provided regarding what the "ambitious and significant reforms in the persistently lowest achieving schools" have been. Applicants talk about implementing the Common Core State Standards and developing common formative assessments in conjunction with the PARCC Assessment Consortium, but these are in process. Specific reforms to show a history of success are absent.

In terms of "systematic review and improvement planning processes," positive practices are identified in terms of the collaborative grade level teams, the School Improvement Plan Leadership Team, the Georgia Assessment of Performance on School Standards (GAPSS) process, and the Nonnegotiable Practices concept document developed to form a common framework throughout the district. It should be noted that in this discussion the focus is on standards implementation and not necessarily college and career readiness. From the evidence, it is not clear that these are translating into student and/or teacher/leaders improvements such that they would constitute ambitious and significant reforms.

In terms of how student performance data has been made available to students, educators and parents to improve their interactions with, and outcomes for, students, Title I meetings and the Website are the venues discussed. There is no evidence of push communications to parents or others via handouts or newsletters. As well, there is no discussion of the need for translation and communications to non-English-speaking populations. These are weaknesses and would seem to suggest that prior success or reform is still emergent.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In this section, the applicant indicates that it makes its LEA processes, practices, and investments transparent through 3 budget meetings annually and numerous public meetings with staff, parents, and community members by the superintendent. Information with which to gauge “the extent to which” such as participation rates and/the venues used are not indicated. Additional information is provided on the *Open Georgia* website which includes CCSD audits, personnel salaries for instructional and support staff, and non-personnel expenditures. The non-personnel expenditures at the school level are not indicated at all—a distinct weakness. Other expenditures that could be included as evidence of increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices and investments are not included such as: expenditures paid from Federal Impact Aid funds and State Fiscal Stabilization Funds, incentive pay and/or bonuses, supplemental pay for additional roles, professional development, instructional materials/supplies, computers/software/technology, contracted services, library books, media Center materials, and others. It would seem particularly important to have a sense of what the CCSD has spent on computer related equipment or supplies and contracted services—particularly in light of the significant budgetary allotments requested in this RTTD proposal for these things.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Evidence in this section largely supports the notion that there is a positive state context for implementation of the personalized learning environment with one large caveat -- there is some ambiguity in this section about the role of the Georgia Department of Education as regards providing access to, or providing resources to partner regarding, its longitudinal data system. The Memorandum of Understanding does not explicitly state anything about access to, or expansion of, George's SLDS for or with the CCSD. Yet, the narrative on page 33 explicitly states that the MOU “describes an expansion of the Georgia's SLDS “for the purpose of collectively designing...” The difference in perspective would indicate that evidence regarding access to the SLDS is not present. That being said, there does seem to be ample evidence of agreement between and among other parties of roles and responsibilities and, in particular, access to various online systems, content, etc. to support a positive implementation context. Specific areas referenced are Georgia Online Individualized Education Program (IEP) System and the Teacher Resource Link (TRL).

Table 7 provides evidence of state reform efforts -- adopting standards and assessments for college readiness, adopting NETS standards and a digital literacy test in 8th grade, collaborating with the Georgia Virtual School, reform of the current SLDS – and how CCSD/PORTAL – the personalized learning environment -- will support and enhance these efforts.

This section also discusses the technical network to support these ideas and the PORTAL. Capacity seems evident although it is unclear who is paying for which elements. Discussion of “PDS partnerships” takes place, but these are not described or explained.

There is some sense of the human involvement from the partnership with the Family Connection–Communities in Schools of Athens. This is real strength of the grant and piggybacking onto the Whatever it Takes initiative -- including its half 1 million Promise Neighborhood grant -- to prepare children to succeed in school and eventually graduate from college is evidence to support the personalized learning environment implementation process. This organization seems an important powerhouse in this grant and among the partners. It is significantly involved in community engagement with over 90 partners and undertaking large, important, activities such as planning “a grassroots community effort similar to the Harlem children's zone” (yet it is not clear what the specifics of this are) and distributing 6000 refurbished computers to family and community centers along with training for the safe use of these and other digital resources. This is evidence of a context that supports the PORTAL project.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The evidence of stakeholder engagement in the development of the RTTD proposal and support for its implementation is not very robust and some key elements are missing. Partners were engaged in the proposal development process and met often. The application states that faculty voted anonymously and 75 were in favor of the project, but there is no evidence of this activity having taken place. The notice of intent placed in the local newspaper does not display a strong attempt to gather stakeholder input or collaboration. It is small, appeared once, and is not inviting or clear about how participants could provide information outside of sending something to an address. CCSD leadership gave a number of presentations – one to the public, and others to relevant interest and/or governance bodies of teachers, parents, etc. Some evidence of feedback is indicated,

but it demonstrates very limited public engagements/feedback. There is no evidence of attempts to engage with non-English-speaking communities.

While there are letters of support in the appendix from teachers and students from a particular school, there is no letter from the bargaining unit and/or the Teacher Advisory Board or the other Instructional Councils. There is support from the Parent Advisory Board.

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

5

1

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

This section seems particularly weak from the perspective that it does not show evidence of a “high-quality plan for an analysis of the applicant’s current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic behind the reform proposal...” It is not clear what kind of Needs Analysis and/or Gap Analysis was actually undertaken, whether it was done systematically, and who was involved. There is no evidence of a plan with goals, activities and rationales for these, a timeline, deliverables, or responsible parties. The proposal states that a gap analysis was conducted on the “‘actionable’ nature of the data available to teachers students and parents in CCSD.” This is necessary, but not sufficient. The need for more digital devices to ensure student access to the proposed PORTAL is indicated. Some strategies for determining teacher readiness levels are proposed (Wayfind Assessment).

It also shows that professional development will take place, but not which aspects of professional development would be pursued based on assessed needs. In fact, the actual plan for professional development is very indeterminate. “Readiness levels” of teachers will be determined using the Wayfind assessment along with other assessments. But there is no supporting research here to say that that is a data-based approach, there is no discussion of technological pedagogical content knowledge as a key competency, for example, or whether or not there are needs regarding linking the resources to student needs. There is discussion about in classroom support, modeling, and observations/mentoring but there is not evidence regarding how they are being mobilized and within what framework relative to the RTTD grant.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	9

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not provide evidence of a “high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment” so students can graduate college and career ready. Specific goals linked to activities, rationales, timelines, deliverables and indications of responsible parties are not evident.

The instructional strategy to enable students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards is PORTAL’s “roadmapping” tools. This strategy does not constitute an effective array of comprehensive strategies and will not be implemented until Year 3 of the grant.

The proposal also does not seem to provide an provide an approach to learning that “engages and empowers all learners, in particular high needs students in an age-appropriate manner.” There is nothing in this section that seeks to differentiate instruction or access by grade, age, or other defining factor such as ability, primary language, etc. In section C1 where discussion about how students will understand learning is key to their success, the applicant provides information about the need to connect student data to instructional practice and then discusses the Digital Learning Conversion rollout of computing devices that are supposed to connect students to real world applications, etc. This section does not address whether students understand that learning is central to their success or not.

In section C,1,a,ii, the applicant discusses the authentic goal regarding student involvement and engagement with his or her own learning. Here, the proposal talks about matching instruction to learning style and identifying student tendencies as guides for data-driven intervention. It does not talk about how this is accomplished. As well it talks about PORTAL’s “roadmapping tools” to help students represent their path to college and career graduation including the courses that they will take. It is unclear whether, by introducing the tool in Year 3 of the grant, it will constitute enough time for students to actually experience it. In this section, teacher development and descriptions of personalized content and assessments based on the common core standards are discussed along with discssion about replication – matters that should be discussed in a different section. The section does not seem to address the criteria desired. In addition, the applicant's discussion of the “deep learning experiences in the areas of academic interest” is not robust. The narrative states, a teacher “will receive a prompt from PORTAL providing resources and digital learning materials based off specific student interest and needs according to defined measures.” There is

no further explication of what constitute such measures. There is discussion about differentiation of materials for classwide, individual remediation, or acceleration of students, but much is at a high conceptual level.

This proposal does suggest that the multimedia tools and capacity of the system will make it possible for students to access other climates and cultures in real time through multimedia video tools in particular. An IB example is provided. There is no evidence to suggest that this is an option for all students throughout the system at all levels. There is a claim that PORTAL will provide teachers more time to focus on content and planning, but there is no empirical evidence presented to suggest why or how this might be the case.

Benefits of the PORTAL system are the lesson builder, assessment builder, and assignment builder applications as well as the multimedia capability and the automated grading. There is no discussion of whether or how teachers in the CCSD and others will be compensated for the content that they have developed and provided for the system as well as whether or not they will receive any protections for their intellectual property.

The PORTAL system will be connected with TRL and, as Figure 3 shows, there will be standard data, performance data, behavioral data, and an attributes profile as part of the student profile. These are positive affordances. There is some question around the assessment of a curriculum resource's high-quality being addressed by "tracking student use of the resource and their subsequent achievement. The system rates the quality of the resource based on student success. Further this 'quality rating' provides information to the teacher on which 'high-quality' resources should be used with students that display specific learning attributes." Other outcomes are possible. Students may choose a resource and use it because it is easy and pleasurable not be because it is quality. As well, differentiation would imply that what is a useful resource for one student may or may not be a useful resource for another student.

The strength of the PORTAL system is that real-time feedback and data from multiple systems can be provided to students, teachers, parents, and administration and applied to learning materials and curricular scopes and sequences. The specifics of this are lacking, however.

English learners and students with disabilities rank the highest in need in CCSD, but this section does not address them or discuss their particular needs. There is reference to differentiation and the use of assistive technology, but specific information about accommodations and high-quality strategies are not present.

Evidence of the look and feel of the landing pages and their various proposed configurations helps contextualize the proposal. Reference is made to the human mechanisms for providing training and support to students (and teachers) that are in place. However, it is not stated in this section that the CCSD's 6 instructional technology specialists, 19 instructional coaches in 5 content coaches would be joined by any new hires or support even though the technology profile and focus will increase multifold. This would seem to limit the proposal's feasibility somewhat.

There is no evidence of a "personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development" toward college and/or career readiness, or of the partnering of the community-based organization to help engage family in this process of college- and career-readiness supports for students.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	9
---	----	---

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

It would seem that the applicant does not yet have a high-quality plan for improving teaching and learning by virtue of the fact that the proposed components are, as of yet, still not coordinated within an overarching design and implementation effort. There is not evidence of goals and supporting activities, rationales, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. There is no specific discussion of a coordinated plan for how teachers and leaders will be systematically involved in training and improvement efforts. A strength of this section is that Georgia, and CCSD, have teacher and leader evaluation systems that they have been working to further develop. These systems are, not surprisingly, very much in alignment with the RTTD goals of differentiated student learning, college and career readiness, building capacity for increasing data-driven decision-making, and authentic connection with content. A weakness is that it is not made clear how these evaluation systems contribute to the PORTAL project – it is to connect student learning/progress to teacher efforts (actionable information) and to ensure teachers and administrators use data better to support instruction, but methods are not outlined.

Another strength of this section is the intent to have high-quality learning resources that are standards aligned and vetted and verified. There is reference to PORTAL being able to access other quality licensed content repositories (the TRL and unnamed others) in addition to teacher developed content. Figure 7 provides a process for vetting content, but not specific criteria. There is not specificity about how courses might be sequenced or how assessments of students might guide their access to particular content ("content is sequenced in a number of manners and assessment may be used as governors for accessing specific content"). The processes described do not seek to account for why students are doing what they are doing.

The Non-negotiable Practices framework is a useful guiding framework for getting educators and parents on one page

regarding instructional practices that support high student expectations and performance. At the same time, the document does not provide information about how its goals are more formally operationalized to serve as a guide for teacher/leader evaluation of practice. The proposed Professional In Residence exploration of value added measures (VAM) may be productive in this regard. How this will impact PORTAL and the teacher and leader evaluation systems ultimately is not presented.

Efforts to ensure instruction from effective teachers is formalized by the teacher experience “risk ratio” –an interesting mechanism that seems to work to more clearly target teacher resources. However, there is no proposal presented by the applicant to increase the number of students receiving instruction from effective and highly effective teachers.

Overall, this section of the proposal provides many key pieces, but a high-quality plan ready for implementation is not evident.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	10
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The PORTAL partners propose to incrementally introduce the PORTAL system. The proposal suggests that CCSD has the flexibility and autonomy to implement the project successfully because its School Improvement Leadership Teams and Local School Council have mechanisms for decision-making and problem-solving as well as autonomy over time, space, material, and human resources within the confines of district policy. This is a strength.</p> <p>Another strength is that the CCSD and the partners seem committed to a student mastery model of student progress and achievement. Students will be able to demonstrate content mastery through assessments. However, the nature and types of assessments are varied, and examples of possible student mastery scenarios are not provided. It is not clear whether student can just test out not having engaged with any of the materials at all.</p> <p>Another strength is the CCSD’s Digital Conversion Initiative to upgrade devices available to students and, as part of this, to acquire and utilize assistive technology for students with such needs whenever possible.</p> <p>While these components are crucial for a successful system of personalized learning, how they are interconnected as an initiative is not clear. The system and vision continues to be loosely articulated, is not congealed into a consistent, high-quality plan with goals and supporting activities and rationales, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. There is no evidence of the “practices, policies, and rules that will facilitate the introduction of in its schools through its central office organization and governance structure.” There is also no evidence that” students with disabilities and English Language Learners [who] use digital devices equipped with assistive technology and language programs will allow for greater equity and access to personalized learning.”</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	4
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal does not show evidence of a high quality plan with goals and supporting activities and rationales, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties related to its representations around the LEA and school infrastructure. The technical infrastructure of the district seems robust and adequate to support personalized learning. Important human supports of the technical systems are also evident. Only some evidence is provided that ALL students and teachers will be able to access content because CCDS is a Google district so those resources are available, free of charge, to anyone who would like to access them. The TSAV partners seem to have the skills to technically support this system and the requirement of interoperability is met. Distribution of 6000 refurbished computers is potentially a strength and will ensure more equitable access for lower income students and families. However, the proposal does not address whether these refurbished computers have the processing and/or memory capacity to access current Internet servers and content at speeds that are useful for users – an important consideration as multimedia streaming becomes more prevalent. Additionally, there is no clear discussion/evidence of student access to content, tools, and/or resources in school.</p> <p>A weakness in this section of the proposal is the lack of attention to district side technical integration and support staff. There seem to be multiple programming positions, positions at the University of Georgia and community positions, but the 5 full-time instructional technology specialists and one instructional technology coordinator to support integration of this very complex technical system seems highly inadequate for 21 schools over 4 years where such support is going to be high for parents as well as teachers and administrators. System interoperability and open format data exchange are mentioned, but clear descriptions of how this will take place or be ensured are not evident.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	12
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CCSD has in place a continuous improvement process to provide ongoing and regular feedback on progress --here, regarding college and career readiness and graduation advancement. The process is driven by the District Improvement Plan and resulting School Improvement Plans. The proposal states that data are fed back continually into the school including AYP determination, student performance growth, achievements, demographics, and attendance rates. This information is used in a variety of ways—for the public and for accreditation and in between. This section is quite strong because there do seem to be adequate mechanisms for feedback and improvement. Surveys, notebooks, classroom walks, reports, and implementation and impact checks. These are undertaken by internal staff and external evaluators. If the portal project is funded, Department of Education will provide external evaluators. Internal evaluators will be sought from the University of Georgia. Specific evidence about how effort and impact information will be disseminated to the public is not presented.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section focuses primarily on communication with external stakeholders although Table 8 does indicate particular data-based activities or documents that drive such communication, some of which are directed at internal stakeholders. The mechanisms indicated are all adequate, but not exceptional. Community meetings are indicated as the primary mechanism for stakeholder input and engagement. A strength is the one page summary of each report to be developed by the CCSD's Office of Public Relations. In general, though, the intent of this section is not realized in the narrative provided. There is no discussion about communicating with at risk populations, populations who are not English speakers, etc. Another strength is that communication using networked media of differing kinds, including social media, is presented.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Table 9 provides 18 performance measures—overall and by subgroup—but annual targets are not provided as requested in the RFP. This treatment does not connect to the previously presented Theory of Action. As well, in some cases assessments have been provided as performance measures, which is not appropriate because the assessment is the test used to determine the measure. In general, the provided measures are appropriate regarding student attendance, student achievement in particular content areas, and student participation in post secondary and pre-post secondary activities. Performance indicators of college and career readiness are not present, along with performance measures related to teacher/leader evaluations and successful evidence of personalized learning experiences. Rationales for the selection of measures are not evident; nor is information about how these will provide “rigorous, timely and formative leading information” to connect to and guide the proposed plan or how individual measures will be reviewed and improved over time.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposed evaluation plan for the PORTAL project does not seem to address the areas indicated in the proposal. The performance measures, data collection approaches, data and analysis approaches, and presentation of findings are all clearly articulated initially. Yet, the process and product questions do not tie specifically to the projects goals. In addition to understanding how the actual PORTAL system is used, evaluation of more productive use of time, staff, money, and other resources to improve results is not evident. As well, activities to understand the effectiveness of partnerships, compensation, school schedules and structures, in decision-making structures are not discussed. It is not clear how the performance measure tables connect with this particular task. In addition to numbers of students attending and receiving instruction from effective teachers and/or leaders, Stakeholder training, stakeholder use of PORTAL, fidelity of implementation, are evaluation elements not discussed but necessary. The IRB response is appropriate.</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>All requested funds and funds from outside sources are represented in the budget. The latter, \$29,600,000 in section 12 of Tables 16 Project–Level Itemized Costs. There is no evidence to determine whether the 5 sources of outside funding will continue throughout the life of the grant. The total grant amount requested -- \$28,511,653 is accounted for in the budget and the spreadsheet and narrative identify all funds that will support the project. There is no evidence of in–kind contributions in this budget. The budget narrative and tables do provide a rationale for the allocation and use of specific funds. Proposed salaries for the Race to the Top Program manager, Instructional Technology Coordinator, Instructional Technology Specialists, Math Curriculum and Assessment Specialists in science, and most of the PORTAL Technology Development staff seem rather high. As well, there are significant expenditures for digital devices where devices for students in the schools seem appropriate, but certain devices for adult personnel seem inappropriate—for example, cell phones and cell phone plans.</p> <p>The budget seems sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal. It is not clear whether the budget is reasonable. The bulk of the effort is focused on software development, University of Georgia instructional technology specialists and teaching and learning support, and 40 positions in Clark County School District including a grant management team of 8. No money is set aside for district costs related to substitutes or additional planning time that will likely be incurred as this initiative goes forward. As well, there is no money set aside for parent involvement, engagement, or travel.</p> <p>The applicant states in the Cost Assumption Column of Table 16 that it will indicate whether the cost is a one time investment or an ongoing operational cost, but the applicant does not do this. This information is provided in certain sections of Table 16, such as Section 5, Supplies. The applicant notes that strategies for long-term sustainability of the project are defined in section F(2) and, thus, are not evident in this section of the proposal.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	3
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The CCSD vision is to use instructional technology for teaching and learning and, in partnership, is “developing a model digital learning school design that will be implemented throughout the district.” This involves using technology within school, the PORTAL system, to achieve 1:1 computing. This section presents a vision, but there is not evidence of a high-quality plan. Goals as supported by activities, rationales, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties are not evident.</p> <p>Sustainability is discussed in terms of funding and \$19 in additional special option local tax (SPLOST) funds are identified. Evidence of the sustainability of instructional coaches and support staff is not provided since jobs have been funded to date by Title I and Title II-A funds but there is no guarantee that such funding will remain.</p> <p>There is no substantive discussion of the sustainability of this PORTAL system or of what kinds of opportunities for third-party services, consulting nationwide, etc. that could develop in addition to the core work. There is the notion that the content developed for this portal can and will be used beyond the CCSD and state of Georgia (Georgia Virtual School, etc.). However, no indication of support from State and//or local government leaders is present; nor is a budget or plan presented for how the work might sustain beyond the term of the grant.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	9
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CCSD-FC/CIS Sustainable Partnership – 10 – The proposed partnership with the Family Connection–Communities in Schools of Athens (FC/CIS) is excellent because not only does it integrate public and private resources such as Promise Neighborhood monies already available to FC/CIS it is partnering with an organization that has access to more than 90 other organizations within the community that have expertise in providing supports for students in need—including supports for social, emotional, or behavioral needs. While there is not evidence that the partnership has had a coherent and sustainable history, the success of FC/CIS in the community would seem to suggest that it has the capacity to undertake this portion of work. This section shows evidence of research conducted by the partnership to identify needs and currently available services. The partners will provide</p>		

training and supports as well as online assets.

9 population-level desired results for CCSD student aligned with educational results and family and community supports are provided. Information is provided about how data would be collected, but not necessarily tracked or used to target resources for improving results regarding participating students. In the case of us a strategy to scale the model for the future evidence is not clear. Discussion of use of an effective national dropout prevention program is presented, but it is not linked to the project specifically. The proposal states that over time improvement will be linked to “a comprehensive set of measures and evaluation processes.” But these are not more clearly articulated.

Integration of education and other services for participating services is evidenced by work through the Whatever the Takes leader activities within communities; the Clark County Mentor program, Fanning Institute, CCSD partnership to provide an on-campus pre-collegiate experience; the Early College Summer Youth Program; and mentoring relationships.

Evidence of how the applicant plans to assess the needs and assets of participating students is not present. Identifying and inventorying the needs and assets of the school community as proposed is being accomplished through the district comprehensive plan and organization’s annual plans and strategic plans. Evidence is not supplied to suggest that information regarding all 9 population level desired results is available from these sources.

Evidence for decision-making process and infrastructure regarding supports for participating students is limited. There is a general structure presented where a counselor, or site coordinator will provide comprehensive case management and if this person through which supports are somehow going to be distributed. An interagency collaborative is also suggested, but specifics of how this will take place are not. Suggestions for using existing community structures for parent engagement and decision making are present, but clear evidence of how parents will be engaged in this process are not. There is strong evidence of the performance measures and instruments to asses progress in the table and data provided.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has not met Absolute Priority 1 based on a lack of evidence to show how the proposed personalized learning environment approach would build on the 4 core educational assurance areas. The proposal demonstrates ample evidence that it would support learning and teaching through core educational assurance area 1 -- building data systems. However, ample evidence of how the proposed project would clearly support achievement toward college and career readiness; recruitment, development and retention of teachers and principals; and turning around low performing schools was not presented in this proposal. Thus, while much of what was proposed could serve to decrease achievement gaps across student groups, increase graduation rates from high school, and improve college enrollment and persistence; actual evidence to show that the proposed project would do so was not fully present.

Total	210	103
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	13

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The applicants present the Skills- and Assessments-Based Learning Environments (SABLE) project to develop software modules that provide authentic, engaging science activities within virtual worlds. A rationale was provided that STEM learning is necessary for this population as evidenced by the data—which is true—and that this kind of template for cross, curriculum learning that advances within a virtual environment will engage students more deeply in real science activities that will require them to consider deeply science methods and concepts.

The proposal presents an appropriate rationale for developing new curriculum that includes scaffolding and formative assessments. A four-year project is proposed during which chemistry, physics, biology, and mathematics will be combined in units, which will be piloted and assessed with in years 1 and 3. Evidence is not presented for the research basis of this particular approach and/or whether, once these units are developed, its assessment will be robust enough to encourage generalization and use throughout Georgia and/or the nation. The actual description of the STEM units and technology is compelling. The actual description of the STEM units and technology is compelling and the team of people to undertake the work seems appropriately skilled/experienced.

A high quality plan is only partially evident. Actual goal links to activities, rationales, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties are described but are not described in a cohesive fashion. A strength is that an evaluation plan is evident and appropriate to the task at hand. The budget seems adequate for the proposed project, yet it seems that a large portion of the supplies is computer hardware that should probably be provided in-kind by the collaborating institutions—at least some of these resources. Despite these weaknesses, this is an interesting project that will result in cutting edge, engaging materials, and authentic applied scenarios for students in science.

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	13
--	----	----

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

In this request for Optional Budget funds, the applicant proposes to "provide a tiered system of supports for teachers in order to improve school readiness skills in the early years so there is no achievement gap among subgroups of students." The project, Improving Preschool Outcomes through the Utilization of a Teacher System of Supports (IPOUTSS), draws upon local expertise (e.g., Univ. of Georgia Professional In Residence) to provide professional development and coaching to central office and pre-K and special education staff in Clarke and Madison Counties -- meeting the two-LEA requirement. Specifically, the PIR supports the design and implementation of the "tiered teacher induction system." The PIR is intended, in part, to sustain professional development that is fading out as a result of Early Reading First grants coming to an end.

The PIR and coaches, with teacher involvement, will "develop a three tiered teacher induction system san develop online learning modules that are easily accessible by teachers of young children." Training, coaching, and modeling re effective teaching strategies, use of technology and websites for personalizing instruction, and interventions for struggling students will be provided along with virtual and actual standards-based walk-throughs. This system is intended to build "teachers' leadership capacity and ensure the sustainability of the project over time."

Part of the execution of this plan is premised on providing 15% of the Director of the Office of Early Learning, a .5 FTE Budget Assistant, and clerical assistance to staff a team that will implement the project with fidelity, oversee meetings and stakeholder involvement, oversee the budget, and conduct data entry and analysis. Looking to the Director of the Office of Early Learning to advance IPOUTTS may not be effective if the individual does not buy into the initiative or does not have the actual time or inclination to devote to it. Note also, that there is no letter of support from this individual or agency agreeing to such a large role.

The actual program consists of meetings of interested parties to determine roles, responsibilities, and timelines regarding the proposed tiered induction system and to professional develop early childhood teachers regarding content and pedagogy, but importantly, technology for use in the early childhood classroom. iPads, webcams, projectors, and other technology are requested as supplies for the project \$244,450 for year 1 and \$31,350 over the 3 subsequent years (Total = \$275,800). It is a strength of the proposal to have provided funds for teacher stipends, travel, substitutes and child care to support to ensure faculty and staff can attend the professional learning sessions.

The applicant presents a high-quality plan that details goals, activities, deadlines, deliverables and responsible parties. While the plan and the narrative talk about the initiative, it is difficult to envision the proposed project, its various stages, and its ultimate outcomes. We know that there will be video-based modules, for example. We know there will be data collection to assess needs and develop profiles of needs. We know there will be support for "coaching and peer-to-peer collegial conversations regarding effective classroom instruction and personalized learning strategies." The high levels of technology are intended to allow for virtual standards-based walk-throughs.

The proposed model is interesting and important. Over 200 pre-K classrooms and family units are slated for assistance and participation and the data-based models for learning and intervention should contribute to the field. While there is quite a bit of indeterminacy about implementation and content details of the project going forward, there is a cohesive vision and a high quality plan for core implementation activities. The rationale for focusing on early childhood learners is explicit and research-based on the first page of the supplement. More information could have been provided.

Overall, this proposed optional budget supplement could result in some very interesting and important resources based on focused data collection, collaborative data analysis and content development, and a concerted effort at utilizing technology in ensuring that teachers are supported. it presents its argument and costs well and seems to be in range and on track for

IPOUTSS.



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0793GA-2 for Clarke County School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Comprehensive and coherent vision: Clarke County School District is proposing a vision of implementing a PORTAL which will link current student management systems and data warehouses with tools and resources to ensure personalization of the educational experience and enhance the connection between the educational experience and college and career goals. Details of how this new system will accelerate and deepen student learning, increase equity, and build on individual student interests are sparse and unclear. There is no description of how this will be utilized as an instructional tool nor how assessments will be integrated.</p> <p>Four core assurances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * college and career ready standards and assessments- Clarke County School District describes the existence of college and career ready standards and documents that they are a part of the PARCC consortium. * data systems with feedback loops and capability to track from pre K to grade twelve- Their current data system is inadequate to meet this assurance area and their current application is meant to address this area with the implementation of PORTAL. * teacher, principal and leader evaluation systems- As their current data system is insufficient to link students to teachers from pre-K to grade twelve, Clarke County School District is currently unable to implement the tenets of an evaluation system as required by the application. While it is documented that there is a new statewide evaluation system currently being piloted, a discussion of how student achievement will be a part of that system is lacking. * Turning around low-achieving schools- The district does not discuss turning around low performing schools as the applicant states there are no low performing schools in the district that meet the RTT-D definition of low performing. <p>Overall, the articulation of the vision of Clarke County School District for the RTT-D proposal is ambiguous and the link between how the PORTAL will lead to accelerated student achievement, deepened student learning and personalized student support based on individual task and student interests is limited.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Clarke County School District aims to include all students at all schools in the initial 4 year project. The required lists of participating schools, students and staff members are present and the students do meet the required demographics.</p> <p>High quality LEA and School-level implementation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. process used to select participating schools- Clarke County School District will include all students in all schools in the project because they believe all students should benefit. b. list of schools that will participate- Clarke County School District provides a list of all schools that will participate which includes schools serving preK-5, 6-8 and 9-12. c. total number of students participating, low income, high need, and participating educators- In all, Clarke County School District will serve 12,784 students 71.6% of which are considered low income which surpasses the requirement of at least 40% 		

as stated in the application criteria. It is stated that 12,784 students are considered high need however it is undocumented as to how Clarke County School District determined that 100% of their student population would meet the high need criteria.

Overall, Clarke County School District demonstrates evidence of high quality implementation their reform proposal at both the LEA and School levels with 100% participation. However, evidence of how high needs students are identified is lacking.

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

10

2

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Clarke County School District does intend to implement the reforms district wide within the four years of the grant window and aims to have the PORTAL system expand to the state and national levels thus expanding the reform proposal beyond their school district. The activities over the four years are clearly delineated by year and are reasonable for full implementation district wide in year four. However, key elements of a high quality plan are not present in the application. Responsible parties are not named aside from mentioning that "Partners" are responsible for certain elements. Professional development and training is mentioned for teachers but no training is mentioned for parents, students or other key stakeholders on the usage of the PORTAL system. The plan focuses on implementing the software program but evidence of the implementation to the student level is lacking and therefore the connection between the PORTAL and the goals of accelerating student achievement and personalizing student learning cannot be made. The application does mention treatment groups versus control groups but the discussion of how these groups will be utilized is undocumented.

Overall, Clarke County School District is ambitious in proposing LEA wide reform within the four year grant window. However, elements of a high quality plan are lacking and the link between the PORTAL system and improving student learning outcomes for all students is inadequate.

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

10

2

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Ambitious yet achievable goals overall and by student subgroup: Clarke County School District utilizes state formulas as submitted in the ESEA state waiver to set student achievement targets.

a. performance on summative assessments- The charts show that student performance decreased for many subgroups from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012. However, the target goals assume equal growth over the next five years. Some of the target goals are contradictory. For example, in ELA sight word assessment for overall population, the target goal is actually less than the baseline performance.

b. decreasing achievement gaps- The state formulas result in inconsistent targets for various subgroups. For example, EOCT Math 1 assessment in the Students with Disabilities subgroup- proposed growth from baseline of 12 to target of 83 but subgroup English Learners from baseline of 29 to target of 62. Some assessments show growth targets that aim to close the achievement gaps. For example, ELA Sight Word Inventory Grades 1-2 has a baseline achievement gap between white students and students with disabilities of 24.3 and the target post grant actually shows students with disabilities outperforming white students. However, CRCT/CRCT-M Math grades 3-5 has an achievement gap of 22.7 points between white students and students with disabilities during their baseline year. In the post grant year, the target is to close that gap to 16.1.

c. graduation rates- An explanation of how graduation rate targets were set is missing as no formula is provided. Again, graduation rates for some subgroups showed a decrease from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012 however targets assume steady growth each year until the post grant year. Asian students are not projected to increase their rate by more than .3% over the five year period however students with disabilities are projected to increase by 46.3%.

d. college enrollments- Currently the district has no process in place for measuring college enrollment rates and no data is given.

Overall, the targets set for student achievement in the post grant year are inconsistent and unrealistic. While some subgroups are projected to make large gains, others are projected to regress. Targets are set to increase at a steady rate although full implementation of the reform proposal is not expected until year four. If the reform proposal is said to be responsible for the gains in student achievement, it would be reasonable to expect minimal gains in years one through three and larger gains in year four. Graduation rates are projected but no methodology is given as to how those rates were set. Data for college enrollment is missing.

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	5
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is insufficient data to determine a clear record of success over the past 4 years. Charts provided demonstrate CRCT scores over the past 4 years as well as the percentage of growth from 2009 to 2012. With the exception of 3rd grade science, all content areas and grade levels have demonstrated some growth with the highest growth occurring in 8th grade math. End of course assessments are presented for high school in the same manner. Negative growth is demonstrated in US History and Math II. Otherwise, all other contents listed showed some measure of growth with the highest growth in Economics. However, there is no data at the subgroup level to determine if achievement gaps are closing. Overall graduation data is presented showing a growth over 4 years but again it is not broken down to the subgroup level. Data is currently not gathered on college enrollment rates.</p> <p>Fifteen schools did make AYP but the application is lacking evidence of reform efforts that produced results. Evidence is provided that a state level award was given for closing the achievement gap.</p> <p>The only data shared with parents and the community is overall performance and perception data shared through Title 1 meetings and the district website.</p> <p>Overall, Clarke County School District provides limited data to show a clear record of success over a 4 year period. Raw data and growth numbers are provided, however they are not disaggregated by subgroup. Thus, there is no evidence to demonstrate closing the achievement gap. Data on graduation rates is not provided for each year for the past 4 years and no college enrollment data is presented. No evidence of previous reform movements is presented. Data that is currently available to parents is not available in such a way as to provide information on instruction and needed services.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Transparency:</p> <p>a. actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional and support staff- the state of Georgia has a website with a searchable database with this information listed by the staff member's name.</p> <p>b. actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only- the state of Georgia has a website with a searchable database with this information listed by the staff member's name.</p> <p>c. actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only- the state of Georgia has a website with a searchable database with this information listed by the staff member's name.</p> <p>d. actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level- the school district provides a report from Business Services on their website with the most recent audit information</p> <p>Overall, while the state of Georgia provides a searchable database, this does not meet the criteria of district level transparency. The information is not broken out at the school level.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Clarke County School District has documented various MOUs with community partners to assist in the implementation of the reform grant. One MOU with the DOE demonstrates the authority and autonomy to carry out the plan. DOE will also provide consultation, assistance, online content and professional development. Other MOUs with the local COE and other community groups will serve a support function throughout the period of the grant in the areas of research related to instructional design and professional learning.</p> <p>Overall, Clarke County School District has developed sufficient partnerships and has provided evidence of the nature of those partnerships as they relate to the grant. This demonstrates the conditions and autonomy necessary to carry out the reform project.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Letters of support are provided from: University of Georgia, State School Superintendent, Athens Clarke County, Athens Area Chamber of Commerce, Athens Technical College, Northeast Georgia RESA, Parent Advisory Board, Family Connection-Communities in Schools of Athens, building principals, staff and students. The district states that the 'partners' meet consistently to develop the initial plan but a listing of what stakeholder groups the 'partners' represent is missing. The plan was then presented to stakeholder groups to and all stakeholders were given the opportunity too ask questions and provide input.

While Clarke County School district does include evidence that all stakeholders were consulted and that they ultimately support the grant, the 'partners' referred to in the development and deployment of the grant are undocumented. It is unclear whether or not the suggestions gleaned from the community meeting were later incorporated into the plan. The building principals were the presenters to the school staff, however without knowing if they were included in the original developing 'partners', it is unclear if they had sufficient knowledge to present to the grant and gain informed support from the staff.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	4
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

High Quality Plan analyzing current status and the logic behind reform proposal including needs and gaps: Clarke County School District analyzes the level of implementation of current technology tools and makes the logical conclusion to move to the next steps of integration of technology into personalized learning. They intend to assess the readiness of both students and staff through assessments and then plan trainings to meet the identified needs. This assessment and analysis will be conducted in year 1. Responsible parties are not identified to carry out this assessment and training however.

Overall, Clarke County School District demonstrates a high quality plan to address needs and gaps. They demonstrate an awareness of the need to assess readiness and identify areas of needs and gaps. Assessment tools are specifically named and the district provides a timeline for their administration in year 1. After analyzing those results, the district will produce deliverables and focus on trainings and professional development. However, the district remains vague on naming the responsible parties, a key element of a high quality plan. Again responsible parties are referred to as 'the partners.'

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	10

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

High Quality Plan including an approach to implementing instructional strategies that enable students to pursue a rigorous course of study and accelerate learning through support: Key components are missing including specific timelines, training for parents and students and responsible parties.

a. all students: Clarke Country School District discusses a comprehensive system that will administer assessments and aid students in setting goals, give them a road map to show them where they are in terms of progress towards goals, and tie in real world learning scenarios as well as conference calls to link learning to areas of academic interest and gain exposure to diverse cultures and context. The proposal fails to address skills and traits such as teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, and problem solving. There is also a limited link drawn between these components and how they will translate into instructional strategies to accelerate student learning. High needs students are not addressed in this section.

b. access to: The PORTAL system includes a roadmap which will give students a complete picture of his/her progress towards college and career ready standards and graduating on time. The proposal documents that courses offered will be vetted and students can access virtual school curriculum however the proposal does not address how a variety of instructional environments will be executed. Regular and ongoing feedback will be feasible as the PORTAL can auto assign needed treatments and assessments given the student's performance. Teachers will also have the ability to assign treatments and assessments as well. Again, high needs students are not addressed.

c. training for students: Specific training plans for students are not specified other than to state that instructional coaches will be available and training can be customized by school.

Overall, Clarke County School District demonstrates an innovative PORTAL system that will adequately track student progress however key elements of a high quality plan are missing including timelines, training, and responsible parties. High needs students are not specifically addressed and the link between these experiences and deepening student learning is limited.

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

20

8

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

High Quality Plan for improving teaching and leading including instructional strategies and support: The district adopted a new framework in 2010 that has been the foundation for the reform proposal.

a. all participating educators engage in training and professional teams:

- i. support effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student's needs- the district has achieved adequate time for teachers to meet and analyze student data and discuss interventions as needed.
- ii. adapt content and instruction in response to individual academic needs and interests- PORTAL will allow teachers to extend learning exercises to focus on areas of interest and adapt content to meet student needs. However, no discussion is made as to how to intervene if students are not successful in a digital platform. If a student's learning style is not conducive to this PORTAL system, there is no evidence presented to suggest that alternatives will be available.
- iii. frequently measure student progress and use data to inform instruction- PORTAL will automate data collection that is currently done by teams and allow teachers to make more effective decisions in student programming. Automation will make data collection and analysis more efficient but educators may not be as familiar with individual student data as they were when they were actually analyzing the data.
- iv. feedback from teacher and principal evaluation systems- the evaluation system currently in place is undergoing revision to include student data. From the evidence presented, it is unclear how the final evaluation system will include feedback, recommendations and supports.

b. all participating educators have tools, data and resources to accelerate student progress including:

- i. actionable information to identify optimal learning approaches- PORTAL will compile student level data and provide links to resources suggested for an individual student thus exposing the student to experiences that are reasonably likely to cause accelerated achievement.
- ii. high quality learning resources- all resources contained in the PORTAL will be vetted by internal and external expert specialists, will be aligned to CCSS and curriculum standards and contains processes to create new resources as needed. This process describes an extensive procedure for ensuring high quality resources.
- iii. processes and tools to match student need- PORTAL will track student resource usage as well as assessment data and analyze if the student's experiences caused student achievement. This information will then be used to suggest further resources for the student thus creating a strong probability of continued success.

c. all participating school leaders and leadership teams have training, policies, tools, data and resources to structure the environment:

- i. information from sources such as the teacher evaluation system- The evaluation system for the district is currently under development. The PORTAL system will assist leaders in drilling down within the data to the instructional level to give educators feedback on strengths and weaknesses. This information will then be incorporated into the proposed evaluation system to improve instruction. The tenets of culture and climate are not addressed in this section nor is there a link described from the proposed evaluation system to overall school continuous improvement.
- ii. training, systems and practice to continuously improve school progress- PORTAL will aid the district in data driven decision making and the development of Value Added Models. However, the district does not address systems of continuous improvement nor discussions of training for these models. There is also no discussion with regards to closing the achievement gap.

d. high quality plan for increasing number of students receiving instruction from effective and highly effective educators- the district does not document a system of measuring effective and highly effective educators. Rather, numbers for experienced and very experienced educators are provided. There is no evidence of a high quality plan to measure effective and highly effective educators nor to increase student access to them.

Overall, Clarke County School District documents evidence of training and the existence of professional teams who engage in activities to analyze student data and intervene as needed. The PORTAL will assist with data gathering and accessibility of high quality resources aligned with individual student need. However, the teacher and principal evaluation systems are currently under going revisions and it is unclear how those systems will provide feedback and actionable information for continuous improvement. Key elements of a high quality plan in regards to improving leading and teaching are missing including responsible parties and timelines as well as systems for gathering required information such as culture and climate measures and students served by effective and highly effective educators. There is no discussion as to how the proposed actions will assist in closing the achievement gap. This places the application in the mid-low range on this indicator.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	7
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>a. organizing the LEA central office to provide support- District states that this is in place although there is no elaboration or discussion to explain in what ways the current organizational structure will accomplish this support. The application does state, however, that because the reform will be implemented incrementally, issues will be addressed as they arise.</p> <p>b. school leadership teams have sufficient flexibility and autonomy- Again, district states this is in place. Each school has a School Improvement Leadership Team and a Local School Council to address implementation and issues. Application states that individual schools have control over schedules, calendars, personnel and staffing decisions roles and responsibilities and site based budgets. This level of flexibility and autonomy will be sufficient to carry out the reform proposal.</p> <p>c. students have opportunity to progress and earn credit based on content mastery- The legislature passed a bill stating that credits can be earned based on mastery rather than seat time. Students will be given the opportunity to accelerate their learning both within the PORTAL system and by enrolling in dual enrollment classes. Thus the PORTAL system would be a method by which to document and facilitate acceleration.</p> <p>d. students have opportunity to demonstrate mastery at multiple times in multiple ways- While students will be able to assess frequently with the PORTAL, the district does not discuss other ways or opportunities for students to demonstrate mastery aside from the PORTAL assessment system.</p> <p>e. resources are adaptable and accessible to all students including English learners and students with disabilities- District states that assistive technology and language systems will be build in but specific information is sparse. There is no discussion surrounding students who may be visually impaired nor is there information regarding the supports the language systems will provide.</p> <p>Overall, Clarke County School District demonstrates limited elements of a high-quality plan in regards to providing needed supports for project implementation. The district does demonstrate sufficient flexibility and autonomy to be able to carry out the reform proposal and systems are in place to allow students to earn credits and progress based on mastery. However, information regarding central office support including responsible parties, providing evidence of deliverables in terms of demonstrating mastery in multiple ways and activities to provide supports for students such as English learners and students with disabilities is limited.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>a. All students, parents, stakeholders and educators have access to content. tools and resources- The district has partnered with community organizations to provide families with refurbished desktops in the home and wireless access in the community. However, desktops will be distributed based on income.</p> <p>b. All have access to necessary technical support- Training sessions will be offered for parents and peer support, online and other local support will be available for students and teachers. Personnel will be designated to provide technical support as needed at the district level. Training and support detailed is reasonable for students and teachers but parent and community support is insufficient.</p> <p>c. Allow for export of information in open data format- District utilizes Google Apps for Education and states that this system is free and secure. It allows for online collaboration. The PORTAL system will be useful in combining information from a variety of formats as well. These two systems would qualify as open data formats.</p> <p>d. Use interoperable data systems- PORTAL will allow for seamless data exchange between various district systems thus fulfilling this criteria.</p> <p>Overall, Clarke County School District demonstrates evidence of a high quality plan to address infrastructure that will soundly provide for the implementation of the reform proposal. Responsible parties, i.e. partnerships with agencies in the community, will provide access to hardware and internet access will be increased. Data sharing among systems, exporting data and securing data are thoroughly addressed. However, the application does state that families will be issued desktops based on income. It is unclear if there are sufficient desktops to provide one to every family who may need one but who would not</p>		

qualify as low income. Additionally, discussed training opportunities for parents and the community will be insufficient. Timelines, a key element of a high quality plan, are missing.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	7
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Clarke County School District currently has a continuous improvement framework in place for evaluation of school improvement plans as well as the district improvement plan. The district proposes to incorporate the RTT-D grant reform process into each school improvement plan and continue to use the same framework to provide feedback and identify opportunities for ongoing corrections. This process is sufficient to monitor a school improvement plan which is largely invested in annual student achievement, but is insufficient for monitoring large scale reform implementation which will require more regular feedback checks.</p> <p>The district will continue to prepare five reports to monitor implementation: annual school improvement survey, annual district data notebook, classroom walkthrough data, benchmark and diagnostic classroom assessment reports, and school improvement plan implementation and impact checks. These will be shared with parent groups and the community through board meetings and annual Title 1 meetings. Additional reports will be needed adequately measure the goals set forth in the grant proposal.</p> <p>While Clarke County School District has a process in place to facilitate continuous improvement, the current model is insufficient to monitor and allow for correction for the RTT-D grant reform proposal in a timely manner.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Clarke County School District utilizes a variety of sources to communicate information both internally and externally. These include: meetings with Parent Advisory Boards, Teacher Advisory Boards, Instructional Councils; technology tools such as website, blogs, social media, email listserv; cable television channel; and paper copies of flyers and reports. These are all in addition to the meetings and reports mentioned in the previous section. The list of various methods used to disseminate information is extensive and several of these methods offer two-way communication allowing for stakeholder input. The district sets forth a comprehensive effort to reach all stakeholders.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>For all populations: number of students served by effective and highly effective teachers and principals- the district is unable to provide this information and states that the state has no plans at this time to require this information.</p> <p>PreK-3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a. Applicant must propose at least one age-appropriate measure of students' academic growth- district proposes the PPVT for PreK measuring age appropriate oral language, GKIDS ELA and Math for kinder measuring mastery in content standards, Math Computational Fluency for grades 1-2 measuring overall math fluency, and CRCT for grade 3 measuring mastery of content standards. These assessments are sufficient to measure academic performance. • b. Applicant must propose at least one age-appropriate non-cognitive indicator of growth- The district proposes to use student attendance rates for this indicator. Student attendance does not provide evidence of age-appropriate non-cognitive growth. <p>4-8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a. The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness based on the applicant's on-track indicator- the district proposes to use measure of percentage of students passing four core classes as measured by end of course grades. This is a sufficient measure of future predicted achievement in high school courses. 		

- b. Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate academic leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan- The district proposes to use the CRCT test in Math, Reading and Science which is a content mastery measure and serves as the district benchmark assessment. This assessment is sufficient to fulfill this requirement as it will measure student achievement in content which is targeted by the PORTAL system.
- c. Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan- The district proposes to utilize student attendance data to fulfill this requirement stating that absences are a reflection of a student's health. This is a weak correlation as attendance can be effected by more than a student's health.

9-12:

- a. The number and percentage of participating students who complete and submit the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) form- The district is not currently able to provide this data but is working with the Student Finance Commission to gain access to this information.
- b. The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness based on the applicant's on-track indicator- The district proposes to use the percentage of students earning credits in all core content areas to fulfill this indicator. This is sufficient to show progress towards on time graduation.
- c. Applicant must propose at least one measure of career-readiness in order to assess the number and percentage of participating students who are or are on track to being career-ready- the district proposes to use percent of CTAE completers earning a industry recognized credential. This is sufficient to tracking on time graduation requirements on a career plan.
- d. Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate academic leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan- The district proposes to use End of Course Tests to meet this requirement. The district states that these tests are aligned with the state performance standards. This measure may be incompatible with the PORTAL system if students are no longer taking traditional courses for which these tests are available.
- e. Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan- The district proposes to utilize student attendance data to fulfill this requirement stating that absences are a reflection of a student's health. This is a weak correlation as attendance can be effected by more than a student's health.

Overall, Clarke County School District is unable to present performance measures to address required measures set forth in this criteria (all: a and b, PreK-3 b, 4-8 c, and 9-12 a, d and e). Other performance measures, as discussed in the Vision section A4, do not show ambitious yet achievable targets. Therefore, the district scores in the low range on this indicator.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Clarke County School District has multiple evaluation methods in place to monitor the effectiveness of the RTT-D investment including professional learning/development, project implementation, PORTAL use and other outcomes. The Project Management team will meet monthly to evaluate status, determine overall progress, assess the quality and rate performance. They will consider use of time, staff, money and other resources and their direct impact on improved use of technology, organization of school structures and working with community partners. This is timely and sufficient to assess and provide opportunities for correction. Specific protocols for gathering data will be developed to justify the ratings awarded and to assure fidelity of implementation. Qualitative and Quantitative data will be collected in both process and outcome evaluations. Statistical models are outlined for process evaluation and documentation artifacts described. A fidelity rating will be awarded and the IRB process adhered to. The proposal outlined by the district is extensive and will thoroughly evaluate the effectiveness of investment.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a. All funds are identified. In addition to RTT-D funds, Clarke Country School District will utilize SPLOST funds (Special Local Option Sales Tax), Title I and Title II funds, Georgia Professional Learning Funds and local district funds. Once RTT-D funds are exhausted at the end of the four year grant cycle, these additional funding sources will remain thus the sustainability of the project remains feasible.

b. Funds are reasonable and sufficient to fund the PORTAL project. A large percentage of the funds will go towards personnel and fringe benefits for personnel. Supplies and contractual services make up another large percentage. The lowest expenditure is for equipment. According to supporting charts, the equipment will consist of servers and software licensing, not devices. The devices are accounted for in the supply budget line item.

c. rationale for investments and priorities:

- i. The district invests significant funds into people. At the end of the grant cycle, the lessons and resources the people develop will become the intellectual property of the district. Therefore, the district is justified in investing a large percentage of grant monies into people. Funds being utilized include federal, state and local funds and involve outside agencies. This demonstrates community support for the project as well as sustainability after the grant cycle.
- ii. The district outlines which funds are one time expenditures and which are ongoing operational costs. Ongoing costs can be sustained by other funding sources mentioned (federal, state and local funds).

Overall, Clarke County School District outlined a comprehensive budget in which the majority of the investment is in people and the development of intellectual property. Their second priority in terms of funding is dedicated to supplies which includes the devices to facilitate the PORTAL project. The district has identified outside funding sources that are sustainable. The budget is reasonable and sufficient to fund the four year project.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

High quality plan for sustainability: The district has identified other funding sources from federal, state and local funds which will continue to support the PORTAL program at the end of the RTT-D grant cycle. Their largest investment during the grant is in people. At the end of the grant cycle, the lessons and resources developed by the people will become the intellectual property of the district. Several of the positions funded by the RTT-D grant are four year positions but some people will remain on staff at the conclusion of the grant which will be sufficient to create a continuity and continue to build on the work completed during the grant cycle. The district will continue to utilize free software programs available, such as Google Educational Suite, to save operational funds to allow for purchase of devices after the grant cycle. Students are also encourage to bring their own technology device to school to access resources.

Overall, Clarke County School District details ongoing funding options that are appropriate to sustain the PORTAL reform at the end of the grant cycle. However, elements of a high quality plan are missing including a transition plan to move from year four (first year of full implementation) to year five (loss of significant funding at the end of the grant and loss of key personnel).

The district also inadequately addresses how devices will be refreshed and how they will continue to move towards a 1:1 device ratio. While students are permitted to bring their own devices, this is not adequate to ensure a 1:1 ratio as stated in the proposal.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

1. Coherent and sustainable partnership: Family connection is a partnership formed a decade ago of 90 organizations. Clarke County School district is a member of this partnership. The partnership will assist with the reform grant in Absolute Priority 1 by developing a comprehensive database of services and provide this information within the PORTAL system. The partnership will also assist with providing computers and wireless internet access to the families in the community. The partnership as described provides an extensive support to the district and the reform projects.

2. Not more than 10 population-level desired results: The partnership has identified 9 goals addressing both academic and social-emotional indicators as well as family indicators. The overarching goal is to increase family engagement. The indicators selected are appropriate indicators of future success.

3. Partnership would:

- a. track indicators- Each indicator will have data collected by a member of the partnership with direct control over that behavior. For example, health indicators will be tracked by the Department of Health. The data collected will then be imported into the PORTAL while observing all FERPA regulations. The district believes it is important to input data into the PORTAL to gain an overall profile at the individual student level however the type of data collected by the partnership is of an extremely sensitive nature and should not be accessible by the student's teacher. The district must ensure that sensitive data is visible on a restricted basis to comply with FERPA.
- b. Use data to target resources- Information from the PORTAL will be used across agencies through the partnership in order to provide case management services and direct families to services that are a match to their needs. The district does not provide evidence of how this case management will target students facing significant challenges such as English Learners or Students with Disabilities. Rather the focus is on family instability and child welfare issues.
- c. Scale the model beyond participating students- Currently, the partnership intervenes with case management one significant issues have been identified. The district asserts that with the PORTAL system tracking all data, case management services can be provided to more families who are at risk before they are in the systems served by the partnership.
- d. Improve results over time- The district maintains that as the various partners and service providers become more adept at using the PORTAL, results will improve as the appropriate services are linked to families at risk.

4. Integrate education with other services: Service integration will be on an individual student/family basis only through the case management process. The local college will assist qualifying students with college transition through pre-collegiate experiences but this is limited to 100 students who meet qualifying criteria. Other large scale integration between the partnership and all the students served by the grant proposal is not addressed.

5. Build capacity:

- a. assess the needs and assets of participating students: Students and families in need will be identified through the PORTAL based on data imported from various agencies.
- b. identify and inventory needs of school and community: The partnership meets annually to discuss the annual plan which outlines the needs of the community. Various work groups then meet monthly to assess progress and success of various programs and identify continuing areas of need.
- c. decision making process and infrastructure: All decisions regarding services for students and families will occur through the case management process and inter-agency staffings.
- d. engage parents and families: Partnership believes parents are the lead partner in the team. Parents are also encouraged to hold leadership positions in various aspects of the partnerships.
- e. routinely assess progress: Each work group meets monthly to examine progress and make adjustments to the plan as needed. Periodic data reviews are also held to assess outcomes.

6. Ambitious yet achievable performance measures: Of the 9 indicators outlined by the partnership, baseline data is disaggregated by subgroup in only one area- high school graduation rate. The other indicators give whole group baseline numbers however baseline data is not available for the last 3 indicators. Performance targets are listed by year and increase or decrease at equal intervals each year. No information is provided as to how these targets were set. No goals were set for the 3 indicators that lack baseline data. With the lack of evidence provided, the performance measures are neither ambitious nor achievable.

Overall, Clarke County School District demonstrates a strong relationship with a well established partnership of 90 agencies. This partnership is well positioned to provide support for the goals and projects listed in Absolute Priority 1. Nine population-level outcomes are identified which include both academic and social-emotional outcomes. However, no data is available for three of the outcomes and thus no targets can be set. The other outcomes have targets set by year but no evidence is provided to demonstrate how those targets were determined. Targets either increase or decrease annually based on a set rate. Therefore, the targets do not qualify as ambitious yet achievable. The partnership relies heavily on the use of the PORTAL system to warehouse data, analyze data and determine if students are at risk. This will necessitate data imports from various agencies. The district must ensure that access to sensitive data be restricted in compliance with FERPA regulations. Once data is analyzed, the partnership will implement case management procedures with identified students and families. These services will benefit those families identified but the district does not address how the partnership will benefit the students served by the RTT-D grant as a whole. These concerns place the competitive preference priority in the mid range.

Absolute Priority 1



	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Clarke County School District demonstrates how they will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to improve learning and teaching through the PORTAL system. This system will adequately provide access to resources and educational experiences that are aligned to college and career ready standards and will prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace. Students will be provided the opportunities to accelerate and deepen their learning by the PORTAL system guiding them to educational experiences matched to their specific learning styles and interests. The PORTAL system will provide educators will access to data that has been analyzed at the individual student level thereby allowing educators to more effectively address student needs. The district has not provided evidence of how the PORTAL system will specifically target decreasing achievement gaps and is unable to gather data on effective and highly effective educators at this time. Also, the district does not discuss recruiting and retaining effective teachers and principals nor do they address turning around low-achieving schools. However, overall, the district does demonstrate evidence of meeting the components of Absolute Priority 1.</p>		
Total	210	114



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0793GA-3 for Clarke County School District

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>Clark County School District (CCSD) shows that they have enlisted a broad scope of partners to help create the vision for their RTTD grant submission. As a result of these partnerships, CCSD is able to present an ambitious and clear vision for how they plan to move beyond the constraints of high poverty to create the conditions that will result in comprehensive reform. The district addresses all four assurance areas via a thoughtful approach of segmenting each area into a separate paragraph: college and career ready, data systems to improve instruction, teacher and leader evaluation systems, and turning around lowest achieving schools . CCS has no low achieving schools but does have three schools designated as Focus Schools under ESEA.</p> <p>This section of their application describes how the district has a new teacher-leader evaluation system already in place as a result of a RTTT state grant, how they have forged a partnership with the GA Department of Education and Athens Technical College to create Athens Community Career Academy which will ultimate offer 17 state specified career pathways for students at upper grade levels and how they are already expanding dual enrollment opportunities for students. They report an effort to implement the International Baccalaureate program for middle grades. Not as much is said about how they will impact elementary students. The vision details a focus on increasing student achievement to levels that will make their students both college and career ready. They speak to the gaps they intend to close regarding technology access, use and understanding of data to impact the success of their application. The applicant outlines a plan to connect fragmented technology, to make available the personnel , and the resources to move this plan forward. Hiring personnel central to the implementation of personalized online learning, sweeping changes in professional development delivery processes, and data access and use by staff, students, parent, and partners to transform the district and its schools to a national model for reform and positive changes are indicators of ambitious goals.</p>		

Though it appears these changes will come at a high financial investment, the proposal does appear to be doable and is forward thinking given what is occurring across the globe with virtual learning. One area of concern left following review of the response is the likelihood of sustainability of the advances made once funding is no longer available. Additionally, neither the (A)(1) section response nor the appendix addresses recruiting, rewarding, or retaining effective teachers and principals one of the expectations for this section. However the applicant does address developing teachers and principals through professional development.

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

10

10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Clark County addresses its intent to gradually include each of the district's twenty-one (21) schools over the course of the four year grant cycle. This process represents a scaling up of the project over the course of the grant cycle with results and challenges identified resulting in modifications to the approach. CCSD defines a plan to begin with pilot schools. Then they address how they intend will to use a treatment group to provide data that will result in a expanded project impacting all sites so that each school ultimately benefits from the grant. Descriptions of the district and the population it serves are included. The district and all schools meet the eligibility criteria for the RTTD competition (i.e. poverty rate of 79% and free reduced lunch % ranging from 43.3% to 90.1%) . The applicant intends to approach the project with a Year 1 of planning and evaluation aimed at addressing and identifying challenges to full implementation. Year 2 is to be devoted to refinement of PORTAL along with the pilot in selected schools. Years 3 and 4 will exclude the two pilot elementary schools representing each high school that were selected based on demographics and feeder patterns. Finally in Year 4 PORTAL is to be implemented in all 21 schools. The applicant presents an approach that appears feasible and that will be likely to impact high quality local education agency implementation.

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

10

6

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

This applicant presents a quality plan, as opposed to a high quality plan, for how CCSD will approach reform. In evaluating whether a plan is high quality, reviewers are looking in each section for the key goals, activities to be undertaken, the timeline, deliverables, parties responsible for implementing activates, and the overall credibility of the plan. CCSD's plan represents a researched based approach to scaled up efforts to achieve individualization and personalization of the learning experiences of the students of the district. This is one goal the applicant specifies in this section of the application. Activities which include meetings among stakeholders, professional development for educators, hiring of personnel to advance the effort, review and, if necessary, adjustment of instructional content are also provided in the response. A broad timeline spanning the life of the grant is included but there are no incremental timelines outlined except what is to be accomplished in each year.

The applicant, through a variety of process and outcome checks, expresses and intent to keep the implementation of the project on schedule while ensuring that they document successes attained and challenges faced and overcome. The plan explains the collaborative's intent to use a broad array of newly developed digital learning modules to impact standards mastery by students. The plan includes a process for data collection that yields personalized student performance information also intended to impact the enhancement of student learning. The plan emphasizes the use of ongoing evaluation to develop, implement, and continually enhance the project though the parties spearheading and held responsible for these processes are not clearly identified. This address the logic model for change that has been selected by the applicant.

The CCSD plan also includes how the district and its broad spectrum of partners will annually scale up the project each year over the previous year so that the specified goals' likelihood of being successfully accomplished is heightened. The applicant's model represents the partners' theory of change and closely aligns to beliefs outlined in the 2012 *Digital Textbook Playbook* according to the application. Since the project will not impact every school in each year, this could limit the rate of change and cause some schools to progress at different levels. Overall goals---to increase student standards mastery and educator performance--- are provided.

Deliverables, parties responsible, and rationales for the activities undertaken are not included in this section of the response which results in the assigned rating.

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

10

6

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant explains that there are some areas where they already exceed state ESEA performance area targets. They have

selected for focus the areas of science and math where many students struggle to achieve at higher levels. The application also points out that the district is largely minority. Therefore the number of subgroups they must address to close achievement gaps is decreased markedly. As part of the funded grant, the applicant addresses that they intend to improve the quality of their local summative assessments and to focus on making longitudinal data available to make predictive decisions rather than mere corrective decisions. There is the intention to implement eight specific activities to meet the goals of the project. The applicant acknowledges that while they have already have access to a volume of data, the access is neither timely nor housed in one place. Tables included in this section provide the baseline information for areas a - d of this section. Data is provided in the tables for all subgroups enrolled and goals for increases over the course of the grant cycle are specified. These expected increases range from goals to attain gains ranging from 12 % for some subgroups to gains of up to 50% (for students with disabilities). This goal range is ambitious but may not be achieved easily given no logistics for attaining these goals are given.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	11
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant chronicles the district's clear record of success over the past four years in its response to this criteria. The applicant reports that despite a poverty rate that climbed to 39% in 2009 , compared to the state's 18.5%, student learning was advancing and achievement gaps were narrowing over this period. They support this statement further by indicating that fewer students are reliant on early intervention and remedial services. The narrative shows that graduation rate has gone up in the district to 70.8% in 2011 over the 58.4% in 2007. They also report increases in all areas of the Georgia Criterion Referenced Competency Tests for all students grades 3-8 from 2009-2012 with the only exception being 3rd grade science.</p> <p>The goals outlined in this section are ambitious and are focused on the areas of greatest need. The district does not have persistently low achieving schools or low performing schools as defined by the notice. Current limitations that may impact the project goals appear to be related to the capability to report all data in the most useful ways and in showing success in all areas of student learning.</p> <p>The applicant describes how they use School Improvement Plans to get schools and the district focused on the areas in need of the greatest improvement. Among the long term goals of this applicant's project is to acquire the personnel, materials, and equipment needed to allow them to make student performance data more readily available to all stakeholders. They want this data available and accessible in ways that inform and result in the improvement of instruction, services, and participation.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CCSD reports the use of local media to get information out to the public. The applicant reports that the district hosts three budget meetings each year that the public is invited to attend and where public feedback is invited. It is also reported that the superintendent hosts numerous meetings each year where information is shared and public input is sought. The application details that there is a website called Open Georgia where the state shares information on how state agencies and school districts spend tax dollars and other revenue. This site also includes the salaries of all employees in any state agency. The data is searchable by agency by district and by school. The district uses its own website to share information and post links to the Open Georgia site showing personnel salaries at the school level and other related district information. This is an indication that the district and the state are working hard to ensure that a high degree of transparency exists. Non-personnel expenditures are not addressed. Also it is not clear whether the Open Georgia site yields total of categories a-c or whether the information is only available by individual.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	9
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Within the application there are several references to the authority given by the state to allow the district the autonomy to work toward improved personalization of learning environments without state-placed barriers that impede them. This is validated by virtue of the fact that the GA Department of Education has agreed to be a participating partner in this grant. With this agreement to partner and support the application it this reader's assumption that any identified barriers to the success of this project that exist in legal, statutory, or regulatory areas will be removed. based on the existence of this partnership and the</p>		

partners' knowledge that RTTD has specific requirements. The existence of autonomy is further validated by the Memorandum of Agreement between the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and the district where the agencies have partnered in the creation on instructional modules that will be digitized and personalized to meet learner needs. The application reports an existing focus on skill/goal mastery in this district rather than mere seat time by its students. This represents an allowance afforded by local policy and state statute. Though some technology may be fragmented at this point, the applicant's plan to tie these fragmented portions together for the good of its students and those who serve them is indicative that successful conditions are in place and are being readied to be in place.

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

10

10

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant is on target with (B)(4)'s requirement for evidence of stakeholder engagement and support. The application reflects the forging of broad partnerships with initial efforts that date back to the 2010-2011 school year. The applicant describes meetings in the early fall of the current year where administrators, principals and other appropriate stakeholders met to talk about and agree on the vision and direction this application would take. An extensive collection of letters of support from all key stakeholder groups (i.e. the mayor, partners, administrators, teachers, students, and parents) is included in Appendix B. One example showing how input being sought and advice was taken is where the GA Department of Education reviewed the application and provided written feedback (also in the appendices) about the application itself including suggestions for items to add and specifics on which parts of the draft parts needed strengthening to meet grant requirements. Information included in the application also refers to a 75% percent buy in of teachers who supported pursuing the application.

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

5

3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

This applicant provides evidence that it is currently making strides in the area of educational reform and innovation. its presented evidence backing this statement is that the district's schools are achieving and are not ranked as low achieving or low performing. The district report that it is not satisfied with "some growth", they seek more. They aspire to perform at even higher levels and seek to identify ways to use technology to make educational environments more personalized. CCSD also has as a goal to have prepared professionals among their employee ranks, something they intend to accomplish through data analysis and improved professional development. CCSD's plan is to build on the existing infrastructure of technological hardware on hand adding to it with funds from an approved grant.. They also report an intent to build on their past successes in bringing about innovation. This is their evidence base for the conditions being present to bring about reform and for activities to be undertaken..

As part of an analysis process, CCSD has taken a self assessment. It has analyzed availability and access to needed technology devices as well as as having done an analysis of needs and gaps across the district. They applicant identifies the need to have the appropriate levels of technology available to implement the project successfully as one need

They have developed an implementation timeline. To get to the heart of student needs CCSD is looking at all currently available data. They intend to give preassessments to teachers to determine both content and pedagogical learning needs particularly in the areas of math and science, the identified focuses of this project where their students are weakest. This is data analysis.

The district is currently bringing in the NETS program and SLDS to measure student growth and success. Also already available is the Georgia Virtual School (GVS) that overs over 120 internet based courses for middle school through high school. Missing from this section are the parties responsible for implementing the activities. The plan is credible though not completely specific. Omitted from this section are the specific deliverables and responsible parties,

Readiness of staff to implement the project fully is not expected until after Year 1 of the project is completed during which time ongoing professional development is intended to occur. While there is a mention of a needs and gaps analysis having been completed, this section of the application does not specifically address the plan for addressing the gaps identified for anyone except teachers. Fragmented technology that does not quickly or completely interface has already been mentioned as an identified gap that must be addressed . Addressing the needs of elementary learners who could benefit from a program like GVS is not touched upon in the applicant's response to this section. This plan is evaluated as a high quality plan as their analysis efforts appear to have been very thorough.

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>Clark County provides a detailed plan for improving the learning of its students and the performance of its professional educators. It is apparent that they place great value on the wealth of possibilities that more technology availability and access can create for teachers and students. As they have done in the prior sections of the grant, in (C)(1) CCSD's response describes a plan to build on the use of existing technology to connect data about students' needs, interests, and gaps in skill mastery. According to the response, the technology additions and improvements will aid in helping students understand that learning is key to their success. Improved data reflecting student progress and standards mastery, they believe, will result in students being better prepared for college and careers. In the CCSD response to this section the applicant focuses on the mastery of critical content, the development of skills and traits for such things as higher order thinking and expanded skill development. This applicant plans to improve instructional practice by focusing on students' needs. The applicant describes an existing fragmented system that this RTTD project is intended to correct so that students' needs are quickly and effectively addressed in all instructional environments. This focus will also result in parents' ability to access and understand their children's progress and growth needs in a way that is more user friendly than what currently exists.</p> <p>The acronym for the project, PORTAL, suggests the applicant's intent to use and further develop personalized online resources to accelerate learning. References to digital learning content, an emphasis on the used of Common Core Standards, and the district's own Non Negotiable Instructional Practices reflect the variety of instructional approaches and environments available in CCSD. Accommodations and high quality strategies for high need students are not specifically defined in the this section nor are specifics for frequently updated 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. The timeline is not repeated in this section nor are the deliverables, parties responsible. Yet the plan is deemed credible and is assessed as quality. The notice indicates that adjustments may be made as more information becomes available therefore this plan for (C) (1) may receive adjustments.</p>		

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	13
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Personalized learning is the emphasis of this applicant's project. They describe a plan for building on current practices and instructional approaches to better meet the needs of students' served. The use of ongoing collaborative processes involving personnel, parents, students, and project partners to build a seamless instructional environment that will enhance teaching and learning. The applicant outlines the frequency of meetings among the professionals and a plan that will help them identify future professional learning needs as part of this project. Frequent feedback opportunities as well as opportunities to assess and reassess evaluation and training systems are also included. Little is mentioned about policy in the response to this section. However, vetting of resources to ensure they are in line with best practices and useful in the attainment of the overall goals of this project are included.</p> <p>As a check for whether the applicant's plan is high quality, a close look was taken at whether there are goals presented and whether they are ambitious and achievable. The goals are listed in the headings of the response. Whether there are activities and rationales for those activities is also evaluated. Activities such as the weekly teacher meetings, district benchmark assessments, assessment of student learning styles are included among the listed activities. The timelines included (other than the specified meeting) are primarily the tasks to be addressed each year and not necessarily any by a more regular frequency. Deliverables are not clearly spelled out nor are the parties responsible. Even with these noted omissions the application's response to this section is credible and the plan, with adjustments made as the project progresses, is of good quality. Unclear in this section is how feedback will be used.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	10
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>CCSD presents information about structure and practice in its response to (D)(1). The applicant is not specific in presenting a structured plan inclusive of timelines, deliverables, or parties responsible for activities which are all components of a high quality plan. The applicant's response to this section addresses CCSD's organizational structure, practices, policies, and rules all of which are aimed at this goal of providing support to educators, students, and the LEA. CCSD provided the structure of</p>		

the district's central office in a prior section of the application. That central office structure was not repeated in this section. The applicant identifies the existence and use of leadership teams who will work to implement the RTTTD PORTAL project. There is no mention of a need to review or revise local policies. There is a mention that some state policies, and as a result, local practices will likely change to comply with grant requirements. Leadership teams are reported to have both flexibility and autonomy. This section also discusses a new GA House Bill, #186, that requires the State Board of Education to adopt policies and set guidelines that address how units of high school credit are to be awarded based upon mastery and not merely time at school seated in a desk. The district reports it is already using a process that involves standards mastery for students to progress through the grades. The full automation and implementation of the PORTAL project is expected to bring about multiple opportunities and multiple methods of delineating mastery according to the application (a goal). English language learners' needs and the needs of students with disabilities are intended to be addressed by the use of assistive technology and language programs.

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

10

6

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Though little was said about local education agency policies impacting the successful implementation of this grant project in the response, the applicant is very clear in defining how the GA DOE has and is removing barriers and supporting school districts in their quest to reach the learners they serve. The applicant's n addresses CSSD does not intend to allow income levels to be a factor impacting student achievement. Regardless of the income levels in students' homes, Clark County describes an intent to make technology available to all families The responses outlined in this section of application address how digital information technology will be used to enhance the learning experiences of students and the repertoire of teachers to bring real world experiences to the students they serve. The applicant addresses that all stakeholders, including parents will be involved, but gives no real details on how meaningful engagement with stakeholder, especially parents, will be accomplished. Letters of support included indicate that there is student, government, and state support for the effort. Purchases of equipment by the district and planned purchases intended as a part of a funded grant are aligned to ensure that CCSD has data systems that interoperate. Their RTTTD project is intended to ensure the expansion and improvement of information technology in CCSD. The added personnel a funded grant will provide should ensure that there are ample people to perform technology related work and to provide the appropriate technical assistance needed by instructional staff, administrators, parents, or students. The focus at this point appears to be on being able to better use, manage and share student level data. There is no written plan reflecting how they will ensure human resources data and budget data will fit into the overall plan. Therefore some critical components of a high quality plan are missing from this section. (i.e.. specific activities to be undertaken, timelines for accomplishment and review, specific deliverables, parties responsible for activities). Goals included appear credible and worthy; specificity to denote the high quality nature of the plan is absent.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	13

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Included in this section are the applicant's plans for the regular monitoring processes and the attainment of goals. The applicant includes an intent to make adjustments when necessary based upon assessments of progress toward goals from data review meetings. Annual surveys of School Improvement Plans and of the District Data Notebook are mentioned in the application as methods for fostering continued improvement. However, no specific frequency for such contacts is reflected in the narrative. The sharing of information with partners and the general public are listed as methods to be employed to achieve continuous improvement. Here again, no specificity about the regularity of such meetings and contacts, beyond annually, is included in this section. The Title I parent meeting is included as a planned mechanism to share information and garner feedback. Also mentioned are the internal quality assurance reviews which are a requirement of the rigorous SACS district accreditation process. What is included in the plan is clear, the omitted portions addressed above result in the assigned score.

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

5

5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Descriptions of multiple methods of ongoing contact and communication strategies are outlined in the application. The

strategies include the use of the Athens Banner-Herald, the local newspaper, the district's website, local cable television, a variety of stakeholder meetings, email lists and list serves for every school, a regularly updated technology blog, along with an annual summary report to the school board. These strategies for ongoing communication sufficiently meet the requirements for this section.

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

5

3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The table included in this section of the application describes the applicable population, performance measure, and the description of the proposed measures for all entries except the percentage of participating students, by subgroup, whose teacher of record and principal are highly effective and the percentage and the number and percentage of participating students who complete and submit the Free Application for Federal Student Aid in grades 9-12. CCSD indicates that for the first measure, instruments to assess these areas are in the development stage during the 2012-2013 school year. For the second measure, neither the district nor the GA DOE is reported to have measures currently in place to gather this information. The rationale indicating why the applicant chose each measure is not clearly explained on every entry. The applicant did not supply measures for all required items (a-c). Annual targets are not provided as required. This section is thus evaluated as being at the lower end of the high point range.

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

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes an intent to evaluate the effectiveness of all professional learning opportunities afforded the staff, the logistics of the project roll out, the use of the personalized learning resources, and all other activities associated with implementation. The combination of internal evaluation processes and external evaluators is viewed as extremely positive because such should yield broad perspectives regarding project goal attainment. CCSD communicates that it intends to evaluate process and product. Statistical analysis is listed as methods for measuring attainment qualitatively. The existence of a plan to assess individual student growth, cohort group growth, the productive use of time, manpower, and resources supports the project's overarching goals and should provide the basis for necessary adjustments over time. The applicant reports an intent of have the PORTAL Project Management Team meet monthly to evaluate the status of each target. Despite the current absence of written protocols for evaluation, CCSD has defined 3 process questions and four product questions to utilize as initial steps of the evaluative process. Quantitative and qualitative analysis are planned to be used as a part of assessment student outcomes a part of the process upon the hiring of the specialists selected for this area. These activities and the depth of the plan outlined represent that the applicant has presented a high quality plan to assess progress and success.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The extensive budget section outlines the RTTT-D funds that are being requested for this project. Budget Subpart 4 further explains that funds from the Special Local Option Sales Tax IV, from Title I, Title II-A, State of Georgia Professional Learning Funds, and Local District funds will also be used though the amounts of this funding are not clearly delineated. In some areas one time investments are clearly specified as are recurring costs. However it was not easy to identify that information throughout the review of this section. It was difficult to determine the plans for long term sustainability of the personalized learning environments after the life of the grant ended with such a significant investment in personnel being a major component of the proposal. The budget appears reasonable for an undertaking of this magnitude. What is not clear is the planned, specific outlay of funds from other funding sources to be used simultaneously with the grant funds and how much, in future years, will be held in reserve to keep this initiative active.

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

10

7

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's plan reflects the support of the Georgia Department of Education the, University of Georgia, Athens Technical College along with local government. The district and the state have already made some investments into infrastructure

(technology and training) necessary to initiate this project. This segment of the plan is deemed to be thorough and of good quality. Ways that the state will provide continued funding for the school district are discussed . However, a large chunk of the grant will be invested into personnel which makes it difficult for this reviewer to clearly understand how the progress made through the grant will be sustained once funding is no longer available. The opportunity to include estimated/projected budgets and funding sources for three years after the grant was not touched upon making one question the capability of sustainability after the grant cycle ends. The applicant presents a table in this section that identifies the population group to be impacted, the type of result to be yielded, the desired result(s), and the measures of determining progress. The chart does not include a timeline, the deliverables, or parties responsible for implementing activities.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

An extensive collaboration of community partners is described in this section of the application. CCSD discusses its partnership with Family Connection-Communities in Schools of Athens, an organization comprised of over 90 members, with the Promise Neighborhood Grant partners, and other organizations. These connections focus on the academic growth of students. They also focus on physical and emotional health, family supports, neighborhood leadership development, youth volunteerism and positive outlets for youthful participation and effective early learning programs. The project's plan is to make available throughout the community via the use of free internet access from "hot spots" sprinkled through the community. Further the applicant addresses the intent to use Strategic Action Teams to meet monthly to review progress, address challenges, and maximize outcomes. Data roundtables are mentioned in the response. However, the only timeframe indicated included is "periodic" for these roundtable meetings. The decision making process is not thoroughly outlined except to indicate that data and results will be reviewed and presented on to the superintendent's level once information is identified. Engagement of parents and families is discussed but the levels of authority to make impactful decisions through the decision making process is not clearly specified.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

CCSD meets Absolute Priority 1--participants all meet or exceed the 40% poverty requirement. They thoroughly address furthering the development of personalized learning environments. They focus are on improving both teaching and learning through the activities associated with the grant project. They are extending their focus to ensuring that the students they serve exit school college- and career ready. In addition, they are using a data analysis process and the benefits of research into best practices to push the focus toward needs and gaps in learning so they may work to eliminate these issues as barriers to their students' achievement and/or the performance of their staff. CCSD schools are already achieving at higher rates than many state counterparts but they take no satisfaction in just being where they are. The district is challenging teachers and administrators to rise to higher levels by using evaluation systems that require specific performance levels to achieve high ratings CCSD believes they will bring about more personalization of learning experiences if they continue technological acquisitions and advances. They are also seeking out opportunities such as RTTTD to further advance what they are already doing. The district is currently making financial investments of its own into technology because of the importance they believe this area holds. An exemplary job was done in outlining the strategies, tools, and supports that will be components of this grant. Learning experiences that are more meaningful to students of the district is a primary focus of CCSD's efforts. They believe that the high in poverty that exists in the district should not destine the students to be low achievers. It should be noted that the applicant also meets Absolute Priority 2--- LEA with more than 50 per cent of participating students in non-rural LEA and in a state that already received a Race to the Top award.



Total	210	154
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	11

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

CCSD has included 2 optional budget supplements with its application. In Project One, the district intends to partner with Elbert County School District to do more work with STEM disciplines where students currently struggle. In this collaboration, the partners intend to develop software modules that will bring real world science and virtual opportunities into the lives of students served. The modules will focus on creativity, critical thinking, goal setting, and other appropriate measures. Personnel to move this initiative forward are identified in this section. Components 1-3 of this section are addressed within this section through the continued development of personalized online learning environments though nothing appears to be mentioned to address students reentering from the juvenile justice system. In Project 2, the district presents IPOUTSS (an acronym) used to address this project focusing on improving preschool outcomes through the use of a tiered of support. In this project Clark County will partner with Madison County to increase teacher effectiveness through through a tiered system of supports. This projects aims to improves teacher effectiveness through professional development and improving preschool readiness in oral language development. Both plans appear to be good quality plan. They will each allow the partners to that will allow the partners to address areas of identified need Not every required component of a high quality plan is evident in either project but enough substance is present to clearly see the intent behind each project.