



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0480NC-3 for Onslow County Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	3
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: Overarching goals with an implementation of such goals is lacking and not specific Lacks deepening student learning data No mention of increasing equity weakens this response Strong in implementing technology but lacks a specific goal and implementation process		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	3
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: Schools participating are listed but not the process to select them No information on schools collectively meeting Student numbers are listed in a table but nothing else No evidence of school selection weakens this application Students listed but no definitive information weakens this application		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: Plan is difficult to discern school wide implementation is lacking goals are lacking which is a weakness of this application math and technology seem to be written about but not clear as to what the exact implementation will be		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	1
(A)(4) Reviewer Comments: No goals listed and so it is difficult to speak to the effect of each of the categories in this prompt Table includes current data but no goals and no connection to student data Lack of information weakens this area of the application		

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	3
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: some evidence of raising student outcomes in Algebra tied to the project K-NEX but not a strong response one year's worth of data for college enrollment is present but lacking in depth of the information Data not broken down by school districts which makes this information difficult to connect to the plan		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: No data actually present but information on how to obtain salaries was given There is no connection to goals and lack of information weakens this application		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	1
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: Partnership with Buck Institute is mentioned but no specifics given which makes the connection to the goal difficult 3 tiered technology implementation mentioned but no details given which weakens this response		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	1
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments: teacher and district support all that was talked about and there were gaps in information asked for in this prompt No connection to collective bargaining, parents, parent organizations, student organizations weaken this response Lacking connection to any groups except teacher and district support weakens this application		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1
(B)(5) Reviewer Comments: several math gaps are mentioned with no exact breakdown which makes it difficult to understand the depth of the plan teacher professional development gap is mentioned with little ties to the vision plan which weakens this response		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	2
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: parents are not mentioned at all in this endeavor no student data is cited no college ready program is in place technology is the only idea mentioned The above gaps in this answer weakens this portion of the application		

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	2
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: State evaluation program is mentioned No improvement is spoken about Student progress is mentioned but lacking a clear improvement plan		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	3
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: coaches for teachers is mentioned Support committees are listed School based decision making No specifics on giving students opportunity to progress, or demonstrate master No evidence of learning resources that are adaptable and fully accessible		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	1
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: evidence is lacking for all of the above a-e which makes it impossible to assess the information needed		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	4
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: Monitoring, Measuring, and Publicity Sharing are all mentioned but lacking any specifics annual presentations and town hall meetings mentioned but not expanded upon No special tactics are measured Lacking rigor		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: Use protocol and appropriate behavior is mentioned regarding technology which is not a strong response but at least is present No stakeholder information other than parents which weakens this response		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: relevant and rigorous curriculum is mentioned by name but lacking details which is difficult to assess due to lack of depth of		

response

This section lacks anything above a regular assessment and does not respond to the prompt in depth with a plan

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

5

3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

five key areas named and defined with a specific goal for each of these which strengthens this piece of the response

The key areas are in place as standard ways of assessing and nothing specific is mentioned which weakens the final score because there is lack of detail

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: Budget is in place with all areas in tact which is why this is scored at a medium range Rationale is lacking clarity is where this response lost points		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	1
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: Plan for sustainability is lacking especially when the technology gets damaged and money for monthly plans will run out There is no specific plan for sustainability and no in depth plan for specific issues in this plan which weakens this response		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	1
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: This plan is lacking in most of the criteria listed which is why this response was scored low		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: There are many gaps in this application. student achievement gaps are not addressed which is needed for this to be met accelerating student achievement is not addressed which is necessary for the criteria to be met		

Total	210	41
-------	-----	----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0480NC-4 for Onslow County Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	4
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: Applicant was scored in the middle range for this criteria. The narrative is not tightly focused on a comprehensive and coherent reform vision, although the proposal does make a case for linking mobile technology with Project-Based Learning in order to provide personalized learning opportunities that have previously proved effective in the district's high school Algebra classes across the district through Project K-Nect. The links are not particularly strong to the four core educational assurance areas, although covered throughout the proposal in various places, to various degrees.		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	5
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: Applicant does not describe the process used to select schools to participate, but does list which schools will participate and provides the requested information on those schools.		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: Applicant does not address very well or comprehensively the elements of a high-quality plan as defined in the notice. The narrative provides a theory of change on how this mobile technology initiative will address the inequity evidenced by students living in low socio-economic households with no connectivity available and how this project will address the high rate of middle school teacher attrition by building a model from grades 6-8 that will enhance the teaching environment for these teachers. A score in the low range is awarded.		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	0
(A)(4) Reviewer Comments: The applicant does not provide annual targets for years 1-4 of the grant in all four areas. It is impossible to identify the extent to which the applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as a result. A score of 0 is awarded.		

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	1
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:		

Applicant's record of success is largely presented through qualitative data of what Algebra 1 students have thought about their experience with Project K-Next and their perceptions of using mobile devices in their learning. The major research outcomes associated with Project K-Nect are vague about specific achievement gains and largely qualitative. One site had increased graduation rates that seemed sizable. Another site had no change in its rate. No evidence was provided as to why Project K-Nect might be responsible for either or both results. College enrollment was described as showing an increase in college enrollment after one year of the pilot, but the pilot did not involve high school seniors and the increase seems to be unrelated to the pilot. Overall, this application presents a weak track record on improving student learning outcomes (and no discussion on closing achievement gaps), and little discussion of other, more comprehensive reforms the district might have been involved in, if any, over the past four years, or how student performance data has been made available. A score in the low range is awarded.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 Applicant reports that the state maintains a salary schedule for all certified employees and has procedures for attaining such data. No mention of actual salaries at the school level are provided, other than a statement that all funding information is a public record, such as for non-personnel expenditures. Every district in the state is required to maintain and provide the public with most recent salary information for personnel. A score in the middle range is awarded.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	2
---	----	---

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:
 The state has adopted new Essential Standards and the Common Core. The district is implementing a plan for transitioning to a more conceptually based, student-centered curriculum and using Teacher Leadership Councils to design pacing guides and conceptual unit plans that promote personalized learning. The district also has three-tiered technology plan for expanded use of technology. The applicant does not provide detail about specific legal and regulatory requirements to implement personalized learning environments. A score in the low range is awarded.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	3
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 Middle school principal input on goals and outcomes were solicited. Through an electronic survey, 70% of teachers indicated they supported the grant. Three letters of support were included from a Member of Congress, a parent, and the local chamber of commerce. A score in the low end of the middle range is awarded.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:
 Applicant does not provide evidence of a high-quality plan for an analysis of the applicant's current status in implementing personalized learning environments. Evidence is provided that that students would prefer to take math in an individualized setting rather than a traditional classroom setting and that only 74% of teachers felt they received sufficient training to fully utilize instructional technology. A key gap identified is achievement levels between 8th grade math and 9th grade Algebra 1. A score in the low range is provided.

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

--	--	--

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	2
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The grant narrative describes plans to implement problem-based learning across the district, with the grant funding provided increased emphasis at the middle school level. Managing student success and providing feedback to their levels of comprehension and overall mastery will be addressed mostly through utilization of individual devices and online resources and coursework. The narrative largely does not follow or touch on most of the subelements required in this selection criteria, and there is scant discussion of what or how the curriculum will be adapted or changed as a result of the shift to individual devices. A score in the low range is awarded. Elements of a high-quality plan as defined in the notice are not addressed at all.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	2
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The grant narrative describes plans to develop an approach to teaching and leading that helps educators to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards by enabling the full implementation of personalized learning and teaching for students. A description of the district's use of benchmark, formative, and summative assessments is provided, as well as of the state educator evaluation system. The narrative largely does not follow or touch on most of the subelements required in this selection criteria, and there is scant discussion of what or how the curriculum will be adapted or changed as a result of the shift to individual devices and how teaching and school leadership will therefore change as a result. A score in the low range is awarded. Elements of a high-quality plan as defined in the notice are not addressed at all.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	2
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant describes its department of instructional services and continual improvement and the specific services it provides. The district has been using instructional coaches to work with low-performing schools to meet the instructional needs of the schools. A System Involvement Team consisting of parents and teachers relays feedback from the schools and communities to county-level leaders. Each school has a strategic planning team to work collaboratively with site administrators and staff in developing, implementing, and improving the school's strategic plan. The state does not yet provide opportunities to earn credit based on demonstrated mastery. Most of the elements in this criteria are not addressed in the narrative. A score in the low range is awarded.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	2
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This selection criterion is largely not addressed in the narrative, although mention is made that the state is developing procedures to allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format in the future, and that the districts and schools use interoperable data system that include human resource data, student information data, budget data, and instructional improvement system data. A score in the low range is awarded.</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 identifies that it has a history of quality continuous improvement processes evidenced through their strategic planning process. Applicants discussion focused on monitoring, measuring, and publicly sharing results, but the details provided are fairly limited. Each school site would use the district-modeled process of town hall presentations, webpage</p>		

information, and newsletters to share site-specific data. A score in the middle range is provided.

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

5

2

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant describes how it would use Introductory Parent Orientations, Parent University Nights, social interactions, and reports of student hours of usage on collaborative tools to promote parent engagement. School report cards would include additional relevant data. This discussion is fairly unfocused and does not address many external stakeholders besides parents. A score in the middle range is awarded.

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

5

2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant proposes eight performance measures, but they do not fully track the required ones for this criterion, or fully describe the other required elements for all performance measures. A score in the lower end of the middle category is awarded.

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

5

3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant details plans to contract with an outside external evaluator to determine the effectiveness of the mobile technology in positively impacting five key areas that will be monitored through the life of the grant. Specific school, district, state, and external data collection processes are described. A score in the middle range is awarded.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: Applicant provides a coherent and clear budget narrative and tables. The project appears to be 100% funded through the grant, despite having numerous partners it intends to work with on implementation of the grant. No discussion is provided on sustainability of the project following the grant period. A score in the middle range is awarded.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	2
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: No discussion of the sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant is provided other than the district could shift resources away from providing professional development, and away from textbooks to online digital resources. A score in the low end of the range is awarded.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	2
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: Applicant outlines over a dozen partnerships with various entities and organizations with which it is already involved. Six population-desired results are outlined, although no discussion is provided linking the existing partnerships to the desired results. A score in the lower range is awarded, as virtually none of the subelements (3) through (6) are addressed.		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This application is focused solely on providing more mobile devices in classrooms, mostly in middle schools. The discussion on problem-based learning is not tightly linked to the technology strategy. The proposal is not part of a coherent and comprehensive reform plan closely linked to the core educational assurance areas. This application does not meet the threshold for the Absolute Priority.</p>		
Total	210	50



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0480NC-5 for Onslow County Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Onslow County Schools proposes to use funding from RTT-D in its middle schools to replicate project K-Nect, a project that it has implemented in its high schools. The proposal is quite specific: it would involve 264 educators in seven middle schools, and would specifically support student learning in the area of mathematics. Based on the high school precedent, the plan makes critical use of mobile technology.</p> <p>The proposal does not appear to present a vision for deepening student learning, increasing equity or basing tasks on students' interests.</p> <p>Points awarded in the medium range for this focused but narrow response</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal will involve all students in all middle schools for the duration of the grant period.</p> <p>The essence of the Onslow County proposal is to expand the scope of a project already implemented in its high schools. It is reasonable to expect that this expansion will be executed with quality on the basis of experience, but the plan for implementation is far from detailed.</p> <p>Medium points awarded.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The project presents no plan for scaling this project beyond the middle grades or translating it beyond the narrow definition of math achievement. This is a medium quality response.</p>		

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	0
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not appear to respond to the requirement to set annual targets for improving assessed achievement, decreasing achievement gaps, improving graduation rates, or increasing college enrollment rates. Targets included for SY2011-12 are not credible, as in some instances they appear to be lower than baseline levels.</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	0
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicants responses in this area discuss examples of success in its high school implementation of Project K-Nect. Unfortunately, these examples do not satisfy the criteria:</p> <p>(a) The applicant does not present evidence of a record of increased student achievement or closing achievement gaps over the past four years.</p> <p>(b) The applicant does not present evidence of success in achieving significant reforms in its low performing schools</p> <p>(c) The applicant does not present evidence that it makes student performance data available to students, educators and parents.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant asserts that school level actual personnel and non-personnel expenditures are "maintained in the Human Resources department for dissemination," but does not provide a sample of this transparency in its application. This is a response of medium quality.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not appear to respond to the question of its autonomy under State legal, statutory and regulatory requirements. However, the plan does not appear to require any particularly unusual autonomy, and as it is an extension of an existing project in the high schools, it is unlikely that regulatory obstacles would impede its execution. Medium points are awarded.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	2
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Onslow County presents weak evidence of support for its plan. It claims to have had one meeting with principals to gather feedback for the development of the plan, and makes no claim whatsoever with regard to obtaining feedback from teachers. The applicant asserts that at least 70% of teachers responding to electronic surveys showed support for the plan, but no evidence is presented to support this assertion. The few letters of support suggest weak breadth of support for the plan.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not present evidence of a plan to analyze the Onslow schools' current status in implementing personalized learning. It refers to a survey finding evidence of mixed support from students for the general idea of taking math "in an individualized setting," but does not suggest an approach to improving the schools' understanding of needs and gaps. This is</p>		

scored in the low range.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	3
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a)(i - ii) The proposal does not appear to connect learning with student-identified goals.</p> <p>(a)(iii) The proposal calls for increased use of “problem solving strategies” that might be of academic interest to students. By emphasizing “problem based” learning, this may be of interest to students, but the applicant presents no clear vision for shaping these problems around individual student motivation. This is a response of medium quality.</p> <p>(a)(iv) The proposal does not provide for access or exposure to diverse cultures and contexts.</p> <p>(a)(v) Although the county’s proposal is primarily focused on math achievement, it claims also to address development of “soft skills” such as goal-setting, teamwork and the like by engaging students in groups on problem-based learning projects. The county cites surveys taken before and after implementation of project K-Nect as evidence of results, but there is no evidence of the size or administration of the surveys to evaluate their quality. More importantly, the questions cited appear to differ between the two surveys, making it difficult to assess the meaningfulness of the comparison. This response is of low quality.</p> <p>(b)(i-v) There appears to be no plan to personalize instructional content or skill development in a way that aligns with individual student goals. Teachers do, however, make use of formative assessments, for example using ClassScape, to identify students that are struggling. This should be helpful in spotting struggling students in a way that helps them take action. The plan does not appear to provide for access to a variety of instructional approaches, or high-quality content, or frequently-updated student data, or connection to college or career.</p> <p>(c) The proposal does not specify mechanisms for training and support of students. This is not a major shortcoming of the plan because the district already has ample experience with the technologies described, and will be able to respond nimbly if the students don’t catch on.</p> <p>The applicant's responses to these criteria place it in the low range.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	4
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal from Onslow County Schools recounts many investments that it has already made to improve learning and teaching, and that presumably would continue with or without support from RTT-D. Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has already invested in development of professional learning communities among its educators. • It has already created teacher leadership councils to support the transition to Common Core standards. • It has already implemented NC FALCON to help teachers make use of formative assessment data. • Teachers and leaders already have a framework for feedback and goal-setting using the North Carolina Educator Evaluation System. • Teachers already have EVAAS to give them a visual representation of student progress. • School leaders already have the North Carolina Teacher Working Conditions survey to inform their work in the area of school culture and climate. <p>The district’s proposal seems to amount to a request for funding to support continuation of these practices in their current form. This is an incomplete response.</p> <p>(a)(i) The applicant does not describe how it will support learning environments that are personalized to individual students.</p> <p>(a) (ii) It does not propose a way to adapt content and instruction for individual students</p> <p>(a) (iii) It DOES reinforce the importance of FALCON in making use of formative assessment data.</p> <p>(a) (iv) The district’s teacher and principal evaluation systems are an area of strength, and they are well matched to the criteria.</p>		

- (b)(i) It does not appear to provide educators with guidance about how to meet individual students' interests.
 - (b)(ii) It DOES appear to provide educators with useful access to new digital learning resources, but
 - (b)(iii) It does not appear to provide guidance in matching content with students' academic needs.
 - (c)(i) It DOES appear to equip school leaders to usefully assess and improve educators' effectiveness.
 - (c)(ii) The district appears (from the budget) to plan for investment in training and systems for improvement.
 - (d) The district does not provide a high quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective teachers in hard to staff schools, subjects and specialty areas.
- Overall, this response merits a score in the low range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	3
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: a) It appears that the district believes it will be able to support the plan without modification to the organization. This might be true, but the district's response is confusing with regard to where leadership of this project will reside. At the district level, the plan mentions a district Quality Council and a System Involvement Team. At the school level, the plan emphasizes the site-based Strategic Planning Teams, which meet monthly. b) The district states that it embraces school-based decision making processes through SPTs, but it does not provide a specific response to the question of school autonomy over schedules and calendars, personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities and the like. c, d) The plan does not give students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on mastery rather than time, or to demonstrate mastery in flexible ways. e) The district does not respond to the question of accessibility and adaptability of learning resources, including for students with disabilities and English learners. The district's response scores in the low range.		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (a, b) Because the district proposal is essentially an extension of practices that are already in place for its high schools, it is reasonable to expect that its technical infrastructure and technical support will be functional. (c, d) The district's plan does not yet provide for use of open data formats and data system interoperability. The plan scores in the midrange for this partial response.		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	8
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: The district proposes to fold improvement of this plan into its existing mechanisms to monitor, measure and share information on its grant-supported investments. This response would be of low quality if the project were a new one. Because the plan so closely resembles work the district has already done in its high schools, the response is scored in the medium range.		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes to engage in ongoing communication and engagement about its implementation through parent meetings, community meetings and written communication. This is credible because the plan very closely resembles work it has already done in its high schools. The plan lacks specificity with regard to communication with teachers.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
--	---	---

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes four general goals: Make 100% of teachers highly effective; Set goals for student achievement in algebra; ensure that all students make a year of learning progress each year; and set goals for digital citizenship.

The district's response is scored in the low range for several reasons, including:

- The district does not respond to the application requirement to set specific, measurable, annual targets
- The district does not define an academic leading indicator.
- The district does not propose a grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator.
- The district does not identify 12 to 14 performance measures, as required.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The district's plan for evaluating effectiveness of investments is greatly compromised by the weakness of its plan for performance measures. However, the district's plan to hire an external evaluator will help to shed light and facilitate improvement.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>a) In its prior implementation at the high schools, Onslow county appears to have enjoyed significant support from Qualcomm, as well as from "community businesses and organizations." However, the budget reflects a concerning absence of support from such partners for its project in the middle grades. .</p> <p>b) The budget is organized into projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devices: The budget is lean but probably sufficient. • Professional Development: The budget includes \$100k to hire the Buck Institute to train faculty in problem-based learning. It also includes \$196k to send educators to conferences, a miscoded personnel expense. This appears out of line with the need, particularly considering that the district has already developed skills in this area through its high school implementation. • Personnel: The budget calls for a full-time instructional coach and a half-time technical resource at each school. This seems generous, particularly in the context of a plan that makes no commitments with regard to measurable outcomes. It also raises issues of sustainability that will be discussed in F(2). • Software: The budget allocates \$70k to buy "mobile tele-presence" equipment for each school at \$10k each, a huge unexplained amount in the context of a proposal that is otherwise built around mobile devices. The budget appears to omit the cost of monitoring software mentioned in the narrative. • Summer school: The budget includes \$270k to design and deliver an annual one-week summer program focused on students that are not high-need with an average student-teacher ratio of 7:1 and no apparent model for support from any other funding source. • Infrastructure: The budget includes \$500k to procure and install networking equipment in seven schools. This figure stands out in its conspicuous roundness. <p>c) The budget does not clearly identify whether each expense will be one-time or ongoing in nature.</p> <p>Overall, the proposed budget merits a score in the low range.</p>		

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	1
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>From the district's narrative, it seem that the sustainability of the high school project depended critically on commitments from local businesses and donors.</p> <p>The budget for the currently contemplated project, which extends the implementation into the middle schools, appears to enjoy no such commitment. The project-level narratives included in F(1) does not clearly distinguish one-time costs from ongoing costs. The district has not included ongoing dollars from other sources in its description of project activities, and does not provide any budget forecast beyond the period of the grant period.</p> <p>The district's plan for sustainability is of low quality.</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>The competitive preference priority gives priority to an applicant "based on the extent to which the applicant proposes to... address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students..."</p> <p>The applicant's long list of partner organizations, however, focuses exclusively on partnerships that provide for academic or infrastructure support, not social, emotional or behavioral needs of students.</p> <p>Further, the applicant does not respond to the application requirement to identify ambitious yet achievable performance measures associated with these partnerships.</p> <p>The applicant's response does not qualify it for any competitive preference.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Onslow County proposes to use digital devices to change and improve the way that math is taught to its middle school students.</p> <p>The proposal does not, however, coherently and comprehensively address personalization of learning environments, which is the core concern of this competition. At the end of a successful implementation of this plan, students would still be instructed in batches and advance in tandem. The district does not respond to the requirement to set clear goals for accelerating student achievement and deepening student learning in the aggregate, subgroup or on the personal level.</p> <p>The absolute priority is not met.</p>		

Total	210	57
-------	-----	----

