



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0379TN-1 for Franklin County School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presented a four pronged vision for the RTT-D project. The first prong of this vision is to implement and institutionalize Professional Learning Communities in all of the district schools through contracting with an expert to offer staff development to all district teachers. The second prong of the stated vision is to build a Science, Technology, Engineering, Math Community Learning Center (STEM CLC) where science kits would be available to teachers. The third prong of this proposal is to extend the reach of the district's best teachers. The fourth prong of this vision is to equip the middle and high school students with the technology that will offer to them more personalized learning environments. The information is lacking a comprehensive vision of a personalized system that addresses the four core areas.</p> <p>While personalized learning is identified as one of the strategies, the applicant does not provide a credible approach to truly address this aspect of the reform vision narrative. The scoring was determined to be in the medium range based on the information provided which partially addressed this criterion.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) The applicant proposed to serve all schools in the district. No methodology was provided to determine why they chose to select all campuses.</p> <p>(b) The list of schools was provided in the required charts.</p> <p>(c) The applicant proposed to serve 5,653 students and 453 educators, totally. The information provided reflects 43% are low income. This meets the required 40% as per RTT-D guidelines.</p> <p>Scoring was determined to be in the High range for this criterion as each of the three specific probes were addressed though a weakness was in the lack of clarity regarding the methodology.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a plan of reform that includes professional learning communities, building a STEM Community Learning Center, placing high quality teachers in the STEM center, and purchasing technology devices for the middle and high school.</p> <p>There is insufficient evidence that the applicant's plan meets the requirements of a high quality plan. The applicant also fails to show that the plan is focused on the best practices of personalized learning systems. The content of the professional development is not specified. It is not clear how many of the participating students would access the proposed STEM center which is the centerpiece of the plan.</p> <p>Scoring was determined to be in the medium range because of the weaknesses in the evidence provided and a lack of information specific to scaling up of the model.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a)The applicant provided 2012 testing data in Appendix D. Goals for the four year project, based on summative</p>		

assessments, are for approximately 1% improvement each year. This is not ambitious which is required to address the quality of the LEA vision.

(b) Inadequate information is provided to determine methodology for reducing the achievement gaps. Again, the goal for each year, overall, is approximately 1% which is not ambitious.

(c) Graduation goals are to expected improve approximately 1% each year of the grant which is not ambitious.

(d) College enrollment is estimated to improve 4% each year reaching 75% at the end of the grant period. This may be achievable and is more ambitious than the goals set in A-C.

Though some growth is expected, the scoring was determined to be in the medium range because of the weaknesses in a, b, and c which likely would not result in improved student learning and performance. Not enough information is provided to determine if equity will be increased.

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	2
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provided a listing of accomplishments indicating their capacity for implementing reform and improving student outcomes. These include awards, grants, and designations by the state that indicated high performance in some areas.</p> <p>(a) Information provided in chart form depicting 2012 achievement does not indicate that the gains reflect a four year accomplishment. K-8 state achievement scores for four year period are static or decline in some areas, slightly. Graduation rates from 2008-2010 do improve approximately 6%. The strongest gains are in the area of college-going rate which has progressed from 46% in 2008 to 58% in 2011. This data does not reflect a strong record of improving student achievement and outcomes.</p> <p>(b) Data provided for lowest performing schools does not reflect growth which again, does not indicate the applicant has a clear record of improving student achievement. In some areas achievement actually declines.</p> <p>(c) District provides minimal access for stakeholders to achievement data. Primarily this is through the state website and state report card, though parents are sent a written copy of their child's achievement.</p> <p>Scoring was determined to be in the low range for this criterion based on the weaknesses in a, b, and c. The lack of significant improvement of student achievement over the past four years and the limited access to data provided to stakeholders also contributed to the determination of this score.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a)-(d) The applicant states that the fiscal information is made available to the public through budget workshops and meetings which are open to the public and are scheduled with advance public notice. The annual budget is published online through the district website. This was the response for all four areas: Actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff, Actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only, Actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only, and Actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level. These responses meet the minimum requirements for transparency and are focused on specific expenditures. A thorough description on processes is not provided.</p> <p>Because the information is limited to a reporting of expenditures, and lacks evidence focused on the LEA processes, practices and investments, scoring for a-d was determined to be in the medium range.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant states that although the State Department of Education has some regulatory authority over local education agencies with regard to certain issues, most issues related to elementary and secondary education are under the authority of local school systems. The applicant also suggests that experimentation with newer concepts of curriculum design, scheduling,</p>		

and instructional techniques is encouraged but must have prior approval of the principal and a presentation must be made to the Board. An experimental program requires the approval of the director of schools, the Board, the Commissioner of Education and the State Board of Education.

In this section, the applicant described purchasing of science kits as being reflective of a personalized learning system, which is more of a curricular approach than a data driven personalized approach. This does not address the primary concern of this criterion which is autonomy of the system, the schools, the teachers, to make decisions in a personalized learning environment which includes not only for specific students but also teachers for their classrooms. This was not addressed.

Because it does appear that the district has autonomy to implement a personalized approach at the state level but this same autonomy was not evidenced at the local level, this criterion was scored medium range reflecting a weakness.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(a) An eight-member panel was convened comprised of district administrators along with a board member, and the county Mayor, to review the proposal. Surveys were then developed and given to principals and teachers focused on the professional learning communities and STEM center which resulted in 300 responses. A student survey was developed and administered to every high school student regarding postsecondary education or training. Additionally, a cross section of shareholders (principals, teachers, parents, students, local teacher union officers, school board members, business leaders, and county officials) was invited to read the proposal and offer input.

This satisfactorily meets the requirements of this sub-criterion.

(ii) Collective bargaining is not applicable in the applicant's district. 88% of teachers and administrators provided support for the professional learning communities and 92% supported the Science, Technology, Engineering, Math (STEM) center.

Other specific data that was reviewed including 75% of students surveyed they wanted more access to technology. The applicant did not address support for the overall project implementation as a comprehensive design.

(b) Numerous letters of support were provided in the appendices with quotes from key stakeholders provided in the narrative supporting the STEM learning center. These letters did not address the overall program design but were very focused on one aspect, the construction of a building for STEM education.

The response to this criterion was determined to be in the medium range because the engagement of stakeholders,(a), was evident though there was a significant weakness in the evidence provided to show stakeholder support of the proposal project.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The plan presented by the applicant as they analyzed gaps and achievement centers around four primary objectives:1. The percentage of schools in FCSD implementing Professional Learning Communities with fidelity will increase from a baseline of 0% in 2012-2013 to 100% by August, 2013, (as measured by PLC training agendas and rosters; PLC meeting agendas and minutes); 2. The number of facilities in Franklin County providing comprehensive STEM education and public postsecondary baseline will increase from a baseline of zero in 2012-2013 to one by July, 2014, (as evidenced by STEM CLC Certificate of Occupancy, and facility schedules); 3. The number of highly effective teachers in the district extending their reach beyond the confines of his/her classroom will increase from a baseline of 0 in 2012-2013 to a minimum of 4, one in each STEM subject area, by August, 2014, (as evidenced by schedules); and, 4. The percentage of secondary schools in FCSD with one-to-one mobile technology will increase from a baseline of 0% in 2012-2013 to 100% by August, 2013, (as evidenced by purchase orders and contracts of issue).

The applicant proposes a four year project in the narrative but states the objectives in the plan based on current status to move from 0%-100% in only one or two years. This appears unrealistic and does not represent a convincing and high quality plan with key goals, the activities to be undertaken and a rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, the parties responsible for implementing the activities, and the overall credibility of the plan which is required. Because of the weaknesses in the information provided, the scoring for this criterion was determined to be in the low range.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant addressed personalizing instruction and ensuring that all students understand the importance of their education primarily through the existing state initiatives.

C1(a)(i) The applicant stated that counselors meet with students at the high school and that coaches have been hired to extend the access to counseling at the largest high school. At the elementary level, the applicant stated that teachers select learning targets and these are used as the lesson is mastered

(ii) The applicant addresses this criterion relative to college and career readiness primarily through a description of statewide initiatives including the Tennessee Diploma Project and adoption of Common Core. The district has chosen to fast track adoption of the Common Core.

These strategies do indicate that the district curriculum is aligned with college-and career standards set by the state but are weak in relation to the requirements of a high quality plan with goals, activities, timelines,etc. that address a well designed personalized system of learning.

(iii) The applicant described several different opportunities related to learning experiences, though no methodology was provided to determine student interests and thus to relate these opportunities to specific student interests which are key aspects of a high quality plan in a personalized learning system.

(iv) The applicant addresses access to other cultures and perspectives through the uses of video conferencing, distance learning, and other digital interfaces will give students access to teaching environments, peer environments, and resources beyond those currently available. Insufficient information is provided to determine the plan for specifically determining how these strategies would help students access and learn about other cultures. These represent methods of access but are only tools without the planning and context for their use which is a weakness.

(v) The applicant addresses this subcriterion through professional development of teachers, specifically through learning about Bloom's Taxonomy and a Rigor and Relevance Framework. This does not represent a high quality plan for ensuring students master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving;

C1 (b)(i) The applicant addressed the personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development through the Tennessee Diploma Project and the work of High School Counselors. The information provided on how this occurs at elementary and middle school includes uses of differentiated instruction and Response to Intervention (RTI).

(ii) The applicant proposed that a variety of high-quality instructional approaches will be employed at the STEM center to be constructed through RTT-D.

(iii) The applicant described the methodology (online courses, iPads, for example) rather than the content. They stated that textbooks, approved at the state level, will be purchased as e-books with grant funding. Though it is clear that the applicant understands technology has the potential to deliver personalized learning, there is insufficient information to determine their understanding of the actual high quality content.

(iv) (A) Data presented included state testing as summative and two formative assessments. Reporting is provided to parents and students halfway through each grading period. This is insufficient to meet the requirement of frequently updated individual student data that can be used to determine progress. The applicant proposed to provide parents with an online gradebook and for students who do not have computers at home, parents will come to the STEM center.

(iv) (B) The state data dashboard is used by teachers to determine student's progress on state yearly testing. Though the use of formative assessments is stated by the applicant, there is insufficient detail to determine what type of assessment and how frequently these are administered. The applicant stated that the intent is to provide training with RTT-D funding to teachers on how to use informal formative assessments.

(v)Accommodations are provided in line with Title I requirements and RTI which meets a minimum requirement for high needs students.

(c) The applicant proposed to use funding to provide training and support for students to use the online gradebook to track and manage their learning. This is the only statement provided on which to evaluate the extent that mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning. This is insufficient to evaluate the manner of the training and extent.

The narrative addressed the minimum requirements for each subcriterion and the scoring was determined to be in the medium

range. This range was determined primarily because of the lack of parental or educator input into the selection and implementation of these strategies and the weakness of the high quality plan which does not include goals, the activities and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, the parties responsible for implementing the activities, and the overall credibility of the plan related to the actual instruction to be provided. A weakness was also noted in the information related to training the students to use the technology.

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

20

10

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not present a high quality plan with the key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, the parties responsible for implementing the activities. Each of the criterion was addressed as follows:

C2(a) The applicant stated that teachers will receive stipends to attend a series of consultant-led training sessions in how to organize, manage, and effectively utilize Professional Learning Communities designed around the PLC model. The Rich DuFour PLC model which the applicant will adopt is focused on results through action research, and an ongoing cycle of systemic data-gathering to identify needs, to develop and/or modify improvement goals, to test solution paths, and to analyze progress toward success. The applicant proposed that the PLCs will meet after school hours and that teachers will receive a stipend for this participation. This description does show the intent of the applicant to create PLCs.

(i)-(iv) The applicant tied each of these subcritierion to a goal of the PLC method including (i) data analysis, (ii)standard-specific strategies, (iii) data analysis and formative assessment, and (iv) feedback and teacher evaluation. This meets the minimum requirement for these subcriteria in an high quality plan as goals, activities.

(b)(i) Actionable information is described as using the data available on the state data dashboard, STAR Early Literacy formative assessment results (acronymn was not spelled out), Discovery Education formative assessment reports, attendance records, students' grades/GPA reports, and the results of a grant-funded science interest-survey. The applicant proposed development of surveys for students and STEM teachers from the grant funding which will be monitored by the independent evaluator. This does not represent improvement over the current assessment model and it is not clear how this will allow for improved identification of student needs and interests.

(ii) Though the applicant states that high-quality learning resources including digital resources will be aligned with the standards and graduation requirements it is not clear how this will be done. A menu of different strategies is presented but not tied to a coherent plan for aligning these resources with each child's personalized plan.

(iii) Processes and tools currently being used are described to address this subcritierion. It is not clear that the current strategies underway have been effective based on student data provided thus, the explanation is lacking in detail.

(c)(i) The applicant will utilize the state's TEAM educator evaluation model which measures each teacher's level of impact as related to planning of services, environment, delivery of services, professionalism, and student success on TN's standardized tests. The applicant states that measures include portfolio assessments, direct observations, and student scores. After each direct observation, teachers meet with the evaluator (typically the principal) to reflect on the lesson and to choose reinforcement and refinement objectives that drive continuous improvement. Extensive training at both the state and local level was provided for all educators – administrators, supervisors, principals, and teachers.

(ii) The applicant proposed that both stipend-paid and job-embedded training will be provided in this RTT-D initiative to prepare teachers for maximizing the professional learning community structure, the resources at the STEM CLC, the mobile technology and digital resources, and the STEM CLC highly-effective teachers for instructional support. This description is adequate for this subcritierion.

(d)The applicant does not adequately address this criterion by presenting a plan for for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals, but rather states that their plan is the construction of a STEM Community Learning Center staffed by a Program Manager, a Technology Coach, and at least one highly effective teacher.

Overall, the applicant provides only minimum information on their plan rather than the requirement to fully implement a system of personalized learning and teaching for all students. The scoring was determined based on medium range of quality based on the information that was provided given the lack of a high quality plan.

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>Though a high quality plan is not provided with the requisite components, the applicant addresses aspects of the criterion related to LEA practices and policies.</p> <p>(a) A description of the district organization is provided with emphasis on the governance of the STEM center to be constructed. This is a somewhat limited approach to a district level policy of personalized learning.</p> <p>(b) The STEM leadership team at each campus in the district will be charged with developing building-level schedules that allow maximum access to the myriad of resources available at the STEM CLC. It is unclear how the total number of participating students will have significant benefit from access to this center.</p> <p>(c)The applicant stated that STEM Center will offer self-paced enrichment and remedial courses for all students to progress at their own rate of learning, earning credits that will be based on mastery, not time spent in the traditional classroom. This explanation addresses this subcriterion.</p> <p>(d) The applicant will use the STEM Center to provide students with a variety of STEM activities. This does not indicate how the overall education system will be impacted by new policies focused on mastering standards at multiple times and through multiple ways.</p> <p>(e) The applicant does not address accessibility other than to say the teachers would be accessible to all students who work at the STEM center. This addresses the intent of the criterion at a minimal level.</p> <p>The application lacks enough information to address the requirements of comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed. The quality of the information provided in a, b, c, and d, was therefore deemed to have significant weaknesses and was scored in the medium range.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	6

<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A high-quality plan with goals, activities and other required components is not provided to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure. The applicant addresses each subcriterion as follows:</p> <p>(a) A description of the district organization is provided with emphasis on the governance of the STEM center to be constructed. This is a somewhat limited approach to a district level policy of personalized learning.</p> <p>(b) A help desk and technicians will be provided for technical support during and after school hours. A technology coach will be hired to help teachers. These strategies are appropriate to support the use of technology.</p> <p>(c) The applicant proposed a technology system that will allow parents to use their own devices with the wireless accessibility available at the Center. Though a list of information they can access is provided, there is no information on specifics regarding the technology system other than a statement.</p> <p>(d)The applicant listed a number of systems in place which they describe as interoperable. These include: shared servers, email, NutriKids' export to STAR notifying parents of lunch low balance or delinquent payments, enrollment and other student information. The applicant states that grant funding will enable the addition of teleconferencing, video conferencing, and long distance learning. This description addresses this subcriterion at a minimal level.</p> <p>Because of the narrow focus of the description provided to address a, b, c, and d, the quality of the plan for this criterion was rated in the medium level.</p>		
--	--	--

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	5
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(E)(1) The applicant did not provide a high quality plan with all required components for a continuous improvement process but rather proposed a four-step continuous improvement process- Plan-Do-Check-Act. The applicant stated that to address this evaluation component the Project Manager will meet weekly with the Central Office team to update the team on the progress</p>		

of the grant overall, specifically working with the architect and construction manager of the STEM center. The Central Office team will troubleshoot any issues with the Project Manager. This is actually monitoring of the process but is weak in regard to the requirement for a clear and high-quality approach. The description provided regarding the PLCs and the construction of the STEM Center and is lacking in detail specific to monitoring student progress and a does not offer goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements especially method for intervening when students are not progressing. Thus, the applicant does not have a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve student performance. Because only limited information is provided related to this criterion, and in absence of a high quality plan, the criterion was rated in the medium range.

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

5

2

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(E)(2) The district website will be the primary communication tool as presented by the applicant. The ongoing progress of each of the four proposed projects as presented by the applicants will be relayed on the web page and through community presentations and meetings. The applicant does not address how input will be provided from stakeholders to truly engage them in the grant activities and thus does not provide a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve its plan. The communication is primarily described as one-way and therefore does not fully address engagement or a process that would result in continuous improvement. Therefore the score for this criterion was rated in the medium range.

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

5

2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides performance data on the E3 charts for four years and post grant year. Primarily these focus on teacher and principal quality, growth on formative assessments, attendance, and other factors. The targets selected represent steady growth and are ambitious and achievable targets. What is not provided is, (a) the rationale for selecting the measure; (b) how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative information tailored to a plan and a theory of action; or (c) how the applicant will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress. Because of the weakness in the description and charts provided, this criterion was scored in the medium range. The applicant failed to provide ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures.

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

5

2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant stated that an external evaluator will be hired. Insufficient information is provided to determine the quality of the process and outcome evaluation methodology. The applicant stated that data will collected and analyzed to measure factors such as student achievement, school climate, student interest in STEM-related coursework/careers, school improvement, career- and college-readiness, and/or workforce development. The focus of the consultant's evaluation will be determined by the Advisory Board. Although the composition of the school based leadership teams is provided, the composition of the Advisory Board is not. This description lacks content to fully address a high quality plan for evaluating the effectiveness of the RTT-D funded activities, and specifically, to more productively use time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results, and thus the criterion is scored in the medium range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The applicant identified potential sources of funding to supplement the grant request. These include local, state, and federal funding.

(b) The budget provided seems reasonable and sufficient to support the approach presented in the narrative (PLCs and the STEM center).

(c)(i) The applicant states what funding is being requested with a breakdown to justify the request.

(c)(ii) The applicant does not indicate whether expenses are a one-time investment.

Because the applicant provides a rationale for investments, but lacks adequate strategies to ensure the long term sustainability of a personalized learning environment, the score was determined to be in the medium range.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	4
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not provide a high quality plan for sustainability. The applicant provided only minimal information to support sustainability. They suggested that their federal Title I funding can assume salaries of some of the teachers and coaches. They stated they will try to replace science kits through the PTA groups or through the local campus budgets which is an extremely weak approach to sustainability. The information provided lacks detail to fully address sustainability and the scoring was rated in the medium range of quality.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Not addressed.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Though the applicant has as one goal to address personalized learning through technology devices, the description provided does not represent a comprehensive personalized learning system for every child that is aligned with career and college standards.

Total	210	104
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0379TN-2 for Franklin County School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has set forth a vision that addresses the need to reach out to high poverty students and provide district resources to build a strong STEM program. The four prongs of the program as described in this section of the application are reasonable yet have the potential to bring comprehensive and coherent reform to key parts of the curriculum and the ways in which teachers will collaborate to improve student achievement. The first prong, the establishment of professional learning communities, provides the structure for embarking upon school improvement but the description is somewhat vague on the deliverables from this part of the plan and how the reporting documents will be collected and used. The second prong of this program proposes to build a Science, Technology, Engineering, Math Community Learning Center (STEM CLC) to serve the district and community. This is an admirable goal that includes the use of technology, teacher-leader expertise, and community partnerships. The third prong describes an effort to expand the reach of the district's best teachers but the proposed use of only 4 of the district's 453 educators for the STEM Center indicates a low level of outreach. The fourth prong would provide technology to middle and high school students in the form of mobile devices, laptops, and e-books and mobile devices to teachers but lacks a description on how this will contribute to personalized learning.

Each of the four prongs of the proposed plan would directly or indirectly support student achievement and deepen student learning but the methodology to monitor the effect of these efforts is not provided. The plan does not address how student academic interests will be incorporated other than through the use of technology.

In addressing the four core educational assurance areas, the vision touches on data collection and effective teachers to some extent but does not address college- and career-ready standards or how the district will attempt to turn around the lowest performing schools; nevertheless, the vision and plan has a strong foundation for building a coherent reform effort.

This criterion has scored in the middle range of 6 out of 10 due to incomplete descriptions of how the reform efforts will be monitored, targeted to student improvement, and expanded over the course of the grant period.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section of the application provides the required reporting of the participating schools and the quantitative data of participating students, low-income students, high-need students, and participating educators. This narrative indicates that the high poverty levels contributed to the determination of the need to improve achievement for all students. This section makes a valid statement that changes in teaching strategies need to occur in all schools of the district. The description of how the participating schools met collectively to determine the competition's eligibility requirements and participation level was not provided.

This criterion scored in the high range of 9 out of 10 due to the full provision of data but failed to earn a full 10 points because the description of the collective process was missing.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	5
---	----	---

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

This section provides an admirable set of goals that include student engagement, targeted instruction, and student goal-setting but lacks the detail in the description of how those goals will be developed, implemented, monitored and reviewed. The plan intends to reach beyond the school district to invite parents and community partners to take advantage of the proposed STEM facility and technology labs. While it may be evident that this will build community support for students' post-secondary goal setting, the outcomes are not clearly articulated.

Due to the insufficient detail provided on how the applicant will reach the goals, this criterion scored in the lower range of the middle score for 5 out of 10.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided targets for improved student learning on the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program in math and reading for grades 3-8 and for high school English II and Algebra I. The targeted goals provided have been set by the state which was granted a waiver from the NCLB requirements. The targets presented for the next 5 years range from 79% proficient or advanced to a low targets in the range of 53-57%. The college enrollment target, for the same time period, is set at 75%. The baseline achievement gap for 2011-12 ranges from 32% to 7% for various subgroups at different grade levels but the gap is targeted to be steadily decreasing over the next five years to a gap of no greater than 15% for any subgroup. Graduation rates have increased slightly over the last 2 years. The data shows a decline in post-secondary going rates over the last 5 years.

The targeted increase in student achievement for all groups is clearly outlined in the charts. It was previously stated that the professional learning groups will use this information for curriculum planning to address student learning but there is no discussion of how individualized student supports will be implemented either in individual classrooms or as a school-based plan as a result of data analysis.

This criterion scored in the upper medium range of 7 out of 10 because all target data was provided but the application lacked specific narrative discussion regarding the use of the data to improve student learning and performance and increased equity.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	12
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided student assessment data that indicates the district's ability to collect and access standardized testing data. The data shows a mostly upward advance in the testing scores collectively as well as high school graduation and college enrollment. This record of success in testing data is evidenced by the tables provided. Other measures of student learning outcomes were not presented although the district reported that it had used a previous grant to identify barriers to college-going students and has hired a part-time post-secondary coach to address these barriers.</p> <p>One of the low-performing schools in the district has instituted significant reforms in school schedules, staffing changes, support personnel, and math program support. It appears that testing scores are gradually increasing at that school.</p> <p>The applicant has provided evidence that student performance data has been made available to parents, students, and educators in a variety of formats.</p> <p>The criterion for this section has been met but discussion of the applicant's ability to improve student achievement and increase equity in learning through the use of that data was sparse for a score in the high range of 12 out of 15.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided budgeted funding totals for 2012-13 for instructional staff, teachers, and the school level instructional and support staff as defined by the F-33 survey. Non-personnel expenditures were found in the Annual Financial Report for Franklin County, Tennessee for the 2011-12 school year (Appendix E). Actual salary totals for teachers and instructional staff were not provided.</p> <p>Public accessibility is provided at budget meetings and workshops that are scheduled but it was not stated how often this occurs or to what extent the public might have input. The report did not indicate how information regarding the budget meetings was communicated to parents and community.</p> <p>This criterion scored in the lower range of 1 out of 5 for providing some information but did not receive a higher score as the requested information in the criterion was not provided.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided a complete set of evidence that supports this criterion in the form of state statutes, board policies, and district practice to ensure sufficient autonomy for implementation of planned projects and programs. Although the district requires School Board approval of new curriculum and programs with a presentation to the board, it appears that the Director of Schools has a significant amount of autonomy to shape curriculum and instructional programs for alignment with district goals and objectives. Detailed and sufficient evidence was presented that demonstrated curriculum and instructional programs and projects have been implemented through district efforts without undue delay or unnecessary requirements of a formal approval procedure.</p> <p>In response to the completeness of the evidence presented, this criterion has scored the maximum score of 10.</p>		

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The support for this project and the letters provided by community agencies and businesses are impressive and broad-based. The proposal was developed following review from an eight-member panel that included a majority of school stakeholders. Surveys were administered to teachers and students on specific components of the grant and the responses indicate a very favorable approval for the implementation of professional learning communities, the new STEM (Science-Technology-Engineering-Math) center, and increased technology to be made available to students and staff. The applicant reports that a cross-section of teachers, staff, local teacher union officers, board members, and community members were offered the opportunity to read the proposal and offer feedback but the narrative does not include a description of how that feedback was solicited nor the number of stakeholders that were offered the opportunity to review the proposal. Evidence of direct engagement from teachers of the bargaining unit was not provided although the signature of the president of the local teachers' union was provided.</p> <p>The broad-based support of the community is commendable and it appears that the proposal was provided to stakeholder groups for feedback but due to the incomplete information describing the feedback procedures, this criterion is scored at the medium range of 7 out of 10 points.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided information regarding the gaps and needs of students in the district but has not provided evidence of a clear plan for a collaborative process that will analyze gaps, develop a strategic plan to address the needs and gaps, or create the personalized learning environment to address the individual and diverse needs of each student. The applicant has listed several items that contribute to a personalized learning environment but the narrative is unclear as to how the elements will be part of a larger district plan.</p> <p>The critical elements that are listed in this section including student motivation, differentiated instruction, education research, and technology are important in building a plan but the details on how this plan will come together and work in concert to bridge the gaps are missing. Other sections of the application that describe the professional learning communities and the development of the STEM (Science-Technology-Engineering-Math) Center will be helpful but are insufficient as separate components without the connections to a comprehensive plan.</p> <p>This criterion scored in the low range of medium with a score of 2 due to a lack of a clear path to building a coherent plan.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	7
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has presented a variety of curriculum resources and instructional strategies that are in various stages of implementation but they have not been presented as part of a comprehensive plan for targeted instruction with monitoring and feedback. For skills and programs that are already in place at the various grade levels, it appears that a majority of the monitoring is undertaken by the classroom teacher. The plan does not indicate that collaborative efforts such as the implementation of professional learning communities will foster greater investment in a school-wide or district-wide plan of action.</p> <p>Although the narrative states that Tennessee has adopted college- and career-ready standards as in the Common Core standards, there is no discussion on how the educators of Franklin County will analyze and teach the skills and content of the standards by grade levels or ability-groupings. The rigorous course of study, as described in the criterion, is not outlined in the plan as presented other than to mention some of the coursework that some students take such as Advanced Placement classes and dual enrollment with post-secondary institutions. Although the proposed STEM (Science-Technology-Engineering-Math) learning center will promote student interest in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and math, there is no indication that the course work will be reviewed to expand the rigorous curriculum. Providing teacher-leaders in STEM to work at the center will be helpful.</p> <p>The proposed plan does address high-need students throughout the application and the applicant has listed a variety of measures in place to monitor progress. The plan indicates that teachers are encouraged to meet with students to discuss</p>		

standardized test scores but it does not institutionalize the practice or incorporate it into the larger district plan. The plan does not offer information on how students will structure their own learning and set individual goals through a process that is systematic and organized for progress to be monitored and measured. A system for regular and on-going feedback to be planned and developed is implied in the vision section of this application but is under-developed as a part of the overall plan.

The potential for deep learning is high in the planned efforts to implement the Common Core standards and to use technology for research, presentations, and to gain access and exposure to diverse cultures and perspectives. Accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students is addressed through Response to Intervention (RtI) but the details on how those interventions are determined and provided are unclear. Training and support to students in the use of technology are mentioned in various parts of this application but it is unclear if students will receive specific instruction on how to manage their own learning.

This criterion scored in the low range of medium due to the insufficient development of a comprehensive and coherent plan that bridges the diverse elements of the learning process for a score of 7 out of 20.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	17
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has described an impressive set of tools and resources for teachers to use to improve instruction and increase capacity to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards. One of four major initiatives of the plan for Franklin County Schools is the implementation of Professional Learning Communities (PLC) and the intent to use that process to analyze instructional needs and gaps, develop learning goals, and plan instruction. The application states that each PLC will have autonomy to choose interventions and strategies most appropriate to their needs.

This section also details some of the multiple sources of instructional data that teachers have available to them for the purpose of instructional planning but it does not indicate the frequency of accessing this information so it is unclear if this data is used regularly throughout the school year. According to the applicant, it would be one of the tasks of the PLC group at each school to use the available data but it is not clear how often that would occur.

It appears that a teacher and principal evaluation system is in place and feedback is a part of this process. The system includes the use of teacher observation, constructive feedback, and examination of student data to provide feedback to the teacher. Staff training appears to be extensive and is an important component of the proposed plan.

The applicant has adequately addressed the parts of this criterion with minor omissions on details and how the various components will provide a coordinated overall effort for a score in the high range of 17 out of 20.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided the source link for the on-line policies but has not identified those policies that are specific to personalized learning systems and the development of a systemic project such as this. In spite of this omission, the personnel structure appears to function as a collaborative team to move the reform agenda forward.

The applicant has a strong proposal for school leadership team development to as a central part of the the reform effort through the DuFour methodology and, in fact, proposes to bring Richard DuFour to the site for a district-wide in-service. The governance structure appears to be flexible and willing to allow the professional development community (PLC) of each school to determine the best strategies for improved student performance.

Demonstration of student mastery is not clear on how a coherent system of student learning goals, instruction, measurement of student progress, and support will be implemented. The applicant lists a variety of structural elements such as departmentalization or flexible grouping as well as instructional strategies such as differentiated instruction and intervention curriculum but there is no description of how student mastery will be measured, tracked, and utilized for placement on a regular basis. Opportunities for multiple ways to demonstrate mastery is not described. It is unclear as to how all students will access learning resources such as the proposed STEM (science-technology-engineering-math) center.

This criterion has been partially addressed with some descriptions that are vague or unclear for a score in the medium range of 10 out of 15.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposes to provide technology resources to parents, students, community, and other stakeholders through the opening of the STEM (Science-Technology-Engineering-Math) Center that will include provision of technical support and resources for parents to access information on student learning although the description of how that support will be implemented is not addressed. Professional development for teachers and training for parents will address the criterion for access, support, and information. The applicant states that the system will be interoperable but does not explain upon how that will allow for parents and students to export their information in an open data format for use in other electronic learning systems. Personalized student learning is addressed only tangentially as students will have access to a variety of on-line learning opportunities.</p> <p>This criterion appears to fully address the infrastructure issues but does not fully address the impact on individualized student learning for a score in the medium range of 7 out of 10.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	6
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposes to use the existing structure of the administration team to monitor and review progress on all aspects of the initiative. Although the communication system between administrators appears to be regular and often, there is little evidence that the communication and feedback loop will be vertically shared among the teacher and parent stakeholders. There is no description of a plan for a formal process of providing updates to the broader educational community.</p> <p>Because there does not appear to be a strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process or an on-going system for feedback for communication of corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant as stated in the criterion, this section is scored in the low range of medium for 6 out of 15.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application lists a number of community outreach venues for communication with internal and external stakeholders including website information, quarterly reports to the Board of Education, local cable show interviews, the Local Chamber of Commerce meetings, and at school administrator meetings. The planned communications structures appear to be broad-based but there is no discussion of a plan for on-going two-way communications for engagement of stakeholders in a process of continuous improvement. This criterion scored 3 out of 5 due to the incomplete description of the strategies for engagement.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The academic measures and the goal to reduce the achievement gap addresses the rationale to some extent and the targets listed in the tables address the timely plan for improvement but it does not provide on measures that will be taken to adjust and make improvements if the targets are not met. Although indicators in each of the grade level cluster groups have been outlined, the narrative does not fully discuss the rationale, the result of the measures, and how the system will adjust and improve over time for some of the 15 performance measures provided. The chart for Performance Measure 9-12 C does not describe the targeted measure.</p> <p>Due to the incomplete response to this criterion, the applicant has score in the medium range of 3 out of 5.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has proposed a number of ways that this project will be evaluated both formally and informally but most of the communication appears to be at the school administrative level. The proposal states that an independent professional</p>		

evaluator will be contracted through the grant to provide an overall evaluation using data collection from a multitude of sources. In spite of the assurances that the school administration will be monitoring the project, there is no information on how adjustments might be made based on evaluative measures nor is there a clear set of communication systems to provide on-going feedback from the other stakeholder groups. There is no clear description of how information from the surveys (e.g., professional development, use of the STEM Center) will be used to make changes or adjustments for improvement.

This criterion is scored in the middle range of 3 out of 5 due to the limited structures that are provided for system-wide feedback and evaluation.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application has clearly identified all funds that will support the project and the expenditures are reasonable and sufficient to support the development of the project as presented during the course of grant but sustainability of funding sources is limited or speculative. The budget narratives provide the descriptions and explanations of the expenditures for all aspects of the proposal. One-time expenditures are identified.</p> <p>The Professional Learning Communities activities are described as to the time commitment and the associated costs such as materials. There is no discussion on how these will be sustained for the long-term.</p> <p>The STEM Center is described with detail on the expenditures that will need to be provided to open the doors of the facility and the personnel needed for operations. Some ideas were set forth on long-term funding from outside entities but that appeared to be based on speculation and no evidence was presented of certainty or probability.</p> <p>The effort to provide highly effective teachers is based mainly on coaches but there is little description of the sustainability of this plan. The expenditures for technology do not address reasonable sustainability.</p> <p>This criterion has not been sufficiently addressed for sustainability and is scored at the medium range of 7 out of 10.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	6
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Individual budget items that will be on-going expenditures at the termination of the grant period have been identified and the school will reasonably take responsibility for the salaries of the some of the personnel such as the technology coach and the instructional coaches. It is proposed that state funding would be procured for operation and maintenance of the STEM (Science-Technology-Engineering-Math) Center and the Program Manager but that is yet to be determined as there is no indication that the state government would be in agreement.</p> <p>Most expenses appear to have some consideration of reasonable sustainability but the on-going expenditures associated with the STEM Center and the on-going nature of professional learning communities are not presented with the associated costs over the long-term.</p> <p>This criterion is scored at the high range of medium for 6 out of 10 points due to the uncertainty for funding of some of the on-going expenditures.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	4
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant did not provide a separate Competitive Preference Priority section but elements of this priority were addressed in the application. The applicant showed evidence of consideration of :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • partnerships with business and civic groups 		

- closing the achievement gaps for sub-groups
- addressing social-emotional needs through some of the performance measures
- improving family and community supports, and
- identifying achievable performance measures for student populations;

The competitive preference priority for this application is scored at the lower end of medium for a score of 4 out of 10 possible.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Although the applicant addressed personalized learning environments in various sections of the application, there is only a weak link between the project components and the building of a comprehensive system that is centered on personalized learning environments. It is unclear as to how personalized learning environments will be actualized even when the system becomes fully institutionalized and integrated.

The applicant failed to fully address how the core educational assurances areas (as defined in the notice) will work comprehensively and coherently to provide a personalized learning environment for each student. Although many of the elements of the plan would be successful in building a foundation for school and district improvement such as the implementation of professional learning communities and the establishment of a STEM center, the plan does not provide a clear process for working with students for engagement and success in various pathways in which they would be invested. The alignment to college- and career-ready standards is vague and does not appear to have been carefully considered in a strategic manner. It is unclear how this plan would expand student access to the most effective educators and decrease achievement gaps across student groups.

Due to the omissions from the conditions of the absolute priority, this criterion has not been met.

Total	210	132
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0379TN-3 for Franklin County School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The reform vision is focused upon implementation of Professional Learning Communities with fidelity; build a STEM CLC (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math Community Learning Center to provided resources to the students and community; to extend the reach of the district's best teachers in the STEM subjects by placement at the STEM center to work with students, teachers, and community; to increase access to technology used for learning with purchase of iPads for all middle and high school students. The application also includes training in Professional Learning Communities (PLC;s) for all

teachers. The components of the vision address needs within the school and the community but do not explicitly address how it will directly increase student performance and academic success. There is little discussion about what needs to happen in individual classrooms to address individual student learning plans or how the integration of technology will change classroom structure or increase student learning. The vision meets the requirements listed above in the middle range of scoring because of the sparse details provided about how the vision will be accomplished.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

All schools in the Franklin County School System will be participants in the grant approved programs. The appendix (A)(4) lists schools with student information breakdown in graphic format as required under (A)(2)(c). The plan also expects to expand offerings beyond the students and offer access to the STEM CLC to parents and other community members.

The information provided meets the high score point range because student data demonstrates a need for increased attention to the learning needs of students who come from low-income families. PLC's may change teaching structure if they use data to drive their instructional plans and individualize teaching to meet student learning needs, however principals must approve any change in classroom structure prior to its implementation.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
---	----	---

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The application plan includes all students and teachers. Students will benefit from the additional professional development training the teachers receive in implementation of PLC's. Middle and High School Students will benefit from increased access to technology in learning. Current data indicates students scoring significantly below expected proficiency levels with high gaps between sub group scores, even though high school graduation rate is close to 90%.

This section scores in the low-mid range because it does not specifically address what interventions will be put in place to increase scores in reading and math at all levels, data provided currently shows most groups scoring below 50%. The main academic focus seems to be STEM at the middle and high school, it does not address classroom interventions required to assist students who are currently not meeting the standard in reading or math which impacts success in STEM classroom. There is also no focus on assisting students in planning/implementing individualized learning plans. There is no information detailing how discussion and use of data in PLC's might be used to address student academic success.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The application provides data tables to meet the requirements of (A)(4) (a,b,c,d). The tables indicate expected growth over time: 3-8 reading in 10/11 is 49.5 and expected to be 70 in 16/17; 3-8 math in 10/11 is 44.6 and is expected to grow to 68 in 16/17; the charts indicate a decrease in the achievement gaps; graduation rate is 90.1 and expected to grow to 94 in 16/17; college going is 58 and expected to grow to 75 in 16/17. There is a disconnect between academic achievement levels and graduation/college ready preparation of students at this time. Expected growth for some grade levels is less than 5%, this does not indicate high expectations for all students. There is no discussion of individualized education plans for students, other than irregular meetings with college counselors at the 9th grade level. There is little discussion of how data is/will be used to drive instructional changes within all classrooms, K-12.

The score for this section is in the middle range because stating an expected achievement level of 75% with a graduation rate of 94% in 2016/17 will allow many students to graduate from high school who are not college-career ready. The expectation for students for are in the lower grades (68% in 2016/17) will continue to move students into the higher grades who are not academically prepared for the STEM coursework.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Data indicates some growth, however in many instances more that 50% of the students are not 50% proficient: elementary math 44.6; elementary reading 49.5, high school algebra I 52.5, algebra II 35.8, English I 61.8, English II 57.6. The high school

value added (ACT) 3 year average score is 19.06. The graduation rate has increased from 84.9 in 2008 to 90.1 in 2010. The college going rate is approximately 58% in 2010/11.

One school was previously in Title I corrective action which was removed upon the granting of waivers to the state of Tennessee. This school has implemented reforms including: state consultants, placing highly effective teachers at the site, changing the daily schedule, restructuring personnel, changing curriculum delivery, math boot camp, hiring a fath facilitating teacher.

Student performance data is currently available to parents, students, and educators. Parents receive printouts. The school results are printed in the annual school report card. Teachers and princials also have access to state assessment data by school and individual student. Parents may contact teacher or principal for additional explanation. There is no indication of more regular discussions about student performance with either students or parents, if the parents do not make the request for a meeting.

This section scores in the middle range because it does not address the need for focused attention to performance data at all grade levels for all students. RTI and progress monitoring are mentioned with no implementation plan provided or description about how each is/will be used to address student learning needs. There is no expectation addressed within the application that the PLC's will include either in their regularly scheduled meetings.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The application provides charts in Appendix E lisitng the data required in (B)(2)(a,b,c,d). Salary information is provided in the annual district-wide budget and its development public. The Director of Schools, the School Board, and Principals and Supervisors collaborate on the development in public meetings (which have advance notice). The budget is downloadable from the School Board Agenda. The salaries are included in the Education section of the budget.

This section scores in the high range because the information requested in the grant application is provided by the district with total amounts listed in this section (total personnel salaries for all school-level instructional and support staff as defined by F-33 survey are \$2,091,947 in 2012-12; personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff are \$1,734,830; personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only are \$18,018,154; the total projected budget for 2012-13 is \$44,250,272). A copy of the annual fiscal report is also included in the Appendix of this application.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The lines of communication are clearly stated in the application; between School Board and Director of Schools, Director of Schools and Team Leaders, Team Leaders, School Principals.

The LEA has aligned their curriculum to Common Core as required by State of Tennessee. Teachers participate in the alignment activities. There is little discussion of the role of Personallized Learning Community(PLC's) in this implementation process at this point in the application. The application states that teachers working under the supervision of the principal may choose the instructional strategies and resources to provide personalized learning environments for students, however there is no discussion of how personallized learning plans for students are developed, implemented and their success documented.

Teachers have carts "loaded"with instructional technology and have received some training in its use. There are three FOSS kits for use in the middle grades to foster the development of individualized learning environments. Even with the implementation of the STEM CLC there is limited evidence that there will be any moves from the traditional classroom structure and learning experience.

Professional development is offered during and after the school, howver no professional development calendar with specific activities is listed. The application states the topics span a gamut of issues and interests that offer teachers choices that help them meet personnel growth goals. In order for Professional Development to be successful, it must be specific and sustained and tied to data indicating its need in relation to student academic needs. The implementation of Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) without a specific plan that is tied to the increase of student academic success will not result in the desired results of the school community.

This section scores in the middle range because there is not a specific plan addressing how the aligned curriculum, implementation of Professional Learning Communities, and the Professional Development plan will increase student academic achievement.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Stakeholders were involved in the proposal development in the following ways:

There was an 8 member panel (Director of Schools, Department Supervisors, Grant facilitator, Board Member, County Mayor), however no classroom teachers were listed as members of the planning committee.

A survey was sent out to principals and teachers (88% favorable to PLC's) (92% favor STEM CLC). This was a 5 question survey, no data chart or comments resulting from the survey were provided in the application.

There was a student survey about post secondary plans (Appendix G). There is no date about when the survey was given to the students and there is no data table listing the results of the survey.

There was a survey given to students about their use of technology in learning (Appendix G). There is no date showing when the survey was given or what grade levels of students took the survey. Those students who took the survey generally responded favorably to the use of technology by their teachers in the classroom setting.

Letters of support from all required stakeholders from school, district, community, business leaders, students indicate support for the Community Learning Center (CLC). Business leaders were supportive of the training opportunities that will become available for their employees and adults in the community. The majority of the letters suggested the CLC would be a source of job training for their employees and provide an avenue for post secondary education in the community.

This section scores in the medium range because even though the planning committee demonstrated efforts made to include all stakeholders in the process, those who actually developed the plan were the District Committee that did not have membership including either teachers or parents. The survey reports lacked clarity and should have been more clearly reported in form of data charts with comments, dates they were given, grade levels (for student surveys), and actual numbers of those taking the survey rather than listing a % in agreement.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The plan presented has four sections:

1. Implementation of Professional Learning Communities(PLC;s) with all teachers. Teachers will receive professional development training and have books available at their school sites to read about this topic. There is no specific timeline for implementation listed in the application. There is no specific agenda/purpose/outcome for the PLC's that will result in the addressing of using data to drive instruction, the use of technology in teaching, implementation of Response to Intervention (RTI) for students not meeting the standards, use of differentiated instructional strategies in the classroom.

2/3. Community Learning Center(CLC/STEM) will be built and open by year 2 of the project. Its goal will be to provide students greater access to STEM coursework. Four effective teachers will be hired (one in each of the STEM subject areas) to work with students at middle and high school levels. The CLC will be open to the public and provide a place for access to the internet and online learning activities. It will also provide support for CTE and/or dual enrollment courses and be available for use by the community as a whole. The plan indicates that placing the four teachers at the CLC/STEM center would extend the reach of the districts best teachers.

4. Middle and high school students will be provided with iPads. The purpose is to give them greater access to information and technology. There is also a plan to purchase etextbooks to load onto the iPads. There is no information provided about the assistance that will be provided to both teachers and students as they learn to use new technology to share and acquire knowledge. There is no information provided about how the iPads might be used to assist in developing and tracking individual student learning plans. There is no information provided about what/which subjects etextbooks will be purchased for, or how students will be assisted as they learn to use a new platform.

This section scores in the medium range because it is lacking data about specific implementation of the plan, ie; what are the expectations of the PLC teams at the schools and how will this implementation be evaluated, how will the use of the CLC/STEM center and the effective teachers be evaluated in relation to increasing student academic success and individual learning, what is the plan for using the student ipads/etextbooks in individualized student learning plans.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There was a lack of clarity tied to the activities the plan will implement and how they will specifically address the learning needs of all students. While there is provision for 2 P-T conferences per year, a meeting with counselors to format academic plan tied to graduation, setting of academic goals at the elementary level, and fast tracking the implementation of Common Core and its assessments, it appears that there is an over reliance on the STEM CLC to automatically meet the learning needs of all students (at least at middle and high school levels). There is little or no mention of appropriate interventions planned or already in place to address students not meeting the standard.</p> <p>Teachers have access to technology to use in their classrooms. There is little/no data or information discussing how this access has changed or improved either teaching or learning.</p> <p>Textbooks are aligned to the curriculum. High school students have access to Advanced Placement courses (no listing of courses or numbers of students enrolled is provided).</p> <p>Tennessee TVAAs data dashboard provides individual student data, as well as school data. On the whole there is little discussion of how either teachers or students use the available individual data about their learning to assist in increasing their academic achievement. Parents will be able to use the CLC/STEM center to access individual student data when there is no technology in the home.</p> <p>There are plans to use the CLC/STEM center to provide students access to distance learning opportunities.</p> <p>There are 5 Title I schools in the district, special education programs are in place, RTI is mentioned as used in the elementary levels, Credit Recovery classes are available during and after school at high school level.</p> <p>Teachers meet with elementary students to discuss goals related to their individual learning needs.</p> <p>This section scores in the middle range because the plan indicates a variety of avenues for students and families to work toward achieving success while both in school and after graduation without specific focus on high expectations for all students in achieving the goals of their personal learning plans. Increased attention needs to be paid to students in the sub groups who are not currently achieving academic success. This needs to be explicitly planned for in the school classroom as well as in the CLC/STEM center. The plan is very dependent upon the success of the student as a result of the STEM program. There is a lack of specific evaluation processes tied to how this success will be demonstrated, especially since the academic goals for all groups at the conclusion of the plan is 80% or less.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	16
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan states it will implement PLC's with fidelity to address learning needs of the students, however it is vague about how this will be evaluated and measured other than teachers will receive training and then have meetings.</p> <p>Teachers will use data to plan for differentiated learning opportunities, however there is little indication that this will be a focus of PLC meetings when discussing student success.</p> <p>FOSS kits are available for teachers to check out and use in their classrooms as a strategy for teachers to offer differentiated learning opportunities in the middle school.</p> <p>Goal setting is monitored by teachers writing academic objectives informally on the board where they are discussed as a class. There is little indication of how this translates into individual learning plans for students.</p> <p>The Tennessee TEAM (teacher evaluation) is in place which requires both formative and summative evaluations of a teacher's performance in the classroom</p> <p>TVASS, STAR Early Literacy, Discovery Education formative assessments, student GPA's.</p> <p>STEM teachers will gather data.</p> <p>Grant evaluator will be hired.</p> <p>Tennessee TEAM provides data to be used in assisting teacher improvement.</p>		

State Survey on school culture and climate.

Safe Schools Grant.

Professional Development is continuous and ongoing at District, school, and individual levels for all teachers (District provides 5 full days, 2 days administrative)

STEM CLS staff will be highly effective teachers, program manager, technology coordinator.

This section scores in the middle range because there is a listing of activities that may possibly increase student learning, however there is not a definitive plan to individualize student learning and reform the methodologies in the classroom to provide increased attention to learning that may occur outside of a traditional classroom setting. The only emphasis in this area may be drawn from student access to classes available when attending the STEM CLC classes.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	10
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: The District organization is set up to facilitate implementation of the plan. An organizational chart is in place. There are numerous regular meetings between District and school personnel. Principals are in the line of communication and also hold regular staff meetings at each school. Classrooms are mainly "self-contained" without options for moving on when progress has been demonstrated. Teaching/learning takes place within the classroom under guidance of the teacher. Learning resources are available to all sub groups included in the school populations. This section meets the middle range of scoring because there is no description of changing classroom structures and strategies through the implementation of the PLC's or increased access to technology.		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	9
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: This section meets the requirements, because it provides access to STEM by all students. The full points were not awarded because there is no clearly defined plan described in the application to demonstrate the implementation of iPads/etextbooks with middle and high school students. There is no listing of which courses will receive etextbooks, how the successful use of etexbooks will be evaluated, and no description of how teachers and students will be trained to use the iPads/etextbooks to increase their learning. Commitment to assisting parents in participating in the learning progress of their children is demonstrated by the provision of assistance from the technology coordinator and help desk to assist parents who wish to use the STEM CLC to check student progress and utilize it for other kinds of information. This allows those stakeholders without access to technology to have a place to come and use it. Commitment by the district to provide access to data through interoperable data systems is demonstrated by access to: Tennessee School Report Card, FCS HR Depart job postings, gradebook access for parents, Enrollment information, teleconferencing, video conferencing, and long distance learning opportunities for students and community.		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: The district plans to implement a 4 step process: Plan, Do, Check, Act. There are regular meetings set up between the Plan		

facilitator and Director of Schools. Schools will be required to provide weekly updates on utilization of PLC's and STEM CLC usage to the principal who will then communicate to the Director of Schools. Project Manager will work with Central Office in completion of the STEM CLC. There were no specific evaluation tools to measure progress provided at this time.

This scores in the middle range because even though there are regular meetings scheduled with all stakeholders there is a lack of specific evaluation tools that each group should be using as they evaluate the implementation and success of this plan. There should be specific expectations for each of their 4 prongs as they relate to increase in student achievement. There should be expectations for meeting agendas and minutes from all PLC teams at all levels which might include how they are using data to drive instruction within the classroom and in the STEM center, what interventions are available for students who are struggling to meet academic success, mentoring/professional development activities available that address the focus of the plan, etc. There is a lack of specific monitoring, other than sign in sheets for use of CLC/STEM center, ie; copies of lesson plans for classes taught, number of distance learning opportunities used with the number of those who participated along with an evaluation of each activity. A listing of what textbooks are going to be made available and for what grade levels should be provided. A professional development calendar listing what/how teachers will be trained to access and use the new technology available to them, how to use the new data from the state, as well as how the students will be trained to use the same.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

There are plans for a page on the District website to share information, quarterly reports to the School Board, follow-up meetings with community groups, presentations at PT organization meetings.

This meets the requirements of the section because information about the plan will be shared in multiple formats to all stakeholders in the process. The addition of a page on the district website is very positive as it allows a much wider range of access than just presenting information at a meeting.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4
--	---	---

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The plan requires a range of 12-14 performance measures in order to meet requirements. This plan provides 15 total in grades preK-12): ie, Brigrance for prek-K, K-8 measure of healthy exercise, K-1 STAR assessment, 3-8 math and reading Discovery Education, 6-8 school suspension data, graduation rate, Tennessee assessments, teacher evaluation system, college going student rates, etc.

This information meets the requirements for performance measures because the measures used cross all grade levels and student groups in both formative and summative areas. There is also use of performance measures that are not academic (suspension and attendance) and also graduation rates and going to college rates. There are provisions for tracking the use of the CLC STEM center by students and teachers. The increase in preparation of highly effective teachers is to be documented by their attendance at professional development trainings, there is no indication of an evaluation of if/when the teachers put what they learn into practice in the classroom.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Evaluation will be undertaken with surveys, sign-in sheets, questionnaires, and student achievement data. An independent project evaluator will be contracted throughout the grant to provide overall evaluation of the plan and its implementation. Regular meetings to discuss progress are scheduled at all levels and with all stakeholders.

This section scores in the middle range because even though regular meetings of stakeholders are scheduled, attention must be paid to more specific use of data in the evaluation process. This includes using student data to demonstrate achievement growth, enrollment in STEM classes and success rates within them, specific expectations about the purpose of PLC's and their results, a professional development calendar developed based upon the goals of the plan that is implemented to all staff with documented implementation data, what the success of moving students to iPads and textbooks is in their coursework compared to hard copy textbooks used in traditional settings.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Budget data sheets clearly show the use of all funds (those from grant and those from other sources in the district).</p> <p>There are no external funding sources, other than other District budget areas (BEP, Title IIA, Curriculum, and Technology).</p> <p>One time purchases are listed as such and identifiable in the narrative.</p> <p>All expenditures appear to fall into approved categories.</p> <p>This section meets the requirements because it clearly identifies all funding sources and what amounts will be used from each source, as well as which expenditures are one time purchases (CLC/STEM center). The use of the funds requested in the budget will support the program designed in the plan.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	7
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The budget narrative comprehensively states how the plan will be sustained upon its end date.</p> <p>The CLC STEM building will be absorbed by Title IIA, FSCD Technology Department, and building by state of Tennessee for distance learning site. However, this agreement has not yet been formulated or agreed to by all parties involved.</p> <p>PLC's will be supported by district funds to continue as implemented. Professional development activities/mentoring will become part of the HR budget/Title IIA budget.</p> <p>This section meets the scoring criteria in the medium range because PLC's will be continued by embedding the meeting time with the school day with new teachers trained within the mandatory training time required by the district; the CLC STEM will be turned over to the state for use as a post secondary trade school campus. There are plans to negotiate to allow STEM teachers continued placement at the STEM center and use of space at no cost to the district. Should the state not take over this site, it will remain the responsibility of the district with district funds maintaining it; salaries for CLC STEM staff would be absorbed by district technology department budget with instructional coaches covered by Title IIA funds; etextbooks subscriptions will transfer to district curriculum budgets. There is no clear statement about how the use of the CLC STEM building would be available for both middle and high school students. There is no clear statement made about the continuance/upgrades/replacements needed for the middle and high school student iPads. The district has included planning for the future and the needs of its students in order for the plan to continue at the end of the grant funding.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There were no specific outside partnerships identified in the plan other than the use of other available District budgets. This section scores in the low range because there is no formalized outside partnerships in the plan.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This plan does not meet the criteria under Priority 1, Personalized Learning Environments. The plan does not address the development of individual student learning plans that are implemented and used regularly by both teachers and students in planning their academic and career program. The goals for expected student achievement do not indicate high expectations</p>		

for all students to succeed academically, even though the goals for graduation and college going are set at high levels. There is no clearly delineated professional development plan to increase the number of highly effective teacher in all classrooms in the District. There are also no clear expectations included for the evaluation of how the professional development opportunities are implemented inside all classrooms. The plan includes increased access to technology, especially with iPads at the middle and high school level, however it is unclear about exactly what, when, and how the iPads will be used other than etextbooks are to be purchased. The District indicates that data is being gathered about student achievement but is unclear about when and how teachers use the data to plan instruction and interventions for all students. It is available for parents and students if they wish to access it.

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