



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0955SC-2 for Orangeburg Consolidated School District Five

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides very clear direction through the vision with strategies that address the overall purpose of this proposal, which is to develop and move into 21st Century Learning. The applicant provides a cogent and comprehensive approach to this grant. This section provides a very clear picture of focus of the applicant and outlines the process for how they will accomplish their vision. The book study approach has made a major impact on the staff and provided guidance for the district. The grant describes the three big ideas for the Teaching and Learning Framework: Clarity of Purpose, Collaborative School Culture and Focus on Results, which will move this district forward which address the four core educational assurance areas. The response should have been more purposeful in responding to the four areas although the did touch ion each one - not directly but in their effort to discuss the visionary shift the district has taken since the hiring of the new superintendent.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The total number of students participating in this grant from Orangeburg Consolidated School District Five is 6,969. The selection (a) was based on the level of low income and high needs students. The number of students enrolled in free and reduced lunch programs determined low-income students. For an entire school to qualify for eligibility, at least 40% of the school's student population must have the free and reduced lunch status. The total number of participating students from low-income families is 5,601. The total number of participating educators as defined by this grant will include 637 educators. All of the (b) participating schools are listed and the (c) number of low-income students was taken from the SNACS (School Nutrition Automated Claims System) Report generated by the District Food Service Office. A list of the participating schools is provided for the grant in A2b.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides three very clear directions through the vision with strategies that address the overall purpose of this proposal, which is to develop and move into move into 21st Century Learning. The applicant provides a cogent and comprehensive approach to this grant. This section provides a very clear picture of focus of the applicant the strategies for how they will accomplish their vision. <i>The action plan did not provide sufficient details on how they were going to bring about the change presented in the proposal. There was limited discussion on how the reform and change would be implemented.</i></p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district is working to equip educators with the tools and best practices not only in general instruction, but also in basic content knowledge and personalized learning. There is a focus on summative assessment and student achievement. During this past year, the district focused on best practices in pedagogy, problem-solving strategies, and science content knowledge as established in the Teaching and Learning Framework. Evidence based interventions were included in the professional development of teachers. Additionally, the district has increase support to the community and emphasized strategies to prepare students for college and careers. Data on students attending college was included in the grant. The grant proposed many programs but there was no evidence to support implementation. The grant included student benchmark testing but did not discuss how they used the data. It was unclear whether the standards are aligned with the state outcomes..</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	13
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The grant provided a detailed description of the successful record of the school district. The district has implemented a number of programs that have/will help students become successful in the classroom. Each computer on the desk of the teacher contains a shared resource folders that contains pacing</i></p> <p>guides, South Carolina academic standards for all content areas, Common Core State Standards, and other instructional resources. The district implemented the Voyager Program to provide intervention for students who do not demonstrate mastery of the academic standards. Additional programs were implemented based on the needs of the students. Intensive professional development was included to be sure that these programs are implemented with fidelity. Professional Learning communities were established . The leadership team received training on data analysis, assessments, identifying and eradicating institutional mediocrity, student centered classroom instruction, school systems and organization, coaching teachers, etc. This was a very unique approach in the district: "Principals also had to select a subject and classroom on their campus to teach actual students and apply their newfound knowledge of key components of student centered lessons. The deputy superintendent observed the lessons and provided feedback to each principal." The grant describes the strong commitment on the part of the district to analyze data and make results available to the stakeholders. Programs that are implemented in the district are based on the multiple assessments</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The grant indicates that the district has a high level of transparency in their financial reports, school personnel salaries, and non-personnel expenditures. The Office of Finance produces a Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) annually (See Appendix B2-1). The CAFR is posted on the District's web site and made available to anyone wishing to review our finances. Included in the Report is a detailed account of salaries for instructional and non-instructional personnel at each level of operation. The information incorporated in the CAFR is also presented to the Orangeburg Consolidated School Board of Trustees in an open session with an opportunity for questions regarding the contents is made available to the public.</i></p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>North Carolina received the request for flexibility of the NCLB. Through this waiver, the district implementing initiatives to significantly improve teaching and learning through personalization that decreases achievement gaps across student groups and increase rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. The district revamped the curriculum in 2010 to reflect these changes and implement a number of personalized programs to meet the specific needs of the students. The district provides materials that best meet the needs of the students and to create learning paths aligned to those needs</i></p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	8
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The district has included stakeholders in the grant proposal and involved all staff and community members in the development of the grant. Each group provided feedback that was used in the development of this proposal. OCSD5 felt that feedback from the students was importance because this grant focuses on them and their achievement. Family/parental support for the proposal was attained through the Parent Teacher Associations and School Improvement Councils at each school. The presidents of the organizations submitted letters of support that can be found in Appendix B4-3). Teachers were informed of the proposal for the grant through teacher meetings and on the district website. All educators attended a meeting in Clark Middle School's Auditorium to discuss the four core educational assurances and the grant proposal. The principal signed letters of support but the grant did not indicate how they were involved in the completion and submission of the grant proposal. It seemed that the teachers provided input but the grant was vague in describing this process, except for mentioning the meetings.</i></p>		

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The grant described a four pronged approach that included Flexible, Anytime, Everywhere Learning, Project-Based Authentic Learning and Student-Driven Learning Paths and Competency-Based Learning which help meet student needs and provide the opportunities to be prepared for the transition from high school to college and careers. Each of the four approaches discussed how the plan is personalized for students including the ability to make choices that are personalized for the learner. The *Student-Driven Learning Paths* provides learning opportunities tailored to the expressed learning interests and abilities, whole child factors, schedule, and goals of the students. *The Competency-Based Learning* allows students to progress through academic content at their individualized pace. With this model, students receive reinforcement of a particular skill or standard until mastery is demonstrated regardless of time or pace of learning. Students' needs, abilities, and interests drive instruction. The proposal presents a high quality plan that is personalize and meets the needs of the students in order to reduce the achievement gap in the schools.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district provides a curriculum that personalizes learning by providing students with challenging, rigorous standards in preparation for college entry, completion, and careers. Input for the curriculum was gathered from students, teachers, parents, community, and business partners to identify gaps in our standards and to create a plan of action to address these areas with emphasis on strategies that would prepare students for college and careers. The district provides a myriad of opportunities for students to succeed through various programs, assessments and guidance. The curriculum provides for interaction with diverse learners through various media, instructional activities, and varied learning opportunities in and out of the classroom. The district encourages students to actively seek an understanding of different cultures. Personalized program such as Compass Learning, E2020, NovaNet, Study Island, Plato and others allow teachers to analyze student-learning gaps and identify appropriate strategies and activities to reduce them. Students can view their progress, grades and attendance on-line. The district provides community literacy courses held several times throughout the year. The curriculum approach has changed to personalized learning paths through the various programs mentioned above, which place a strong emphasis on tailoring the curriculum to meet student needs. Student are able to use these various programs for personalized learning after receiving training and support from the teachers.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The grant describes personalized learning as a 21st century approach to education that tailors its instructional program according to the individual needs and interests of each student. The district has made strides in implementing such a curriculum that offers students varieties while meeting their individual needs. The district is committed to PLCs and quality professional development that will ensure fidelity across the curriculum. The district implemented "Science U where participants receive intensive course instruction on conducting student lab experiences, developing student vocabulary, and explaining how to teach content concepts. The Science U lab instructor observes teachers in their own classrooms and offers coaching, provides feedback, and clarifies any misunderstandings. Teachers are required

to maintain comprehensive portfolios that include sample lessons, research based articles, and documentation of implemented strategies. Special Education University covers a variety of topics such as curriculum-based measurements, data-driven decision making, writing measurable goals, and assisting students with meeting those goals." The district is also planning to differentiate the professional development programs for staff. The district provides an instructional coaching model to assist educators in the areas of best practices, professional development, and data analysis. The district also plans to hire full-time intervention specialists at each school to help support the academic needs and help ensure all students meet college and career-ready graduation requirements. The proposal did not have the actions, timelines and strategies for implementing these teaching and learning approaches.

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>(a) There is a clear delineation of hierarchy and organizational structure in the district and leadership teams in the building that provide support to the school buildings and all participating schools in this grant. (b) Each school has a Leadership Team led by the principal. Assistant principals and other staff members are also part of the School-Based Leadership Team at the discretion of the principals. The autonomy of each school's leadership team can be observed by the differences in many factors such as school schedules, calendars, and budgets, all of which consider input from the faculty, staff, School Improvement Council, School-Based Title One Committee and other key personnel. (c) The district provides various software programs to allow students to earn credit in a non-traditional classroom setting. The grant provides a list and features of each one. The district also provides exemplary educational programs for all students including students with disabilities and English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL). Dual-credit courses allow high school students to enroll in college courses and simultaneously earn college credit and high school credit for the course. Students are able to access many of these courses on-line, which facilitate personalized learning. As indicated in the grant the state placed heavy emphasis on seat time. However, new Superintendent of Education has provided many waiver opportunities to schools and districts to implement innovative and unique programs to meet the needs of the students. (d) Students in OCSD5 are offered multiple methods to demonstrate mastery of standards. All schools in OCSD5 offer extended day programs to provide the opportunity for students to attend after-school programs to receive additional instruction and assistance on content standards. This allows students to review standards in numerous settings. Schools also offer Saturday Academies that provide students additional instruction on the grade level standards in order for mastery to occur. Last year the district initiated a "Re-Teach/Re-Do" policy. This policy grants students multiple opportunities to master the grade level content if they are not successful during the initial instruction. (e) According to the grant, the curriculum, as well as the teaching and learning process, is student centered, personalized, and achievement-based. The goal as indicated in the grant is for OCSD5 to provide exemplary educational programs for all students including students with disabilities and English Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL). The District's current emphasis is to ensure that every student is prepared to function successfully in a rapidly changing, technologically advanced society.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The district has established positive communication portals with the community at large including parents, provided student information data to teachers and parents.</i> (a) OCSD5 will partner with local churches, libraries, and civic centers to provide public service internet access centers throughout the Bowman, North, and Orangeburg communities. End users will have web enabled devices such as iPads and laptops that will give parents and students the necessary technology to access at the local wi-fi sites. (b) All stakeholders will have access to online user guides along with video tutorials. In addition, Media Specialists and PC Technicians will provide onsite assistance to students and teachers on an as needed basis. (c) PowerSchool provides the opportunity for parents to view the grades, attendance, and behavior through the Parent Portal. OCSD5 offers Compass Learning, NovaNet, GradPoint, and E2020 on-line course delivery software programs that are diagnostic and prescriptive and provide a personalized learning environment for our students taking the courses. (d) OCSD5 uses SmartFusion in the Office of Finance and Human Resources and PowerSchool for the student information system, It is unclear whether these two programs can talk to each other.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district has identified action plans to address the specific needs of our subgroups along academic deficiencies. The components of the action plan are: strategy/activity, data source, purpose, expected outcome, person(s) responsible, monitoring process, measuring process, resources needed, timeline, and sustainability. The district will develop a Race to The Top Oversight committee that will be charged to assist with monitoring the implementation of the grant along with the grant's project director. Stakeholders will be able to view reports on our district's website regarding student performance data. Race to Top Annual Reports will be created and disseminated to stakeholders as a means of keeping everyone informed of the grant's progress in meeting its objectives. While this is a start in the continuous improvement additional details on how this will be implemented would have been very helpful.</p>		

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
--	---	---

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The OCSD5 district included comments that there are a number of approaches to reaching the community at large. The district is employing these methods:

-The Office of Public Relations guided by the leadership of the District's Board of Trustees and Superintendent disseminates information.

-General information can be accessed via the District's website using numerous hyperlinks on various topics.

-More current information is disbursed monthly through the E-Blast Newsletters.

The same process is used by each of the 13 schools with an ongoing effort to establish for effective two-way communication. In addition, schools publish monthly school newsletters, conduct monthly grade level PTA meetings, schedule bi-annual parent/teacher report card conferences, and have a School Improvement Advisory Council that is communicated to the stakeholders. Schools have also established external partnerships with local business owners who have become their adoptive benefactor and schools respond in kind by choosing a non-profit organization to whom they can provide assistance.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The grant identified measures that indicate there is an increase in student performance. The district will review all types of data to determine the accomplishment of its outcomes.

The grant identified the focus of student performance by subgroups in English Language Arts, mathematics, science, and social studies and included a rationale for these indicators. In addition, discipline data was also analyzed by subgroups and targets for decreasing the number of discipline referrals were delineated. The district decided to focus on discipline because it wanted to improve student achievement by providing an environment that was safe and conducive to the learning process.

The grant indicated that the academic measure is rigorous and at the end of the grant cycle, at least 80% of students in each subgroup will be proficient. The measures are also timely as they require incremental growth on a yearly basis in order to attain the mark of 80% proficiency. As the district strives to have greater numbers of our students being proficient, benchmark assessments will provide formative assessment data that will be used to determine area for growth and improvement.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Various data collection forms will be used to evaluate the effectiveness which does support the goal of improved productivity. These are quality indicators and include:

- o Technology Usage logs
- o Community Event logs
- o Volunteer logs
- o Leadership Team Agendas and sign-in logs
- o School Improvement Councils
- o School Based Title One Committees
- o Community Forums with the Superintendent
- o Annual Superintendent's State of the Schools Address
- o Annual School Improvement Reports

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><i>The budget is described in detail and the Office of Finance and Operations will create a separate budget account for Race to the Top Sustainability. The budget and budget narrative appeared comprehensive and fully included the costs outlined in the proposed strategies and implementation of this grants. The applicant provides a cost analysis in both the program narrative as well as in the budget narrative. All of the partners and MOU's are included in the grant.</i></p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>Did not mention issues related to sustainability and only discussed using indirect costs to fund the programs at the end of the grant cycle. How long the funding will last is unclear and not delineated in the grant proposal. There was minimal mention of which programs will be sustained except that all departments will submit their budget requests and no mention of which programs will continue. One example described in the grant discussed the purchase of hardware and while the grant will pay for the equipment, the district funds not used for the equipment expenditures will be placed in the sustainability fund for use after the grant cycle. While this appears to provide some stability to the sustainability of the programs, the specifics of which program will be maintained and criteria for the selection is not included in the grant. The grant did not mention any support from State and local government leaders except the Orangeburg Area Department of Mental Health Center which will assume 50% of the financial responsibility for the continuation of the services at least three years and possibly beyond so that students can continue to receive services.</i></p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The district has long-standing relationships with local non-profit organizations, institutions of higher education, law enforcement, faith-based communities, private and public businesses, and government agencies. These relationships and collaborative partnerships remain current and have allowed the school district to use the expertise and resources of those relationships to increase and enhance the services provided to our students and to meet their social and psycho-emotional needs. The community partners are more than willing to help the district personalize the students' learning experiences. Data is collected to determine priority areas and areas for improvement. Constant monitoring will be used to determine the progress towards the goals. The grant included the wrap around program that would provide many additional services to the students.</i></p> <p><i>The grant described the process for keeping track of the students' progress and needs through the data warehouse to keep up-to-date records for each measure. The district will also monitor using the benchmark data, common assessments, student grades, and state test results. Additionally, on a quarterly basis the district will check student discipline referrals, student attendance, enrollment/dropout report, and volunteer and mentor reports. At any given point in time, stakeholders will be able to view reports on the district's website regarding student performance data. A chart with the indicators and desired results is included in the grant to identify the targets for this effort.</i></p> <p><i>OCSD5 will blend solid academic programs with community services to serve the needs of the whole child. As indicated in the grant, OCSD5 decided to use and scale up improvement strategies to address the high needs and environmental risk factors specific to the Bethune-Bowman K-12 complex. The District will convert the Bethune-Bowman K-12 school campus into a Wrap-Around Community Success School (WACSS) that operates on an extended day and extended year schedule. Bethune-Bowman Elementary and Middle/High School share a K-12 campus. Collectively the campus serves approximately 715 students.</i></p> <p><i>Collaborations between Orangeburg Area Department of Mental Health, Tri County Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse, Claflin University, South Carolina State University, Community Child Development Centers, BootStraps Mentoring Faith-based Foundation and Orangeburg County Sheriff's Office will bring the necessary services to this site required to ensure the future achievement of all students.</i></p>		

These collaborative partnerships provide program services include personalized learning plans. These plans will address student's remediation, acceleration, college and career readiness counseling, work-based learning, and family literacy skills which will be supplemented by the districts' external social/psycho-emotional counseling services. The goals of the plan will be based on the individual's cognitive and emotional strengths and challenges. The counselors, mentors/advisors and parents, all middle/high students will help students develop an individual 10-year academic road map that incorporates identified career goals.

Teachers will be trained on the use of current technological approaches for data gathering, research, and instruction. Students will have access to a variety of technological tools, including iPads and computers. Specifically, the district will use E2020, GradPoint, and Compass Learning as computer assisted learning programs. These computer assisted learning programs will enable the students to lead and support themselves and one another. There will be a strong emphasis on systemic professional development that will emphasize personal growth and assist students to reach the goals developed for their 10 year plan.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: The proposal provided a plan that built on current research based practices to improve student achievement and the gaps across student groups. There was the emphasis on increasing graduation rates and prepare students for college and careers.		
Total	210	156



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0955SC-3 for Orangeburg Consolidated School District Five

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: The district has embraced the five phase process (five I's) recommended by the Du Fours as its basis for its comprehensive and coherent reform vision. All district administrators and school principals have participated in book study review of the Du Four resources. The district's application connects the five I's with the four core educational assurance areas from the RTTT-District expectations, although the specifics in these areas are, for the most part, only examples of possible alignment. Their proposal does appear to build on some prior work, related to the four core assurance areas. The district cites its involvement with South Carolina's adoption of Common Core Standards, and appears to be part of the process of implementation at the first grade. In a different section, the application does include information about what the district is itself doing in this area, through its development of a CCS-anchored Teaching and Learning Framework. The district's incorporation of a comprehensive data system appears to be appropriate, with school-level training being conducted currently. The system appears to be capable of producing data on student growth and data to inform schools and parents.		

References to teacher and principal effectiveness are made in the Improve phase, and principal changes are also cited in the district's introduction to its change. The application does not say how the most effective teachers and principals will be identified and moved to the most challenging schools.

The district has had some success with improving its overall state designations of performance and those of some of its individual schools. The example of Science University demonstrates the district's willingness to take on large-scale instructional improvement.

In the A(1) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the middle range.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district made a determination to include all of its students and schools to participate in the proposal, because they see their reform effort as encompassing all school levels, and the schools collectively meet the eligibility requirements. The district has provided a table of the participating schools and the demographics of the participating students.

In the A(2) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the high range.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	1
---	----	---

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Although the application makes reference to high-quality plan for reform, there is not a section which supplies detailed information about that plan, including goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. Because the district intends to include all schools, there is no information on the ability to learn from small effort and/or scale up. The application does include copies of state-required school improvement plans in the appendices, but not a district-level plan for reform.

In the A(3) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the low range.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The district's charts are clear in describing the assessments and the methodology to be used in determining performance on summative assessments. For the students taking PASS, the expectations are set at proficient (met) and above. However, for the students taking the HSAP and end-of-course exams, the expectations do not appear to be ambitious. A 2 on the HSAP and a D or above on end-of-course exams do not equate to meeting standards -- they seem more like barely passing thresholds. It is also difficult to understand the annual increases for each group -- they all end up in the same place, but it is not clear how the annual percentages were determined.

In its table on decreasing achievement gaps, the district is clear on its identification of comparison groups and gap parameters. The performance goals do not always match those of the prior table. The district's intent appears to be to have all groups increase in performance over time, and to match near to the end of the grant. Again, the low expectations for students taking the HSAP and end-of-course exams is worrisome.

The high school graduation rate increases seem to be satisfied with 80%, which is not ambitious for the district.

The table on college enrollment rates is difficult to interpret. Different subgroups are used instead of the subgroups listed in the other charts. Different expectations are reported for males and females in both categories.

In the A(4) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the low 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	13
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district itself and a number of its schools have won state and national awards for the improvement of student outcomes. It has developed a Teaching and Learning Framework connected to the common core standards and aligned to its reform structure of the five I's.</p> <p>The district has instituted common strategies in literacy and mathematics in its low-performing schools and pacing guides by subject area and grade level, which are accompanied by regular assessments. The district has adopted particular curriculum programs tailored to its needs, has prioritized professional development at the beginning of the year and ongoing during the year, and has established professional learning communities based on book study format.</p> <p>The district cites multiple avenues for the sharing and use of data with teachers and parents, and has summarized its findings from these data reviews and conversations.</p> <p>In the B(1) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the high range.</p> <p>In the B(1) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the middle range.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district provides all the required information concerning expenditures and salaries, and has a variety of formats to disseminate them. These formats allow a reasonable degree of transparency in the sharing and use of expenditure and salary information.</p> <p>In the B(2) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the high range.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district cites the work done by its SEA in gaining an NCLB waiver, and also cites its score from the state review as a "B", exceeding requirements. According to its application, the district has initiated a number of its own reform activities in alignment with state ESEA requirements. For example, the district's Teaching and Learning Framework goes beyond the state's requirements for implementation of Common Core Standards, and the district provides a copy of the Framework in the Appendix as evidence.</p> <p>In the B(3) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the high range.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district involved its stakeholders in the development of the proposal and in its review and revision. Examples of suggestions from some stakeholder groups are listed in the application. School faculties received presentations on the four core assurance areas and provided commitment via individual forms. Teachers were part of the grant writing team and the district provided ongoing information via its website and board meetings. Letters of support are included in the Appendix.</p> <p>In the B(4) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the high range.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The district has analyzed its current status in implementing personalized learning environments, and makes general statements about current gaps between what they do now and what they will be able to do using grant funds. They do not use the identified gaps as a basis for constructing a high quality plan.

In the B(5) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the middle range.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section of the application calls for a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the teaching environment. The district describes a great number of policies, programs, and practices that will lead to the improvement of teaching and learning, but does not provide a substantial plan about doing so, including goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. The district does reference a plan for incorporating CCS in its appendices, but that plan is not the one asked for here.

Nevertheless, the district identifies a number of building blocks that will be key to the development of such a plan for personalized learning environments, such as its middle college initiative and virtual school. The use of Student Learning Logs and Learning Station will contribute to the ability to track student progress and tailor instruction to student needs. The proposal also cites other technology-based tools for assessing and monitoring student performance that will be of value to the district.

The district currently makes use of a number of computer-based student learning programs emphasizing differentiation. The district acknowledges candidly that the computer cannot be the only access that students have to differentiation. The spiraling structure of the district's pacing guides also offer opportunities for personalization and differentiation, as they are used in concert with the CCS and its assessments.

In the C(1) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the middle range.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	10
---	----	----

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Again, the application calls for a high quality plan in this section about teaching and leading. No such plan is found in the proposal and its accompanying materials, although the district describes a number of policies, programs, and practices that would be a strong basis for such a plan.

The four principles identified by the district as the basis for personalized learning -- flexibility, project-based, student-driven learning paths, and competency-based work projects -- are all key ingredients for a personalized learning comprehensive district plan. The district already has in place several tangible examples of these four principles, including professional learning communities at sites, Science University and Special Ed University, Mastery Checklists for monitoring progress (including data walls), and its initiatives in effective teacher and principal evaluation systems. The district acknowledges that it has much more to do in designing differentiated professional development for its educators.

The district cites current efforts in new technologies for performance tracking, and the need for ongoing familiarity with the successful use of such technology. The district's Classroom Management Manual and its Professional Development calendar (provided in the Appendices) both provide knowledgeable practices in these areas and would be an important factor in the success of establishing personalized learning environments.

In the C(2) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the middle range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	8

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district describes its current organizational structure, along with the main functions of each. It does not indicate that it will do any reorganization as part of solidifying its support to schools with the RTTT-District grant.

The district describes its model for school leadership teams and asserts that they have a great deal of flexibility and autonomy. A few examples of different school leadership team decisions would have been good to illustrate the kinds of flexibility the teams have used.

The district appears to have several opportunities for students to progress and earn credit outside of regular class time. These include Compass Learning, E2020, and dual enrollment with colleges. The examples and their descriptions were very helpful in this response.

The district cites a number of ways in which students can engage in other opportunities to learn -- such as extended day and Saturday class, but doesn't reference any ways in which students can demonstrate what they know differently from the classroom.

A good deal of information is provided about the resources and practices for Special Education students, but little is said about English Learners.

In the D(1) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the middle range.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	6
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district will partner with other community organizations in order to provide access to learning resources, particularly in rural areas.

The district states that all students, parents, educators, and stakeholders will have access to online user guides along with video tutorials. It does not state if these materials are available in Spanish.

From the proposal, it appears that parents and students have the ability to review student performance information and that students have access to additional modes of electronic learning.

The district cites the use of PowerSchool and Smart Fusion systems, and states that they are interoperable.

In the D(2) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the middle range.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district did not develop a high-quality plan for the implementation of the grant, although it states that it developed plans for improvement in each content area. These content area plans were not submitted as part of the district's proposal, and so the reader cannot evaluate the continuous improvement aspect of the work. The district will put together a RTTT-District Oversight Committee to monitor all aspects of the grant.

In the E(1) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the low range.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
--	---	---

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district appears to have multiple strategies for ongoing communication with both internal and external stakeholders. Although not specifically stated, it appears that these existing venues will be used for ongoing communication about the grant.

In the E(2) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the middle range.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

In the first two required tables for ALL students, the district appropriately lists the ESEA subgroups. However, the desired

outcome is only 37.5% after the period of the grant, which does not seem ambitious. The third table for ALL students, the district's choice, concerns students meeting standard on state tests. Appropriate ESEA subgroups are listed. An endpoint of 80% of students at standard by the end of the grant is commendable. However it is confusing that White students and full-pay students have an endpoint of 90% at some grade levels and content areas. The table ends at grade 8.

In the table for Pre-K-grade 3 students, the district has selected the academic performance measure as 3rd grade students meeting standards in ELA, math, science, and social studies state tests -- ambitious and commendable. The endpoint is 80% for all students, except for the same confusion about full pay students. The social-emotional performance indicator is a drop in discipline referrals Prek-3. Not all the ESEA subgroups are listed in the table.

In the required table on on-track indicators for grades 4-8, the district uses grade retention as its indicator, but then states that fewer than 1% of all students are retained in grades 4-8, so it is not an ambitious indicator. In the academic table for grades 4-8 students, the district has selected the academic performance measure as 4-8 grade students meeting standards in ELA, math, science, and social studies state tests -- ambitious and commendable. The endpoint is 80% for all students, except for the same confusion about full pay students. The social-emotional performance indicator is a drop in discipline referrals grades 4-8. Not all the ESEA subgroups are listed in the table.

The first two required charts for grades 9-12 students appear to be appropriate, although the indicator for on-track is not identified. For the table on career-readiness, retention in grades 9-12 was used as the on-track indicator. The district selected the academic performance measure for grades 9-12 as passing the HSAP. The rates are already high, so it doesn't appear to be very rigorous. The social/emotional performance measure for grades 9-12 was a decrease in discipline referrals. Not all the ESEA subgroups are listed in the table.

In the E(3) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the middle range.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The district appears to have a number of strategies in mind for monitoring the grant-funded activities.

In the E(4) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the high range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district's overall budget and project budgets (4) are all clear. Most budget categories appear to be ongoing, instead of one-time. There are no supplementary funds from other sources. The project budgets provide ample detail as to the rationale for the costs. All of the project budgets, except for the Wrap-around school, build from the narrative of the district's proposal.

In the F(1) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the high range.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section of the application calls out for a high-quality plan, including goals, activities, timeline, deliverables, and responsible parties. The district does not provide such a plan, although its narrative in this section does include a number of good ideas and practices that would be key to the development of such a plan, including the opening of a special account, regular monitoring of project budgets, etc.

In the F(2) section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the low range.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	3
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section of the proposal provides a general summary of the partnerships already in place between the district and the community. The section appears to include all students in the district again, and uses the same performance measures as section E. One area in this section which is unique is that of the Wrap-around Academy, which carries a detailed description and use of partnerships.</p> <p>There is a district-developed table of desired results, but the measures in that table do not match those in the performance tables.</p> <p>In the Competitive Preference Priority section of the application, Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 scores in the middle range.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This proposal has a number of strengths -- the involvement of stakeholders in the development and review of the application, a strong connection with community stakeholders, some district success in working with low-performing schools, the readiness for Common Core Standards, etc. The district's prior record of success with low-performing schools is commendable. So many of these strengths would be pivotal in the design of a coherent, comprehensive plan for district reform in the area of establishing personalized learning environments.</p> <p>Yet the district has not submitted such a plan, not for providing services, teaching and learning, monitoring improvement, or sustainability of budget. Also, the expectations for students include some low performance thresholds and some confusing expectations.</p> <p>Orangeburg Consolidated School District 5 does not meet the Absolute Priority of providing a coherent and comprehensive system to build on the our educational assurance areas.</p>		

Total	210	120
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0955SC-4 for Orangeburg Consolidated School District Five

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Orangeburg Consolidated School District Five's reform vision which includes a framework of five domains (Instruct, Inform, Intervene, Improve, and Include), incorporates the four key areas to support comprehensive education reform: (1) adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy by adopting Common Core Standards; (2) building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction by purchasing a comprehensive data warehousing system; (3) recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most with professional development and content coaches; and (4) turning around lowest-achieving schools by utilizing data to create plans of improvement with partner support, technology, professional development, and data systems.

Applicant fails to articulate a clear and credible plan to reach their goals by not providing specific goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. Applicant's vision to reform schools is based on credible studies and research and effectively ties to key elements of the RttD criteria. However, applicant is vague on how this framework is applied to bring about change in this district and fails to provide specific details on how the schools will implement the framework, i.e., technology and data systems will need to be purchased but no information was provided on analysis of needs to determine what will be purchased, implemented, timelines of implementation, and detailed goals and outcomes with the implementation.

Long term goals are for students to develop learning environments based on their individual academic interests. Applicant will begin this process with training teachers on how to develop and utilize personal learning environments which will then lead to students being able to participate in development of their own goals and learning paths based on interests. This is a logical approach to implementing the strategy.

Overall, Orangeburg Consolidated School District's reform vision is based on sound fundamentals of school reform but is lacking specific details of how these approaches will accelerate student achievement, deepen student learning, and increase equity through personalized student support which is reflected in the score. Applicant's score is in the middle range due to the lack of detail identified above.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Orangeburg Consolidated School District's approach to implementing its reform proposal is to include all schools and all students from each school site. Justification is provided for how they selected participating schools with a global perspective indicating their goals and activities will positively affect each student. Applicant provided details on each participating school and an explanation on how they were selected to participate.

Applicant has provided a detailed list of the schools that will participate.

Applicant has provided the total number of participating students, identified the percentage of the participating students that are from low-income families, and participating students who are high-need. There is sufficient evidence based on the definition provided on how low-income and high-need were identified.

The high score for this area reflects the comprehensive definitions of identifying participating students and educators.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Orangeburg Consolidated School District's framework of the proposed plan to reform student learning outcomes in their district is a high-quality plan in theory and activities based on these theories would likely result in change. Even though applicant does not provide detailed activities, there is some evidence to support their proposal for reform in the following areas:

- Scaling up - proposal is based on existing successful teacher trainer program, will develop a Data Warehouse
- Change beyond participating schools - teachers will be trained through a personalized professional development plan

Applicant provides some evidence on how their proposed plan of reform will improve student learning outcomes for all students:

- Comprehensive teacher training program
- Develop data systems to personalize learning for students and assist teachers with instruction; improve reporting of data to maximize students' achievement

Applicant's change model depicts inputs, processes, outputs, and outcomes with high level concepts. Applicant fails to

expand on these concepts in the narrative to provide sufficient information on how the change will be implemented and did not include supporting evidence of inevitable change.

A middle range score for this area is given based on the applicant's lack of supporting evidence.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Orangeburg Consolidated School District's vision in theory is likely to result in improved student learning and performance due to their approach to train teachers in developing a blueprint for effective teachers. There is no evidence of data supporting success of past programs but applicant documents that the program just began implementation last year. Applicant's vision is likely to increase equity by addressing individual performance of students with benchmark testing but there is no evidence to document how the district utilizes these assessments to personalize instruction.

Applicant's proposal exceeds State ESEA targets by including assessments aligned with Common Core Standards in addition to rigorous state assessments. No information was provided on the goals of raising performance on assessments above the State level targets for all or specific grade levels. Gaps were identified between low-income students and general population students and between African American and Caucasian students.

- Performance on summative assessments includes benchmarks and annual assessments which is likely to increase proficiency status in four areas (core content, graduation rates, college enrollments) no documentation on specific State targets were identified
- Decreasing achievement gaps is identified between African American/Caucasian and low-income/high-income participating students but no specific documentation was provided on how the plan will address decreasing the gaps
- Goals set for graduation rates is 85% for all participating students. Significant increases are established in the goals for some subgroups (disabled, males) but no details are provided on how the increases will be attained or the justification of expectations for all students being at the same level
- Increasing college enrollment rates to 85.9% for end of project overall but subgroup percentages are significantly lower and it's unclear how the overall rate was calculated
- No data was provided for postsecondary degree attainment

Applicant has not provided detailed documentation on their vision to improve student learning and attainment of goals is difficult to evaluate with the lack of supporting evidence. The low score reflects the lack of evidence in this area.

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	8

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Orangeburg Consolidated School District has provided success records for some of the participating schools by indicating awards received for closing achievement gaps and growth. Charts and raw student data were provided for the consolidated district and individual schools in the appendix. It's difficult to substantiate claims of growth with each school's data over a period of time. Applicant does not provide a sufficient track record of success specifically tied to the initiatives being proposed in this plan.

Applicant definitely operates low-achieving schools based on assessment scores provided in the application. There is evidence in most content areas that overall the district has improved and is making progress to turn around pre-existing schools. Applicant does provide convincing evidence of helping close under-performing schools and providing a high-performing option to parents for their children. It is difficult to determine the impact the proposed plan has had with some of it already being implemented or how it has had significant impact on student performance. Again, in theory, the proposed plan will likely increase equity and improve teaching and learning but more evidence is needed to support specific activities to apply the theory and create detailed plans of action.

Applicant makes student performance data on state assessments available to students, educators, community, and parents through parent teacher conferences at first nine weeks, school/district level report cards, district website, and board meetings. The proposed plan will increase access for students and parents to data for benchmark testing. Proposed plan specifies students and parents will be able to track progress across specific content area. The plan is specific to monitor assessment data and help teachers analyze and plan instruction. Documentation of the plan does not specifically address how or if the

student will be involved in the development of plans to improve performance.

Applicant's score in this area is in the middle range due to the level of detail not provided to support their record of success and documenting their ability to improve student learning.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Orangeburg Consolidated School District has demonstrated evidence of a high level of transparency in their school processes, practices, and investments with substantial public documentation for each participating school. Detailed expenditures for instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration were provided as appendixes in the proposal. All school-level expenditures from State, local, and private funds are accessible to the public through annual reports on their website and were included in the proposal for personnel salaries for all instructional and support staff at the school level. These salaries were documented for instructional staff, teachers, and non-personnel expenditures.

The high score reflects the thoroughness of the applicant in providing all the supporting evidence.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Orangeburg Consolidated School District abides by South Carolina laws and regulations. Schools in SC are granted a high degree of autonomy and Orangeburg Consolidated School District has proven success in this area by receiving a "B" on their report card which is only given by the state to district's that the exceed the state's expectations. No documentation was provided that supported evidence that each school in the district is allowed to independently create their own path to meet the needs of their school. Teachers have a range of tools to tailor their instruction to meet the personalized learning environment for each participating student.

A middle high score depicts applicant's demonstrated evidence of successful conditions and lack of sufficient evidence to demonstrate autonomy in each participating school.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Orangeburg Consolidated School District has submitted a proposal with strong stakeholder engagement and support including:

- A description of how students, teachers and parents participated in the development of the proposal and provided feedback
- 85% of teachers signed in support of the proposal which exceeds the 70% requirement

There is sufficient evidence that students, teachers, and families were engaged in the development of the proposal. Stakeholders responded to surveys in support of what was being proposed and provided feedback. Applicant indicates how the feedback was incorporated into the proposal.

Letters of support were provided from students, parent organizations from each school, principals from each school, city and county officials, community organizations, local churches, and technical and higher education institutions. Applicant's proposed plan of area churches providing support through mentoring and tutoring is innovative and is likely to make a difference in implementing the plan.

Applicant's score in this area is high due to the supporting evidence of engagement of teachers, students, community and church organizations, and higher education institution in developing the proposal.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Orangeburg Consolidated School District performed an extensive analysis of resources and effective methods to create personalized learning environments. Needs were assessed and targets set to improve student learning. Applicant identified critical needs as developing effective teachers and improving technology, learning tools/programs, and data systems. The proposed plan is likely to continue progress made from proven strategies in theory. Applicant has sufficiently identified needs but has not sufficiently addressed in the plan how it will close identified gaps. A score in the middle high range is given based on the lack of thoroughness of the application to address these areas.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Orangeburg Consolidated School District has submitted a high-quality plan in theory for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment to support participating students in graduating college and career ready. The proposed plan includes an approach to implement Common Core Standards strategy that enables all students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned with college and career ready standards and graduations requirements. Orangeburg's plan accelerates student learning through supporting individual students' needs. Evidence to support the plan includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed Common Core Standards implementation plan in Appendix C1.1 • Meetings to gather input from students, parents, teachers, community, and business partners • Participating schools are in the process of transitioning to Common Core Standards • Continued development of effective and highly effective teachers <p>Learning in the applicant's program is based upon implementing Common Core Standards and involves parents with monthly forums, increased technical assistance to parents and community partners by providing self-help classes that emphasizes using technology and literacy skills, and exposure to and understanding of Common Core Standards. Through these efforts applicant is improving partnerships and home-school connections which is important to successfully implement proposed plan. Applicant provides specific information on how students identify their interests and how the plan enables them to pursue those, i.e., technology (iPad apps), Career Corners, software and web based programs. Students are exposed to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives through virtual communication devices, curriculum, and interaction with higher education programs. Supporting evidence would have been stronger if the plan included aspects of student learning in other areas, i.e., character building, creative thinking, problem solving, creativity, communication skills.</p> <p>Orangeburg includes strategies in the proposal to enable personalized learning goals to graduate on time and be college and career ready. Relationships are built with parents and students, ongoing communication is established, students are provided support through focusing on STEM areas, advance placement courses are offered, digital learning through a variety of software and online programs. Evidence is lacking to support high school students participation in specific programs to ensure college and career readiness and meet graduation requirements. Applicant identifies areas where teachers need more training to ensure students have resources and tools to be successful but there is no plan supporting how applicant proposes to provide these trainings.</p> <p>Multiple strategies for incorporating data-driven decision making and instruction are apparent in applicant's proposal. Utilizing technology and expanding existing data systems, Orangeburg's plan will provide regular feedback that is frequently updated and personalized learning recommendations. Applicant's proposed Data System is undefined as to what data will be incorporated and how teachers, students, and parents will access the data. Applicant specifies it will provide mechanisms/strategies for high need students by providing these students with access to numerous technology programs and applications, opportunities for credit recovery, extended learning opportunities, and self-paced learning environments. Applicant does not provide a definition of high need students they are addressing in this proposal as defined in the notice of this application.</p> <p>Applicant provides sufficient evidence to support how the proposed plan accommodates all students to ensure they are on track to meet college and career ready and graduation requirements by providing appropriate modifications, and comprehensive professional development and resources for district staff. Evidence is lacking on how intervention is used for students who are not on track to be college and career ready and graduate on time.</p> <p>Orangeburg's proposal supports teachers in instructional technology by hiring technology facilitators and if funded through this proposal will hire more facilitators to train students. Supporting evidence is insufficient in specific detailed plans on implementing proposed strategies.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant has met requirements in this area but has not provided sufficient documentation to support their approach which is reflected in the middle range score.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	13
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

Orangeburg Consolidated School District has submitted a quality plan in theory for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment to support participating students in graduating college and career ready. The proposed plan includes an approach to teaching and leading that helps educators improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college and career ready standards and graduations requirements. Orangeburg's plan engages all participating educators in training and in professional teams or communities. Evidence to support the quality of the plan includes:

- Adopting a flexible schedule to allow teachers to work in PLCs.
- Response to Intervention program using data walls will be re-evaluated and moved from paper pencil to an electronic version
- District will hire a full time intervention specialist to support students in academic and career and college ready standards.
- Implementation of ADEPT system to evaluate teachers and principals.
- Fully implementing and providing training on data systems to manage student performance

Even though the above components were included to support the proposal, applicant fails to provide sufficient documentation on how professional development will be modified to support personalized training based on the needs of the individual teacher, how the data wall will be converted to an electronic version, and how additional coaching support and options to expand content universities will be accomplished. While it is likely these initiatives will increase student performance, applicant does not provide evidence to support outcomes if these were implemented.

Orangeburg's proposal states that all participating educators have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements as indicated but also states educators will require more professional development in differentiating instruction based on students' needs and interests. No plan of how educators will gain these skills is provided. They have identified needs in training on effective uses of data and improve access and functionality of technology for students and educators. Proposed new software and technology devices to increase skills is an acceptable approach but more detailed explanation on how these tools will be used and evidence of successful implementation would have provided a stronger plan.

Applicant's proposal provides access to information for school leaders to improve educator effectiveness through their teacher evaluation system. School culture and climate will be improved through input from student surveys and Classroom Management Framework. Frequent and consistent observations and feedback from principals is an effective approach to improving performance. These initiatives plus the identified professional development will most likely result in improved instruction.

Applicant's plan to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals includes plans to add and develop programs, provide flexible professional development options, and hire more special education staff. There is no evidence to support these initiatives are based on proven successful strategies. Applicant addresses special education students but fails to address other high-need students, i.e., students who are living poverty, who attend high-minority schools, who are far below grade level, who have left school before receiving a regular high school diploma, who are at risk of not graduating on time, who are homeless, who are in foster care, who have been incarcerated, or English learners. Proposal would have been stronger if additional high-need students would have been identified and plans put in place to address their needs.

Orangeburg has provided documentation to support their proposal of effective teaching and leading to improve instruction but lacks supporting evidence in key areas. A middle range score is given to reflect the documentation in this area and lack of supporting evidence in key areas.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	13

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Orangeburg has provided a comprehensive plan to support the implementation of the proposed plan. Resources and support will be available to educators and students to focus optimal results in the classroom.

1. The district's central office is structured to house key administrative personnel who focus on supporting classroom-based instruction and supports each participating school. Detailed organization chart was provided.

2. Leadership teams at each school lead their schools by controlling their own budgets and personnel. Principals have a

highly effective degree of autonomy with full access to district-wide instructional resources, professional development in Common Core Standards, and school-based operational resources. Principals develop school schedules, calendars, budgets, and personnel matters for educators and non-educators in their own schools.

3. The proposed project will enable students the opportunity to become engaged in creating and monitoring their own learning pathway to meet personal and academic goals. The innovative framework provides students an alternative method of completing course work in multiple ways without having to attend traditional hour/day class schedules.

4. Multiple assessments to measure student learning exists in the proposed plan and are given multiple times throughout the school year to provide students more opportunities to master content knowledge through extended day programs, Saturday Academies, and a re-teaching process. Applicant does not provide specific timelines of when the assessments, other than state assessments, will be administered to insure students have multiple opportunities to demonstrate mastery of standards.

5. Modeling of differentiated instruction for teachers, adding technology components to meet special education students' needs, access to a variety of instructional materials, providing appropriate intervention, and parental involvement are appropriate practices to give full accessibility to all students. Application would have been stronger if it specifically addressed other high-need students and how their needs were being met.

The applicant receives a score in the low high range in this area for providing documentation for a comprehensive infrastructure to support implementation for their plan but lacking documentation for other high-need students.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Orangeburg Consolidated School District presents a quality plan in theory to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure to support personalized learning. Sufficient evidence is provided for:

1. All participating students, parents, and educators have necessary content, tools, and other learning resources to support technology investments through partners and community organizations providing internet access to learning resources for all stakeholders, regardless of income. Applicant's support provides details for access for teachers, parents, and students, in school and out of school and is sufficient to meet the goals of the proposal.

2. Applicant's plan to provide teachers, parents, and students with access to technical support by effective training procedures for teachers and instructional staff is adequate for identified processes. Due to the lack of documentation on processes that need to be developed to meet training needs of teachers, sufficient evidence of effectiveness is undeterminable.

3. Evidence supporting applicant's proposal provides parents and students the ability to export information in an open data format is the use of an online technology system, PowerSchools and multiple online course delivery software programs. There is no evidence to determine if the system allows multi-year plan opportunities or if it complies with FERPA. Applicant does state that the systems allow parents and students to monitor progress toward academic goals.

4. There is supporting evidence that parents and students will have access to some data but not in an open data format. Data is imported to other data systems to create benchmark assignments. SmartFusion is used for personnel and budget management. It is unclear how these systems will be used to support the specific activities in the proposed plan.

Based on the proposed program described in this proposal, the students and parents will have access to the information they need once all areas of need are identified and plans are put in place to address the needs. The score for this area is in the low high range.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Orangeburg Consolidated School District's strategy bases its rigorous continuous improvement process on incremental gains in student achievement as measured by assessments in content areas. There is no evidence of a continuous improvement process for the implementation plan which would provide timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. The strategy addresses how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments by developing an

oversight committee in conjunction with the project director. A data warehouse will keep up-to-date records on progress for each identified measure but no specific plan was identified for reporting or what the reports would consist of.

Applicant has presented a plan to focus on student achievement but lacks a comprehensive strategy to implement a rigorous continuous improvement process that is ambitious and achievable which is reflected in the low score.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
--	---	---

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 Strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders is convincing and supported by evidence of each school and the district level providing information on the websites, newsletters, and strong relationships with partners which contribute to internal and external communications. Applicant's proposal would have been stronger if they had supplied timelines and staff responsibilities and indicated how these would be published which would provide accountability. Quarterly reports, parent-teacher conferences, and meetings of PTA organizations and staff are sufficient and allows adequate time for monitoring and making adjustments if needed. Applicant meets criteria for this area and receives high score.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
--	---	---

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:
 Applicant's proposal includes performance measures that are attainable, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures. Goals are ambitious for some subgroups (disabled students) but some subgroups (white) have minimal gains identified. Overall measure for effectiveness of teachers and principals is not ambitious with a goal at the end of project at 37.5%. Multiple measures have been identified by Orangeburg for the required performance measures and additional leading indicators have been identified in the project to ensure each site based teams have information to determine interim growth as well as long-term proficiency outcomes. Proposal includes project performance measures in College and Career Readiness (retention rates for grades 9-12), Academic Growth, and Social-emotional Indicators (discipline).
 Rationale behind creating these performance measures is appropriate based on the goals established by the project.
 The measures do not provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to the proposed plan due to the lack of evidence of how the proposed plan will impact each area of concentration. The change model is high level and lacks detailed activities regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern by addressing college and career goals, educator effectiveness, social-emotional indicators, and project evaluation. Plan provides professional development for teacher content knowledge, utilizes curriculum and resources to meet needs of diverse learners, utilizes project based lessons, and uses to technology to manage the process.
 Applicant's approach to review and improve the measure over time is insufficient to gage implementation progress. The proposed plan includes obtaining feedback from participants through teacher, student, and parent surveys, and input from data warehouse reporting which is feasible to provide sufficient information on the effectiveness of the program.
 The score for this area is in the middle range due to the applicant's lack of supporting evidence in thoroughly addressing all components.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 Applicant did not address this area (E) (4) in the narrative so it is difficult to evaluate without having to go through the entire proposal to find evidence to support the effectiveness of the their plans to evaluate. Evaluation is not sufficiently addressed in other areas of the application. Score is 0 for this area.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:
 The budget proposed by Orangeburg identifies all funds that will support the project. The budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the proposal. Applicant has identified one-time investments

and ongoing operational costs.

A high score has been given in this area due to the comprehensive, detailed budget and narrative supporting this proposal.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A thorough analysis was performed by the applicant to develop a high-quality plan for sustainability by including participant support (state, mayor, partners, participating schools), high quality project management (oversight committee), accessible curriculum systems (data warehouse, common assessments, online learning programs), highly qualified and certified staff, ongoing staff development, and interactive learning and teaching resources (technology, data systems, state and federal accountability systems). Applicant did not identify other support funds from other sources during the life of the grant and beyond. Sufficient evidence was not provided to describe the sustainability of the project and a middle score was given.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Orangeburg meets the competitive preference priority based on:

- Partnerships with business and community partners, churches, higher education, and parent organizations and provides documentation on how the partners will support the project.
- Identification of 10 population-level desired results for students in the LEA or consortium of LEAs.
- Each partner has a specific role in the project and partner collaboration will be tracked at the aggregate level for all participating students and will be determined for each grade level of students
- Use of data to target resources for participating students by use of data warehouse. Will work with partners to target resources and improve student achievement and complete college
- Develop a strategy in theory to scale the model beyond participating students by utilizing a model with proven successful results, share best practices, and expand to other partnering community-based organizations.
- Improve results over time by working with partners to provide tools to change the structure and strategies for each participating school.
- Work with partners to provide participating students with social, emotional, and behavioral skills and increase number of low-income students who are college and career ready
- Partnerships and the increase of personnel to support emotional and behavioral needs of students and provide professional development and career readiness training for staff will build capacity of staff in participating schools
- Needs and assets of school and community are aligned with goals for improving education and family and community supports. Churches will provide mentoring and tutoring to personalize services to students.
- Meaningful conversations and communications are held with parents on a quarterly basis
- Students and families will have access to partner services to support families to keep students on track to graduate
- Development of oversight committee will allow project staff to monitor key indicators and results and making necessary adjustments.
- Performance measures are correlated with partners and are achievable but lack ambition in some areas.
- Applicant lacks sufficient documentation to support evaluation of the project.

Applicant provides convincing evidence of meeting competitive preference with exceptions noted above and receives a middle range score.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

As stated in other sections, Orangeburg Consolidated School District has comprehensively addressed how it build on the core educational assurance areas in theory to create personalized learning environments to improve learning. The designed plan has the potential to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards and graduation requirements; accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student; increase the effectiveness of educators; expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. However, application lacks evidence to support detailed activities to apply the theory to meet the specific needs of the district.

The applicant address the four key areas in theory originally identified in the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) to support comprehensive education reform: (1) adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy; (2) building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction; (3) recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and (4) turning around lowest-achieving schools. Supporting evidence that the plan addresses these core educational assurance areas is not thoroughly documented to apply theory to specific areas. These areas lacking evidence are noted in the other sections.

The applicant does not provide sufficient evidence that these areas of concentration will positively effect student learning and insure goals under this proposal are met. The applicant does not meet Priority 1.

Total	210	135
-------	-----	-----