



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0829GA-1 for Henry County Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has thoroughly developed a vision for this project, including strategies to build upon existing work that supports the four core educational assurance areas. For example, there are two existing programs (<i>Academy of Academic Success</i> and <i>Impact Academy</i>) that already have begun work towards providing personalized instruction and student support. The main emphasis of this proposal is to develop an "all-encompassing data dashboard system" that will assist in the development of lessons that are aligned to the Common Core State Standards. Along with the blended learning component of the proposed project, this will allow students to work at differentiated paces with teacher support. This section receives the full number of possible points.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The process described by the applicant for selecting participating schools is appropriate for the population to be served. Priority was given to low-performing high schools and their feeder middle schools. Additionally, schools already in the middle of another reform initiative were not included in the proposal. This procedure was chosen by the existing District Innovation Team, which includes stakeholders from across the district. The applicant has chosen seven participating schools (2 high school, five middle). These schools serve 7,506 students. Of these, over 54 percent are from low-income families. Overall, these students also represent nearly 19 percent of low-income students from the district.</p> <p>With the process and information given, the applicant has fully met the selection criteria.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant includes a partially-developed plan to explain how the plan will be implemented and how it will support meaningful reform beyond the participating schools. Activities in curriculum and assessment in each project year align, building to a model in which all subject areas are included. Additionally, these processes include implementation into elementary grades during the final project year, even though these are not grades to be served by the proposed project. Similarly, professional learning and technology improvement plans are appropriate where found, but they do not extend all the way to the last year of project implementation. If the applicant is going to extend project activities into lower grades during that year, professional development will need to be ongoing, as will the deployment of technology.</p> <p>Overall, this section scores in the middle range of the points.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's vision, description of activities, and annual measurable objectives are likely to result in improved student learning. For each subgroup described, the annual goals are ambitious, yet achievable. The applicant has also increased the pace of increase for subgroups in order to decrease achievement gaps. For example, the baseline for 6th grade math is a 83 percent pass rate, and the target is 93 percent. For the students with disabilities subgroup, the baseline is 56 percent and the target is 70. This shows thoughtfulness in setting goals rather than just blanket increases that would leave achievement gaps at existing levels.</p>		

Achivement gaps in graduation rate increase, however, under the applicant's goals. The overall baseline rate is 73.49 percent, with a target of 87.49 percent. Goals for the black, hispanic, students with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged subgroups are less ambitious.

No college enrollment rates are provided. The applicant explains that the LEA and the state do not compile this data, but that the district will in the future. No information is given about how students will be tracked as they enter college. As such, it is not possible to predict how effectively this will be done.

Overall, the applicant has scored in the middle range for this section.

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>(a) The applicant provides some data that demonstrates the district's ability to improve student learning outcomes and close achievement gaps. The four years of data provided show that in all middle school tested areas, student performance has increased over time, with the exception of the economically disadvantaged subgroup in sixth grade math. However, the high school test data show declines in math and English scores. The decline is even worse for the students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged subgroups. Similarly, gains were shown in graduation rates during this time frame. No college enrollment data are available.</p> <p>(b) The applicant notes gains made previously in one of the LEA's high schools, which received a School Improvement Grant in 2009. For this high school, test scores increased, as did graduation rates. This proposal is modeled after many of the practices that were effective from that program. As such, the applicant demonstrates a record of achieving significant reforms in low-performing schools.</p> <p>(c) The state has required that every school has a council consisting of the principal and a group of stakeholders to review and report data to the public. The applicant provides lists of data for each grade span that the schools report to the public. As such, the applicant meets this criteria.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant scores in the high range for this section.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a description of the extent to which information about expenditures is made publicly available. However no supporting evidence is provided to demonstrate this. The narrative explains that job descriptions and salary scales for all positions are searchable on the district's website, and that categorical expenditures may be searched through the state's websites. This represents a minimal level of transparency and is not fully responsive to the criteria. As such, the applicant receives low points for this section.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	6
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes how the LEA's partnership with the state RTTT grant has provided autonomy to implement personalized learning environments. For example, the district has already received waivers from the state to provided flexibility in granting high school credit based on mastery rather than seat time. However, the applicant has not providing supporting documentation that would serve as evidence of the extent to which the stated autonomy is actually available. As such, the score for this section is in the middle range.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	8
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides meaningful evidence of stakeholder involvement, including meeting agendas. In all, there were eight parent meetings and over 40 community letters of support for the development of the proposed project. At schools selected to</p>		

participate, over 90 percent of teachers indicated support. Eligible schools not meeting that threshold were not included. One piece of evidence lacking is letters of stakeholder support. Overall, the applicant's response to the criteria is strong, and is awarded a score in the high range.

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

5

3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided evidence of gaps in achievement between middle and high school, but no analysis of the root cause of those gaps is given. The applicant provides a table explainin possible explanations for these gaps, such as high school organization and climate, but there is no evidence to link the possible reasons to the current state of student performance in the district. As such, the explanations are purely theoretical. The applicant does, however, provide a table that shows the differences between traditional instruction and sites within the LEA that have implemented personalized learning environments. This demonstrates an approach to addressing gaps tha present implementation of a personalized learning environment.

As such, the applicant has partially met the criteria and gets points in the medium range for this section.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The applicant includes a well-developed plan for personalizing the learning environment. It includes a Teachers as Advisors program to help students understand that what they're learning is key to their success. It also includes strategies for integrating the Common Core State Standards that includes professional development for teachers and an online learning management system. The applicant also will include career pathways for students to pursue in order to ensure deep learning experiences that are relevant to them. The plan falls short of meeting the selection criteria, however, in the strategies presented as appropriate for giving students exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives. The strategies listed (college and career standards, pathway family groups) are included for all the criteria listed in this section. The extent to which they contribute to broadening student learning in a way that promotes diversity is not described.

(b) The applicant provides a well-developed plan describing activities that will lead to successful implementation of a personalized sequence of instruction for students. One piece of this is the plan to hire Personalized Learning Specialists for each participating school. This meets the criteria because it allows each campus to have embedded professional development in topics such as learning styles and classroom management within personalized learning environments. The plan also describes instructional approaches that are appropriate to meeting these goals. One shortcoming of the plan, however, is that the applicant describes how the learning management system will help teachers better utilize data but does not explain how the proposed project will provide digital learning content to students. It is also unclear how the applicant will seek and manage ongoing feedback from stakeholders.

(c) The plan to increase the availability of effective and highly effective teachers and principals is partially-described. While the applicant expresses support for the adoption of the state evaluation system that is aligned with the criteria described in the Notice, the proposal does not explain how teachers and principals will be trained to understand the requirements of this system and improve their performance accordingly.

Overall, the applicant's strengths in this section outweigh the weaknesses. As such, the section receives points in the medium range.

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

20

8

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The plan for engaging teachers and teams of leaders in professional learning communities is partially described. The applicant lists several high-quality professional development offerings but does not describe the structure of the PLCs. It is also not clear how the applicant will utilize feedback to improve teacher effectiveness under this plan.

(b) The plan for training educators to use data tools as described in the critera is well-developed. Beginning with the purchase of the learning management system and professional development for teachers and principals, the applicant explains how this

initiative will be deployed to provide accurate, timely data to assist in giving students personalized learning environments. The only weakness to the applicant's response to this criteria is the underdevelopment of the explanation to provide continuous feedback.

(c) The applicant's explanation of training, policies, tools, data, and resources in place is poorly developed. Other than mentioning the state-adopted evaluation system, nothing else is provided in the narrative to describe these systems of support.

(d) The applicant does not explain how the proposed project will increase the availability of effective and highly effective teachers in hard-to-staff schools and subjects.

While this section of the proposal contains many strengths, the weaknesses are profound. As such, it receives a score in the low-middle point range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>(a) The applicant partially demonstrates a governance structure conducive to supporting personalized learning. The response includes a list of personnel with their district responsibilities and their roles within the grant, including several specific responsibilities related to personalized learning. However, the list does not include a narrative explanation of lines of responsibility and how these individuals will collaborate on program implementation.</p> <p>(b) The applicant demonstrates that leadership teams are in place and have the necessary flexibility to implement calendars, scheduling, and staffing to promote personalized learning. These school councils have been in place long prior to the proposed project and already work within the school structures to communicate with stakeholders on school progress and seek input for changes of this magnitude.</p> <p>(c) The applicant demonstrates the flexibility to grant credit based on flexibility rather than seat time by having a waiver in place from the state to do so. Documentation of this waiver is included in the appendix.</p> <p>(d) The applicant partially demonstrates students having the opportunity to demonstrate mastery in multiple ways and at multiple times. While the practice of allowing students not showing mastery of a skill to remediate and retest meets this criteria, this is not representative of a personalized solution. Additionally, the applicant states that comprehension can be demonstrated in "multiple comparable ways," but describes solutions that are common practice in most classes.</p> <p>(e) The applicant fully demonstrates instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible. These include use of adaptable materials and media that allow customization of instruction.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant's response to the selection criteria in this section have many more strengths than flaws. As such, this section receives points in the high range.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	9
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>(a) The applicant has fully planned to ensure that stakeholders have access to necessary resources, particularly technology, to support implementation of the proposal. Examples showing this include mobile laptop labs for each campus, partnerships with community and faith-based organizations to support neighborhood technology hubs, a data portal with access points for students, parents and teachers, and training for all stakeholder groups.</p> <p>(b) The applicant partially ensures technical support through the existing help desk protocols and plans to increase technology implementation staff with grant funding. However, the roles for the technology support staff to be hired are not fully developed in the narrative.</p> <p>(c) The applicant's current data system and the system to be implemented both fully meet the expectation of being able to integrate with learning systems and inform instruction. The applicant also ensures that the systems are FERPA compliant.</p>		

(d) The applicant provides assurance of use of interoperable data systems containing all components that meet the criteria. Overall, the applicant has many more strengths than weaknesses in this section and scores in the high range of points.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant has a fully-developed plan for a continuous improvement process. It includes opportunities for input, dissemination of information, and feedback for each goal at multiple times during each project year. As such, the applicant receives full points for this section.		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant has a partially-developed plan for stakeholder engagement and communication. It includes weekly leadership meetings, bi-monthly project manager meetings, monthly meetings with district personnel, and print and web communications with external stakeholders. The project narrative does not, however, discuss what information will be communicated through these opportunities. As such, this section receives a score in the medium range of points.		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: The applicant partially meets the expectation of having ambitious yet achievable performance targets. In most instances, the targets are for performance measures in need of improvement and in places where gaps exist. Some, however, are less clear. For example, at Dutchtown Middle School, the performance target of 95 percent of students having at least 95 percent attendance is actually lower than the current level of performance. Also, at Hampton Middle School, the applicant sets targets for language arts performance that flip the performance gap. Baseline numbers show that overall performance is ahead of special education and economically disadvantaged subgroups; however, targets have overall performance falling behind these subgroups in four years. Overall, this section receives a score in the middle range of the point scale.		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments: The applicant includes a well-developed plan for evaluating the effectiveness of project-funded activities. The timeline for implementation includes several checkpoints for each strategy. The plan also includes clear lines of responsibility. As such, this section receives all available points.		

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's budget is clear in asking for RTTT funds. However, the costs listed as LEA support are existing staff salaries. These are costs that the applicant would incur with or without grant funding. As such, they do not constitute funds from other sources.		

(b) The proposed budget is sufficient for implementing the proposed project. It includes personnel that are sufficient to cover the training and technical support. It also includes supplies, travel, and contractual support.

(c) The rationale for the use of funds is well-developed. The applicant includes most of the costs as one-time expenses that would occur during the first year of the proposed project. One weakness in this area is the explanation of how the applicant will ensure long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments.

Overall, this section scores in the middle of the point range.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant includes a partially-developed plan for project sustainability. While it includes the development of human capital and the maintenance of equipment purchased through the grant, it does not include details for how people entering the school district later will be trained to be successful within this model of instruction or how obsolete equipment will be replaced. As such points are awarded in the medium range for this section.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	2

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant poorly responds to the criteria for the competitive preference priority. Counting on the local cable company to provide Internet service to low-income families at a discount and making those families aware of this opportunity does not constitute a partnership. Additionally, relying on services that the local library system already offers does not contribute to the applicant's response. The applicant also does not indicate population-level desired results for this section. The implementation, integration of services, and professional development described in this section do not contribute anything additional that is not described elsewhere in the proposal. As such, this section scores in the low range of points.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

While the proposal has several areas that would benefit from further explanation, it is clear that the applicant has developed a plan based upon prior success in raising student outcomes and turning around low-performing schools. The proposed project includes the use of existing data management tools and expanding them to include more that will lead to greater flexibility in student learning. It is also clear from the proposal that policies and supports are in place to support these types of changes. Overall, the result of the proposed project would likely be more students on track for success beyond high school and reduced gaps in performance between subgroups. As such, the applicant has met the absolute priority.

Total	210	145
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	8

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

Optional Budget Supplement 1 -

(1) The applicant has a well-developed rationale for the optional budget supplement, which would provide flexbooks and the development of digital content for math instruction. This supplemental project is tied back to the need for improvement in math achievement, transition to the Common Core State Standards, and the main project's initiatives to create personalized learning environments.

(2) The applicant does not address how the activities described in the optional budget supplement will be co-developed and implemented across two or more LEAs.

(3) The proposed budget includes many costs that are appropriate and adequate for implementation of this project. However, training 38 teachers to develop digital content for math instruction will likely take more than \$5,500.

Overall, the optional budget supplement proposes a meaningful activity that is tied to the main proposal, but it does not fully address the selection criteria. As such, it receives a score in the middle range of points for this section.

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	8
--	----	---

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

Optional Budget Supplement 2 -

(1) The applicant partially describes the rationale for the optional budget supplement. This initiative would expand the LEAs existing virtual instruction program. The applicant has not, however, described the extent to which virtual instruction is already in place. As such, the need for this supplement has not been fully established.

(2) The applicant partially explains the reason for the partnership with the second LEA to be included in this initiative. It is unclear from the narrative why this partner was chosen or how the two LEAs will be able to manage the partnership. The need to establish a physical classroom space in both districts as described is evident, but the organizational structure of the partnership itself is not.

(3) The budget is well-developed and suited to the activities contained within this initiative. They include computers, personnel, and professional development that are well-suited to establish and/or expand the availability of virtual instruction in both districts.

Overall, the applicant has partially met the selection criteria and scores in the middle range of points for the optional budget supplement.

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	8
--	----	---

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

Optional Budget Supplement 3 -

(1) The applicant has a well-developed rationale for the optional budget supplement. This initiative would expand the ability of the Academy for Advanced Studies (AAS) to create opportunities for students to receive personalized instruction. The first use of funds under this supplemental budget would be to make the setting at the school completely wireless, allowing for students to engage in a "bring your own technology" school culture. This would make the learning environment between home and school more seamless. The second use of funds would be to allow teachers to develop digital curriculum beyond core content areas, including those with a career and technology focus. The third use of funds is for professional development to ensure strong implementation of these programs.

(2) The applicant does not include an explanation of how activities from this supplemental project would be co-developed and implemented across two or more LEAs.

(3) The proposed budget partially aligns with the goals of the supplemental project. The expenses for hardware updates for the wireless environment and for teachers to develop digital content are well-explained, but the \$532,000 included for professional development at one charter school seems excessive. The applicant has not thoroughly explained why the amount is this high. Learning opportunities described align with project goals, but the cost is above that of professional development as seen elsewhere in this proposal.

Overall, the applicant has partially met the selection criteria and receives a score in the middle range of points for the optional budget supplement.



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0829GA-2 for Henry County Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Henry County Schools presented a comprehensive and coherent vision for improving teaching and learning by implementing Pathways to Success which will provide students with choices for personalized learning pathways to college and career readiness. The proposal builds on and extends prior work in the four core educational assurance areas including the district's lead role in piloting a new state level RTTT teacher and principal evaluation system, creating a charter school featuring personalized learning environments, and moving to a mastery rather than seat time approach to granting course credit. The applicant's approach was of high quality and all 10 points were awarded.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Henry County Schools provided a credible rationale for the selection of schools to participate in the project. The selection factors and process resulted in the selection of schools which meet the eligibility requirements, include high-need students, have sufficient buy-in and a track record to make success likely, and will provide middle school and high school models for personalizing instruction to promote college and career readiness that should later help with scaling up the project. Henry County's approach to implementation was of high quality and all 10 points were awarded for this section.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Henry County included a logic model showing the theory of action for how identified inputs and activities will produce outputs, outcomes, and result in the project goals. The model is coherent and credible. In this section, Henry County also addressed plans for scaling up the project to ultimately include all schools for many of the project elements. There was a lack of clarity and some ambiguity regarding impact on all schools in all grade levels. For example, page 31 of the application included the statement "As the school district finds success under the Pathways to Success school reform initiative, elementary school (K-5) may be added to expand the initiative." The data tables submitted for LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes suggest that impact is anticipated only at the middle and high school levels.</p> <p>The required sub-elements for a high quality plan such as timelines, deliverables, and persons responsible were not included in this section. Because of the ambiguities regarding system-wide implementation and the failure to include all high quality plan elements, four points were deducted which resulted in a score of six for this section which is in the middle range.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Henry County provided ambitious but achievable annual goals for improving student performance on numerous middle and high school end-of-course tests in reading, mathematics, science and social studies. The goals call for progress even in areas where performance is already very high. The goals also call for closing achievement gaps observed with disabled and economically deprived student subgroups</p>		

on state reading and mathematics assessments at the middle and high school level. Actual observed achievement levels for Henry County's middle school students are so high that it places practical limits on the amount of improvement which can be obtained. In a few cases, the projection is that ultimately 100% of students will be proficient which is probably not realistic. Henry County did not provide annual goals regarding college enrollment although it is a requirement of the section. Two points were deducted because this information was missing, resulting in a total score of eight for this section which is in the high range.

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	7
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Henry County provided data showing that over the past four years reading and mathematics achievement for middle school students has increased substantially with moderate to substantial growth being seen at the high school level. No data were provided concerning elementary level performance for the district. The data show moderate progress in closing achievement gaps for both disabled and economically deprived students at the middle school level but at the high school level meaningful progress is reported only for disabled students.</p> <p>Henry County reported making turnaround reform strategies only at the Henry County high school.</p> <p>Henry County described extensive mechanisms for making performance data available to students, educators, and parents for improving instruction. In this section eight points were deducted because only moderate performance improvements were reported, progress in closing achievement gaps was consistently reported only at the middle school level, no data were provided at the elementary level, and due to the district's limited history with implementing ambitious and significant reforms with persistently low achieving and low performing schools. The score awarded for this section is seven which is in the middle range.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Henry County reportedly makes available salary schedules and job descriptions on its website and indicated where on the state website salary information for individual staff members of the district can be obtained. This shows some but not a high level of transparency for LEA processes and practices. It did not, however, report how it makes available salary information at the school level for actual salaries, instructional staff only, teachers only, and non-personnel expenditures. These omissions resulted in a deduction of three points an overall score of two for this section which is in the middle range.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Henry County described early work it has undertaken as a partner in the state Race to the Top implementation including SLDS for data analysis, an effective college and career readiness performance index, and has played a lead role in piloting a new RTTT state evaluation system for teachers and leaders.</p> <p>Henry County has obtained state waivers to implement Pathway to Success and to grant credit for mastery demonstration rather than traditional seat time requirements. They also received state approval to create a new charter school featuring personalized learning environments. Through these actions, Henry County has shown it has the ability to obtain state waivers and generally establish the conditions and autonomy necessary to assure that they will be able to implement personalized learning environments which meets the requirements of this section. The response for this area is high quality and full points were awarded.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Henry County described a variety of procedures for engaging stakeholders in the development of the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engaged parents, students, and school councils in planning the current proposal (no details were provided) Linked work on the proposal with the Henry County Chamber of Commerce Excellence in Education initiative 		

- Established partnerships with the Henry County Chamber of Commerce and Ministerial Alliance, and
- Surveyed faculty in the project schools confirming a minimum of 90% support.

Henry County reported holding eight parent meetings in the 2011-2012 planning work on flexible online learning environments which were foundational but not directly related to the current proposal. There were just a few letters of support for this proposal and none from any parent or teacher groups. Overall, the evidence of engagement of stakeholders in the development of the proposal is low, resulting in the deduction of five points and a total score of five which is in the middle range.

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

5

2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Henry County described a problem where students' achievement drops from middle to high school but did not coherently analyze needs and gaps of the system in implementing personal learning environments. It did provide a table contrasting current and future use of the teaching/learning process that is the core logic for the proposal. Henry County did not include a high quality plan for assessing its status in implementing personalized learning environments. Because of these deficiencies, three points were deducted for this section resulting in a total score of two.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	20
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Henry County provided a very impressive, coherent, and comprehensive plan for improving teaching and learning to support personalizing the learning environment. The proposal addresses personalizing learning through the development of graduation plans linked to college and career curriculum standards and assessments, and blended instructional environments which personalize learning. The proposal addresses aligning instructional content and processes and using data and assessment systems to provide ongoing feedback for students. The need for accommodations for students and technical support and training for students, parents, and staff is also addressed.</p> <p>The plan addresses all six research-based strategies identified by the What Works Clearinghouse for promoting student engagement including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> data systems adult advocates academic support and enrichment programs to improve student behavior and social skills personalizing the learning environment and instructional process, and providing rigorous and relevant instruction aligned with college and career ready standards <p>The high quality plan covered all four years of the grant, incorporated goals, activities, deliverables, and systematically addressed all criteria. This very high-quality response fell in the high range and resulted in a total score of 20.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	20

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Henry County provided a very impressive, coherent, and comprehensive plan for improving teaching and learning to support personalizing the learning environment. The high quality plan covered all four years of the grant, incorporated goals, activities, deliverables, and systematically addressed all criteria. The proposal addressed:

- support for implementation of personalized learning environments
- adaptation of content and instruction
- frequent measurement of student progress
- use of teacher and principal feedback in the evaluation process
- collection of actionable information
- the maintenance of high-quality learning resources
- processes and tools to be used to match student needs and resources
- how teacher and training systems would be used to continuously improve student performance and teacher effectiveness, and
- how the district would increase the number of students receiving instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and

principals.

It is clear the plan incorporates and builds on the district's work with the state RTTT implementation especially with regard to increasing the number of students receiving instruction from highly effective teachers and principals.

This very high-quality response fell in the high range and resulted in a total score of 20.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	15
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Perhaps due to earlier work with their participation in the state Race to the Top grant and educational reform initiatives, Henry County already has in place many practices and policies that would support their proposal. The section included a functional management structure to support the grant including the use of an already existing District Innovation Team. Henry County presented convincing documentation of its capacity to seek and obtain waivers from the Georgia State Department of Education that will enable it to assure that students progress based on mastery rather than seat time, have opportunities to demonstrate mastery in multiple ways at multiple times with appropriate accommodations, and that teachers differentiate instruction. The response to this section was a very high-quality and all 15 points were awarded.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Henry County presented a strong conceptual plan for assuring students, educators, and parents have access to content tools and resources, and appropriate technical support. The proposal described how the district's Digital Classroom, Community Technology Pods, Mobile Digital Technology, and POINT digital portal initiatives make specific provisions for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • assuring student access to content tools and learning resources • having appropriate levels of technical support • allowing students and parents to export information in an open data format, and • ensuring that LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems <p>The proposal also provided assurances that the technology systems meet the requirements for open data format and interoperability. This section calls for a high quality plan with specific sub-elements that were missing for this section. The high quality plans in other parts of the proposal to some extent do address criteria for this section. Two points were deducted from this section because there was not a specific high quality plan and not every criterion was addressed systematically with a high quality plan with elements such as timelines and persons responsible. This resulted in a total score of eight for this section which is in the high range.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Henry County schools described a systematic, coherent, and credible model for monitoring, measuring, and publicly sharing information regarding the implementation of the project.</p> <p>The model is systematic, coherent, and credible because it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • includes a plan, act, check, and correct cycle with specific activities aligned with grant implementation goals • provides specific details regarding project activities to be undertaken aligned with the plan, act, check, and correct cycle • is embedded in the district five-year improvement plan and processes, and • builds on extensive district experience using this model as part of its AdvanceEd school improvement and accreditation processes which is likely to increase the feasibility and effectiveness of the approach 		

This high-quality response resulted in all points being awarded which is in the high range.

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

5

5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Henry County schools described its plans for community and engagement which included a broad array of appropriate activities including at least bi-annual, public updates to the local BOE by the district leadership team. The BOE will be briefed at their regular monthly public meeting.

Other communications activities will include newsletters, district websites, data system portals, press releases, and brochures. The Assistant Superintendent for Learning, or designee, will conduct monthly meetings for all interested stakeholders at the participating school sites. These ongoing and comprehensive approaches were of high-quality and full points were awarded for this section.

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

5

3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Henry County did not complete performance measure tables related to highly effective teachers and principals reportedly because related evaluation strategies are only now being implemented as part of the state's Race to the Top grant. The district could, however, have included target data for future years for this activity but chose not to do so resulting in the deduction of one point for this section. Henry County provided two different tables related to performance measures addressing submission of FAFSA applications with a 70% criterion and another with a 90% criterion. Student participation numbers for these tables differ inexplicably and it is not clear why two tables were submitted. No on-track to college measure, a required element, was included at the middle school level resulting in the deduction of one point for this section. All other required performance measures were provided with generally challenging but attainable targets. At the middle school level, however, the ultimate targets for school attendance were 100% which is neither feasible nor desirable. Henry County's response for this section fell in the middle range and three points were awarded.

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

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Henry County schools provided a high quality evaluation plan for evaluating the project. The submission included a table with a comprehensive array of measures, methods, timelines, and persons responsible. The evaluation addresses all required elements for this section by including:

- appropriate use of funds
- implementation processes for the grant components
- impact of professional development on PLE, data analysis, technology integration, and blended learning
- the extent of success in implementing blended learning
- technology usage and reliability, and
- feasibility of replication of the project.

Use of an external evaluator and Georgia-based review and reporting methodology, adds to the credibility of the evaluation plan. All five points were awarded for this high-quality response.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Henry County schools provided a detailed, adequate, and credible project level budget with the rationale for the expenditures. The budget

narrative included an explanation that much of the budget is devoted to putting in place technology infrastructure and developing human capacity and content resources that will continue beyond the life of the grant and in the district's view will not require ongoing funding. The largest share of the budget is devoted to personnel who will be strategically reallocated to other district functions and will continue to be able to use their unique background and experiences to support continuation of the project activities while in more traditional roles. The budget narrative did include discussion of strategies designed to ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments. This high-quality response resulted in all 10 points being awarded.

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

10

4

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Henry County schools did not provide a high quality plan addressing the sustainability of the project beyond the life of the grant. For sustainability, the district is relying on arguments discussed above in section F(1) regarding the focus of grant resources on capacity development and placing infrastructure which can carry on beyond the life of the grant. The district indicated that if funds were needed to support project activities after the grant, additional funding resources such as grants would be sought. There was no data or discussion about any need for ongoing fiscal support for the project beyond the life of the grant, which is not credible. The absence of a high quality plan and the low credibility of sustainability resulted in the deduction of six points and a total score of four for this section which falls in the middle range.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Henry County schools addressed the competitive preference priority with its Community Technology Pathway initiative, a partnership involving public libraries and community centers in the county to provide educational support services to low income students beyond the school day. An array of performance measures and targets was provided that included successful course completion in reading, mathematics, science, and social studies, on-track to career and college status, attendance, completion of high school graduation requirements, taking of college admission tests, and matriculation in postsecondary institutions. This is the same set of measures that was used to meet other performance monitoring requirements of the proposal.

The partnership appears to be coherent and sustainable but appears to focus on supporting students' academic progress rather than addressing social, emotional, or behavioral needs of participating students which is the focus of the competitive preference priority. Due to this mismatch in focus, five points were deducted for this section resulting in a total score of five points which falls in the middle range.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Henry County Schools submitted a robust proposal which comprehensively and coherently addresses how it will build on prior reform work as a participating district in a Race to the Top state to improve teaching and learning by using technology in a reconceptualization of the teacher role to personalize instruction for students. The strong application meets the absolute priority for this competition.

Total	210	170
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	3
Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments: Flexbooks for Mathematics Henry County's Flexbooks proposal included a generally convincing rationale but the content development activities are not clearly different from those on the core proposal. The plan did not provide high quality plan elements such as activities, timelines, deliverables, and persons responsible. It also did not include the requirement to involve two or more school districts. Because of these deficiencies, 12 points were deducted resulting in a total score of 3 which is in the low range.		
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	7
Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments: Impact Academy Flexible Learning Henry County's Impact Academy Flexible Learning proposal did not provide a convincing rationale and appears to at least partially duplicate the core proposal activities and objectives. The plan did not provide high quality plan elements such as activities, timelines, deliverables, and persons responsible. It did include the requirement to involve two or more school districts. Because of the noted deficiencies, eight points were deducted resulting in a total score of seven which is in the middle range.		
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	5
Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments: Academy for Advanced Study Henry County's Academy for Advanced Study proposal included a rationale but some of the activities are not clearly different from those on the core proposal. The plan did not provide high quality plan elements such as activities, timelines, deliverables, and persons responsible. It also did not include the requirement to involve two or more school districts. Because of these deficiencies, 10 points were deducted resulting in a total score of 5 which is in the middle range.		



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0829GA-3 for Henry County Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant provides a comprehensive and coherent reform vision which includes pairing two innovative reform models, <i>POINT</i> and <i>Go When Ready</i> across all content areas. This vision's goals outlined in table A 1.3 – <i>Aligning Pathways to Success Goals with the Four Core Assurances</i> articulates a clear and credible approach to the goals presented. The <i>POINT</i> initiative provides a convincing approach to measuring student's growth and success through integrating a new learning module with the current Student Information System into one platform. Through this approach, is it feasible that data will be available on the student's progression and achievement will be available for teachers, students and parents to assist with developing individuals pathways which will be based on the student's needs and interests. This section scored high because the applicant presented a comprehensive and coherent vision which builds on the assurance areas.		

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant demonstrates convincingly that their approach will support high-quality LEA-level and School-level implementation. This is evidenced through their providing the process used to select schools to participate which involved a District Innovation Team's work of assessing various metrics. The applicant provides the composition of this team (through <i>Appendix A2</i>) which was evidenced as a diverse and well qualified group to make decisions on schools chosen. Though <i>Table (A) Applicant's Approach to Implementation</i>, the proposal details the schools chosen which includes The applicant further provides information that 7,506 total students will be participating with 4,064 low-income participating students, 1,501 high-need students and 512 participating educators. This section scored high because the proposal provided a solid approach to implementation for grades 6 – 12 in seven schools.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal provided a clearly assembled table (<i>A 3.1 – Pathways to Success – POINT and Go When Ready Logic Model</i>) which provides goals, activities and deliverables, but fails to provide timelines and responsible parties for implementing activities. The proposal ties the goals of the logic model to the four core assurances which allows for a direct connection to meaningful reform. The information provided, in addition to the <i>Table 3.2 – Pathways to Success – Scaled-up and Replication Model</i> provides a solid framework for how the reform will be scaled up into the lower grades, K-5. The applicant scored high in the medium range of points because they did not provide timelines or responsible parties in the high-quality plan. Timelines and who will be responsible for implementation in scaling up would have strengthened the application by showing capacity for district wide change beyond the participating schools.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's visions of pairing two innovative reform models, <i>POINT</i> and <i>Go When Ready</i> across all content areas is likely to result in the targets set. The proposal provides ambitious yet realistic annuals goals by projecting gains of 1% to 5% growth for each subpopulation while at the same time explaining that in certain subgroups and subject areas a 5% growth is not sufficient to close achievement gaps. The applicant provides clear understanding that in those areas, the goal targets will be 6.2% to 10%. The goals to decrease the achievement gap range are realistic. The most gains in one year are 10 percent. The applicant, or the most part, is seeking to close the gap for the majority of areas. The trend moving downward for the achievement gaps is a realistic way to decrease. The applicant provides incremental increases in the area of graduation rates for all the subpopulations which are ambitious and realistic to be achieved. The proposal fails to provide targets for annual goals for College Enrollment. The applicant states they do not track at the time of application but will be by December 2013. An explanation of how this will occur (i.e.. resources to be used, process to be developed, etc.) would have strengthened the application. This would have given the understanding that collecting the data would be achievable. The applicant scored in the low portion of the high range of points because they did not provide clarity around collecting college enrollment data.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	15
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant evidences success in the past four years through a variety of manners. Students realized and improvement through the End-Of-Course tests for an average increase of 11 percent in the courses using summative and formative assessment data. The <i>Table B 1.2 SIG – Henry County High School EOCT Meets/ Exceeds</i> evidences this. The high school graduation rate experienced a 12% increase from 2009 – 2011. College enrollment was not being tracked in the past and therefore no evaluatory statement can be made concerning this. The applicant provides a clear understanding that they were able to take Henry County High School, the recipient of a federal Turnaround School Improvement Grant in 2009, and make gains in academic performance. This is evidenced, as mentioned earlier, through an increase in seven out of eight End-Of-</p>		

Course tests for an average of 11 percent in those courses. The proposal demonstrates that the applicant makes use of School Councils comprised of the principal, parents, certified teachers and business persons. The district gathers and reviews student achievement data then distributes to the school councils annually allow them the opportunity for informed decisions on student needs. The proposal further clarifies that a variety of data report on student performance is made available to parents a monthly meetings, posted on various websites and other various methods of data distribution. The applicant scored high because of their clear, articulation that student performance data is available to educators and students to help inform and improve participation, instruction and services.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal describes that all salaries are made available to the public. Since all salaries are available, this would be all schools level instructional and support staff. While the applicant explains that all required reporting expenditures, required by the state are reported in the following areas: instruction, instructional support, pupil support and school administration are available for public access at a state website, what is not clear is if all non-personnel expenditures at the school level are available. Based on the narrative, only the requirements by the state are available. The applicant scored in the middle of the scoring range because more clarity` is needed.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant explains that they have been working to provide the conditions and waivers necessary to implement their vision of *Pathways to Success*. A statement made on page 43 indicates that all waivers may not have been granted yet, "*The State Board of Education has demonstrated a willingness to support waivers from state requirements for innovative models focused on student achievement and tied to achievement goals.*" The question is, has the state granted ALL the waivers necessary to implement the project. Through being one of 26 RTT partners, it would appear that the district is in a position to implement the personalized learning requirements, yet hte narrative needs more clarity to provide definitive knowledge that sufficient conditions and sufficient autonomy exists to implement the proposal at time of application would have strengthened the application. The applicant scored in the middle of the point range because of lack of clarity concerning criteria response.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	6
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

While the applicant explained that eight parent meetings were conducted, they fail to explain the engagement level at those meetings. A description of how students, families, teachers and principals were engaged would have strengthened the application. They clearly explain that al but two schools achieved a 90 percent approval rate from teachers. The applicant only provides a letter of support from a congressional office external to the school system along with a support email from the Mayor. No letters of support from key stakeholders such as parents, parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, the business community, civil rights organizations, advocacy groups, local civic and community-based organizations, and institutions of higher education. While the proposal explains there were over 40 community members who wrote letters of support for the start-up of the charter programs that became AAS, not letters of support are offered for this proposal. The applicant scores in the low range of points for this section because of the lack of evidence that meaningful stakeholder engagement occurred at the level needed.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal provides a compelling analysis of implementing personalized learning which includes a 10% to 15% decline in students who meet or exceed proficiency from middle to high school. There is a marked decrease for math results when comparing middle and high school students. What the applicant fails to provide is a high-quality plan for analyzing their current status in implementing personalized learning environments. This high-quality plan would have included goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties. The applicant scored in the low point range because of the lack of the high-quality plan.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	18
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal provides the understanding that the POINT Learning Management System is designed to adjust curriculum to meet student needs as they work through the instructional modules. The student can move through the school day based on their individual needs and interests. The evidenced based approach from the What Works Clearinghouse concerning student engagement thereby increasing graduation rates provides an extensive understanding of the transformation of the learning environment for participating students.</p> <p>The applicant provides a high-quality plan C.1.1, C.1.2 and C.1.3 which takes each of the criteria listed in i – v and uses them as goals, then links activities to each, a timeline for each and then assigns persons responsible for each activity and then assigns each activities to one of the four core assurances. The clearly, articulate plan presents the plan in a manner which the approach to implementation and points to deliverables which will result in increased graduation rates for all student subgroups, increase in participating students from all subgroups entering post-secondary institutions and a decrease in dropout for all student workgroups.</p> <p>Applicant did not provide activities which explain that support from parents will be built. Activities are focused on educators and students. More explanation of the Pathway Family Groups to be established in each school would have strengthened the application by providing the objectives of this group.</p> <p>Applicant scored high because of the clear, concise manner in which they presented data which covered the criteria.</p>		

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	14
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant clearly articulates the high-quality plan which focuses on training to educators that suppose their capacity to accomplish the goals outlined. The proposal clearly explains the goals of the implementation plan which includes a timeline and persons responsible for the activities. The applicant thorough details each criteria listed in a manner which explains they will strive for every student to be taught by highly effective teachers ad leaders and that participating schools will reflect innovative, collaborative, student focused school cultures.</p> <p>The section also clearly presets that they will work to ensure that all participating educators will have access to, and know how to use, tools, data and resources to accelerate student progress towards meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements. The major activity will be the purchase an implantation of the Learning Management System which will provide a solid foundation for data. While it is convincing that the ELMS is a critical component, the applicant does not address whether this tool will match student needs or how the system intends to use the ELMS to accomplish this.</p> <p>The section describes the training and policy goals to help enable the teachers have the structure to build an effective learning environment. Table B 5.5 highlights the move of key stakeholder from now (a traditional system) to then (the systems being sought). The teacher and leader evaluation systems are to be used to assist in this.</p> <p>Applicant states that they currently implement a teacher and principal evaluation system to ensure that all students receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals. While the system can evaluate, it cannot ensure. The applicant needed a high-quality plan which outlines the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and reasonable parties.</p> <p>This section scored in the high medium range of points due to the lack of high quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals. In addition more information is needed on how the ELMS will be used to match student needs with specific resources.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a table (D.1.1 – Pathways to Success Governance Structure) which demonstrates the broad overview of governance. A more detailed description of specifically how the governance structure would be organized. The table</p>		

presents that the Board of Education will be in the structure yet clarity on whether they will be policy oriented only or a part of the management structure would have strengthened the application. More information is need concerning the specifics of the governance structure and how it will provide support and services to all participating schools

Applicant details the school councils which currently exist at each school. This includes the members, responsibilities and their authority which provide advice and recommendations to the Board and Superintendent. Applicant does not specify whether the councils have sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as schools schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators and school-level budgets. More information is needed.

Applicant explains that a waiver will be requested eliminating seat time in class. The narrative explained that feedback received on the project indicated the state would grant flexibility needed to implement the project in appendix D.1, yet no statement was found stating this.

The section explains that teachers use differentiating instruction to meet student’s needs. They present that if the students are unable to show mastery of a concept then instruction is changed to provide multiple avenues of grasping content. This provides evidence that they students will be given the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways.

The applicant demonstrates that the Go When Ready program will provide individualized graduation plans, execution of a Dashboard system to provide teachers with data to develop personalized learning plans and diverse instructional delivery too to allow all students from targeted subgroups to be monitored to ensure that gaps in achievement are being addressed.

The applicant scores in low in the high range because there is a lack of clarity if the seat time can be waived for the district.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant fails to provide a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies. This plan should have included goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties. A plan would have provided the overview to ensuring that every student educator and level of the education system has the support and resources they need. The section clearly addresses the technology infrastructure which will be provided for the seven participating schools. Yet, no mention is made concerning the other necessary content, tools and other learning resources both inside and outside the school. The applicant clearly outlines the content, tools and resources along with training and support and data which will be available to each stakeholder group. Applicant details that POINT and the current SIS allows the district to share and export data in an open format with parents and students through a portal at any time from any location. They fail to explain that the data could be used in other electronic learning systems. The section clearly articulates that POINT is interoperable with the current SIS system. This section scored in the medium range of points due to the lack of a high-quality plan.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant clearly articulates through Table E.1.1 Continuous Improvement Process how their strategy for the continuous process for each goal. This process includes a plan to publicly share information about the findings in the process and a plan for timely feedback. The plan not only includes the process for determining deficiencies but what corrective action plan would be taken for various deficiencies. The process is rigorous because it provides evaluator processes for each of the goals. The applicant scored high in this section because of the clarity of the rigorous, continuous improvement process.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
--	---	---

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The section addresses how communication about the program will occur, yet the criterion is seeking how required adjustments and revisions during implementation will be communicated with internal and external stakeholders. The applicant explains that for the first 100 day of the project, monthly meetings will occur, yet information is needed for the duration of the project. The applicant scored low in this section because of the lack of information on communicating internally and externally the adjustments and revisions needed during implementation

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>While applicant does not include targets for the performance measures concerning teacher of record and principal, they do provide a target of 95 percent of students that will have a teacher of record and principal who are highly effective and 5 percent of participating students in grades 6 – 8 will have a teacher of record and principal who are effective. These numbers are ambitious yet without some benchmark to gauge against may be not achievable. Applicant does not provide the pre-K performance measures required by the NIA. The targets given appear ambitious and realistic. Applicant fails to provide how they will review and improve the measure overtime if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress. Applicant scored in the medium range due to their failing to provide the pre-k measures and the ambitious yet not achievable teacher of record and principal measures.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a high quality plan for the evaluation of investments (Table 4.1). This well conceived plan will evaluate each goal in the fours area. They intend to meet monthly and review how the implementation is progressing in meeting the goal. The plan is inclusive of the major activities for the project implementation. The applicant scored high in this area because of the clearly articulated evaluation of investments plan.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant explains the total budget for the project is \$138,329,849 with \$118,331,772 coming from other sources, but they fail to explain the rational for these funds. Page 186 explains those funds are personnel costs, but the applicant does not provide clarity on why they were provided. The grant funds being requested are reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the proposal. The Applicant provides an explanation through the budget forms that the fund from other sources are salaries and explains they are from state, local and federal funds. Applicant provides a clear detail budget outlining one-time expenditures as well as on-going costs. Overall, the applicant scored high in this are because of the detail of the budget which appears reasonable for project being proposed.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	3
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant fails to provide a high quality plan which includes goals, activities, timeline, deliverables and responsible parties. They do explain that with the purchase of the standards based instructional material or course modules, along with hardware funded through the project which will be maintained by the district, a portion of the project will be able to be maintained after the grant ends. Applicant doesn't provide information to concerning operational costs after the project to allow for evaluation of sustainability nor do they provide support garnered for after the grant period. Applicant scored low in this section because of the lack of information.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	5
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant doesn't explain coherent and sustainable partnerships that it has formed, but rather partnerships the partnerships they will form (i.e.. library, community centers, neighborhood meeting areas.) The criteria ask for partnership that has been formed to support the plan outlined. The applicant provides nine (9) population level desired results with only five being students focused. The applicant explains that the POINT system will be used to track overall student performance in schools which is a strong approach to data management. The POINT program will allow leaders to evaluate progress in real</p>		

time in order to measure effectiveness and make adjustments as needed. The applicant doesn't explain how the desired outcomes will be tracked, but only provides the listing in the table Population-Level Desired Results.

The applicant explains that participating in CTP is voluntary but that they would seek to increase the number of eligible students and parents participating. A strength is that through the process of continuous evaluation and effectiveness review, the project leadership will meet to adjust services and meet specific needs of families therefore improving results over time.

The applicant will be dependent upon the educators to provide parents with information on services available throughout the school and through the community. No mention is made of partnerships with other community based organizations to assist with this. It appears that the teachers will have their time taken up through implementation of the personalized learning programs, and also serving as an ombudsman for supportive services may be too much to ask.

The LEA will be building capacity of staff in participating schools through training in the Community Technology Pathway which tools and support are outlined in table XI. This table appears appropriate for assessing needs and assets of participating students, identifying the inventorying the needs and assets of the school and community, creating a decision-making process and infrastructure to select, implement and evaluate, engaging parents and families and participating students and routinely assess programs.

The section identifies the performance measures for the overall program rather than the subpopulations mentioned in the Population-Level Desired Results table. More specificity around those populations and the performance measures or those would have strengthened the application.

The applicant scored in the medium range of points because of the lack of information surrounding performance measures around the subpopulations mentioned along with how the outcomes would be tracked. In addition, placing the responsibility of being an information and referral source for parents in addition to implementing the personalized learning environments appears to be unrealistic.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a coherent and comprehensive plan to build upon the four core educational assurance areas. The applicant convincingly explained that the plan will create learning environments to improve learning and teaching through personalized strategies, tools and support for students and educators that are aligned with college and career ready standards or college and career ready graduation requirements. The applicant's use of the POINT dashboard systems, which will interface with their existing Student Information System and existing Learning Management System (LMS) will help accelerate student learning and deepening their learning through having data for key stakeholders to make decisions about the academic needs of each student. The applicant met the Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments.

Total	210	155
-------	-----	-----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	8

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided three optional budget supplements for 1) flexbooks, 2) Impact Academy, and 3) Academy for advanced studies. Each section's rationale for a specific area is sound in their goals, project scope and purpose. The applicant fails to provide a high-quality plan with no timelines being provided. The applicant does provide goals for the flexbook project which appears reasonable. More information on the high-quality plans would have strengthened each supplement. The applicant's proposed budget for each appears reasonable and adequate to support the development and implementation of activities outlined. The applicant scored in the middle of the point range because of the lack of information required in a high-quality

plan.