



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0455GA-1 for Peach County School District

### 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant's proposal continues to build on the RT3 Scope of Work awarded to the District. A copy of the RT3 activities was included for reference. The Applicant's outlined goals in this proposal align with the goals of RT3 ensuring a coherent reform vision.</li> <li>The Application is comprehensive in addressing the core educational goal areas as well as transitioning to standards and assessments of the College and Career Readiness Standards. This is a critical element in implementing Individualized Learning Plan and will assist in ensuring success in this project.</li> <li>The reform vision as presented utilized several reform initiatives from the RT3 model. One of the initiatives was the development and implementation of the Georgia Statewide Longitudinal System. This initiative has provided the robust data system which builds a stronger foundation for refinement of success areas and additional information to improve student achievement by identifying the gaps in learning and creating individualized learning plans for students in need of remediation and enrichment.</li> <li>The reform vision is comprehensive and coherent because of the major role the state has assumed in turning around all schools that are not experiencing success. The State's role can be seen in the implementation of a comprehensive professional development plan, the statewide data system and the curriculum teams formed to roll out the Common Core Standards. It is the goal to prepare all students to be successful.</li> <li>The reform vision is designed to have each student develop an individualized learning plan focused on application of skills, concepts, and understanding that requires abstract reasoning as well as interest.</li> <li>The Applicant described thoroughly each effort that will be a part of the personalized learning environments for all students: implementation of the Georgia College and Career-Readiness Performance Index, a Summer Bridge Program for students transitioning from 8th to 9th grade, building on students' interests and skills through main academies, increased learning time, project-based learning and 1:1 technology model, and programs such as gifted, Academic Decathlon, and Community Problem Solvers which are resulting in a deeper level of learning.</li> </ul>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant's high quality plan included the process of school and student selection which began with the District receiving the School Improvement Grant and the RTT funding. The Federal regulations and guidelines clearly defined the indicators for selection and the proposal's data is in compliance.</li> <li>The application included extensive detail on the following:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>participating schools</li> <li>the total of students to be served through this grant, grades taught at each school, number of participating educators, enrollment by school free and reduced percentages and percentage of total low income student.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Applicant's proposal addressed all requirements as outlined in the grant notice ensuring the selection process was authentic and justifiable.</li> </ul>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant's proposal included a high quality plan (addresses grant notice requirements) that builds on the existing RT3 model. The Applicant described all district reform efforts in the Personalized Learning Environment Plan; the goals were developed collaboratively through data analysis, research in current educational trends, and effective instructional</li> </ul>		

strategies. The plan which emphasizes differentiated instruction and individualized support through personalized learning environments for all students aligns with the State and District's vision. The high quality plan included goals that are in alignment with the state's focus, appropriate actions/activities, an established time frame, and persons responsible for the various activities.

- The Applicant's District has already implemented most of the components of its plan: Individualized Learning Plans, Project-based learning, and tiered learning. Assessment of needs have been identified in the areas of differentiated instruction, flexible grouping, and recognition of mastery of standards and skills. The Applicant's proposal addresses those elements of needs as well as refinement of those elements of the RT3 funding that are having positive results and move them to a higher level of achievement.
- The proposal will be scaled up in terms of building on an existing infrastructure that was implemented as a pilot in the last school year. Although the targeted population was a small group, the basic underpinnings can be expanded to a larger population with more refined assessment guidelines to ensure that the plan is grounded, rigorous, and yield information that can be quantifiable.
- The Applicant's proposal is designed to expand to the entire state. The various components of the RT3 model have yielded positive results and provide a level of improved student achievement for all students as outlined in the goals of this project.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- The vision as defined in the Applicant's proposal is likely to result in improved student learning and performance because there is a strong alignment of the District and State goals to the core educational assurance areas. The Applicant's District has provided schools sufficient autonomy to implement research-based practices that are supported by Federal and State guidelines and procedures.
- The goals and targets set forth in the project have exceeded most of the ESEA State targets. The Applicant's Data Teams have included detailed data information and analysis in the proposal that outline student performance on the summative assessments: End of Course Test (EOCT), and Criterion Referenced Competency Test (CRCT). Charts are included with the following data displays: ELA, math, science, and social studies subtests, school level performance data for each participating school. The Data Teams used the data to determine subgroups' gaps, prioritization of students' needs for curriculum and instructional programming, and ensuring availability of instructional resources for all students.
- The Applicant included data about graduation and college enrollment. The Applicant indicated that the State has moved to a cohort graduation calculation which had the District's rate of 87% is now 61.9% which certainly indicates a need to further refine goals and targets that closely align with the College and Career Readiness strategies for all students.
- The Applicant's proposal included disaggregate student data as to target the initiatives that will continue to yield improved student achievement and mastery of the goals. The extensive data analysis has informed the goals of this project and they are rigorous and ambitious yet achievable because of the District's student success track record and lessons that have been learned from the RT3 project that are included in this project.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- The data charts in the application reflect varied data. The data was of a high quality in that the data clearly reflected areas of strengths and weaknesses. There are slight ups and downs in the percentages for students meeting and exceeding the targets. The percentages for African American students not meeting the targets increased. There are notable improvements in several instances for the Hispanic students in terms of a decrease in the gap between White and Hispanic Students. There is a clear track record of student data and indicators of success for some subgroups and less for others.
- The data was analyzed in a way to readily identify the strengths and the continuing challenge areas. Specific disaggregate data provided focus for the application.
- The application indicates that Peach County High School was identified in Spring 2009 as the Lowest Achieving School (LAS) which had it selected for the School Improvement Grant and Race-to-the-Top application. According the

Applicant, the Transformation Model has facilitated significant improvement in the following areas:

- o Establishment of three themed academies aligned to the Georgia College and Career Readiness Index. (CRI)
- o Implementing CCGPS in Math and English Language Arts in which literacy standards are embedded in all curriculum areas.
- o Incorporation of research based instructional strategies (Project-based learning)
- o Implementation of a I:1 technology initiative
- o Implementation of the school's Work-Based Learning Program
- o Implementation of a new teacher evaluation system
- o Use of data to drive classroom instruction
- The Applicant described the ongoing accessibility of data to all stakeholders:
  - o Student-level reports (students)
  - o Student progress reports (4.5 weeks) Students
  - o Report cards (every 9 weeks) Students families
  - o State Longitudinal Data (Teachers)
  - o Student performance, discipline and attendance data (monthly principals meeting, District Retreat, Board of Education Meetings)
  - o Superintendent presents information at monthly community Engagement meetings and Civic organizations.
- The Applicant has included the necessary data results to craft a meaningful and sound plan of action to ensure attainment of the goals.

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

5

3

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- The Applicant described the budget process used:
  - o Annual district budget is advertised for two weeks prior to Board adoption (local newspaper)
  - o Financial reports are given monthly at the Board of Education meetings
  - o Minutes of the Board meetings are on the Web site
  - o Local television stations and newspapers cover all Board meetings.
- The applicant indicated that a salary report by school and district level is compiled annually and updated quarterly reflecting any new personnel at district and school levels.
- The application included documentation that shows salaries are reported (Copy in the Appendix):
  - a. Actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff
  - b. Actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff
  - c. Actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers.
  - d. School level expenditures are available upon request by parents/community members for review purposes.
- The Applicant's information did not convey a high level of increasing transparency in that all grant budgets had to be requested by parents and community members. Student information as well as policies and procedures were available upon request only.

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

10

5

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

- The application describes in detail the autonomy that Peach County School District has to create and implement operating procedures which are aligned to current practices and programs. The Applicant indicated that all district policies are aligned with Georgia State Code and Georgia State board policies. The district procedures are compiled into an administrative handbook and are updated annually.
- The Applicant described with confidence that the District has the flexibility to develop the procedures as needed to effectively implement appropriate instructional practices. An example was included for clarity i.e.. development of procedures for personalized learning environments and the "Teachers as Advisors Program" will be formulated for inclusion in the Administrative Handbook. This aforementioned action would indicate successful conditions and autonomy for the Districts to implement programs and initiatives unique to each district but essential for equitable opportunities for all students.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	6
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant's comprehensive plan presented a meaningful stakeholder engagement process that included surveys of needs from staff, Guidelines were developed to be inclusive of the collective bargaining unit, parents, administrators and the community as well as achievement data as indicators of meaningful engagement in the proposal development. The survey resulted in a 94.22% teacher support rate for the grant and the Community Stakeholders Meeting was attended by twenty six internal and external stakeholders and seven committee members-all supported the project.</li> <li>The Applicant described a process that will continue to seek input from all stakeholders and providers of services which will yield improvement in strategies and delivery of services. The process to keep everyone informed as well as providing opportunities to give feedback/input is a convincing stance for the assurance of likely project success.</li> <li>The application included letters of support from community members, city officials, teachers, college faculty and clergy. Input was included from the Georgia Department of Education and the Mayor of Fort Valley.</li> </ul>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	4
(B)(5) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Applicant submitted a high quality plan that incorporated lesson learned from previous personalized learning experiences. Analysis of test data, program interventions, and remediation and enrichment activities have been beneficial in improving student achievement as evidenced in the test data. The Applicant's high quality plan included goals/rationales, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.</li> <li>The Applicant's comprehensive high quality plan identified needs and services that must be provided to ensure the continuing success that has begun in the district. The needs are reflected in the budget and correlate to the District and State vision and school reform.</li> </ul>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The applicant provided comprehensive information regarding Georgia's transitioning from the NCLB's accountability system to a new accountability, the College and Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI). The high quality plan provided goals and rationales, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. The plan identified the learning approaches that would involve strategies and supports of parents and educators to ensure that all students have access to high quality instruction and that all students would have the opportunity to invest in their own learning through the use of personal learning plans.</li> <li>The Applicant outlined the elements of preparing students to succeed in post-secondary education and in future careers. CCRPI also targets indicators such as rigorous coursework, completion of career pathways, career development, completion of world language courses, student attendance and participation in work-based learning experiences.</li> <li>The Applicant's detailed approach to learning involves students, parents, teachers and "Teachers as Advisors" using the tool of the Individual Career Plans which will include:                         <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High school academic</li> <li>Course work and activities related to future educational goals</li> <li>Experienced-based learning</li> <li>Consideration of College Credit Now programs</li> <li>Expectations to meet graduation requirements</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The Applicant's high-quality plan is rigorous and ambitious yet attainable.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	17
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:		

- The Applicant's proposal presents a comprehensive high quality plan to address the core educational assurance areas as well as the State's College and Career Readiness Standards. The plan did address goals, aligned activities, timelines, deliverables/outcomes, and persons responsible for implementation. The plan includes ongoing professional development for all staff, implementation of data teams at each school, implementation of the Teacher Keys Effectiveness System (TKES) and Leader Keys Effectiveness System (LKES). The TKES and LKES are staff evaluation tools that are organized using a process to ensure meaningful exchange that is similar in implementing the goal setting and mastery processes of personalized learning environments. These initiatives assist in assuring mastery of the goals outlined in the District and State Reform visions which are in direct alignment with the requirements of the grant notice.
- The Applicant's comprehensive plan also includes a strong incentive program for highly effective staff which supports the action to ensure that every student receives instruction from a highly effective teacher. The comprehensive data driven professional development plan is designed to give research based instruction and information to teachers, principals, students, parents and support personnel that will have a role in implementing the personalized learning plans.
- The Applicant's proposal describes a comprehensive plan to ensure that participating educators have access to and are trained to have adequate knowledge and skills to the tools, data and resources to accelerate all students' progress toward meeting college and career readiness and graduation requirements.
- The Applicant's plan includes a thorough description of each component as outlined in the grant's notice. Appropriate documentation was included in the Appendix.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	11
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Applicant presented a comprehensive description of positions and roles that support the organizational chart. The organizational chart is designed to serve school level administrators, teachers and students to ensure necessary resources and tools to meet the designated goals of the project. The Applicant's plan included goals, activities, deliverables, timelines, and persons responsible.</li> <li>• The Applicant's plan describes all participating schools as having their leadership teams and school councils made up of all stakeholders. The plan addresses district directors who work collaboratively with participating schools to ensure compliance with state and federal regulations as well as providing necessary information to avoid scheduling/testing conflicts. The Applicant shared various processes pertaining to school operations with the ultimate decisions being made at the school level.</li> <li>• The plan is inclusive in its description of services to students , various opportunities to progress and earn credits at the High School level based on mastery an not the amount of seat time. The plan also addresses the multiple ways and multiple times that students can demonstrate mastery of standards. The plan specifies resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to students who have disabilities or may be denoted ELL.</li> </ul>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Applicant provides specific details around the plan for personalized learning which includes goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and persons responsible to ensure that highest level the necessary resources to ensure the implementation of personalized learning environments.</li> <li>• The Applicant's goals and processes for implementation of personalized learning plans have equitable opportunities and resources for all students as its basic foundation. Therefore the designated staff will be provided to ensure the professional development needs are executed fully.</li> <li>• Parent Resource Centers and coordinators are in each school to provide support for parents since the parental involvement research supports and advocates the critical they play as educational partners.</li> <li>• The High quality plan provides for technology and resources for all students and parents to ensure exporting of information in an open data format and to use the data in assessing progress on skills and standards as out lined on students' plans.</li> <li>• Instructional and technology specialists are included to support teacher in utilizing technology, data, and improved instructional strategies to meet the college and career readiness standards.</li> </ul>		

- The initiatives as outlined in the Applicant's high quality plan are research based best /effective practices that will yield positive results.

### E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Applicant's proposal provides a detailed process encompassing a strategy for continuous improvement that will give timely and regular feedback on project goals and opportunities as well as the quality investments funded by Race to the Top- District . The proposal continues to build on existing activities from previous federal funds. The District has a foundation for the continuous improvement process that is firmly grounded in research and results.</li> <li>• The basic underpinning for the continuous improvement process is that it must be owned by all stakeholders and that it occurs at all levels: district, school classroom and student. The Applicant outlined the following aspects of its process: annual needs assessment, sharing assessment results along with district's performance measures and benchmarks with all stakeholders.</li> <li>• The Applicant presented a concise description of how this ongoing monitoring would occur. The District's Directors of Grants and Title I conduct monthly school monitoring/technical assistance visits at each school. The visits consists of progress in meeting school improvement and grant specific goals and short term action plans are developed.</li> <li>• The state will conduct quarterly monitoring visits with a deeper focus on the RTT3 investments. The District shares the information to internal and external stakeholders through presentations at BOE meetings, parent meetings, school leadership meetings, school council meetings, Community Engagement meetings, civic organizations, and collaborative planning sessions.</li> <li>• The strategy as presented in the Applicant's plan will have deliverables that can be discussed and shared with all stakeholder permitting necessary changes if needed.</li> </ul>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Applicant's plan referenced the various opportunities for open, honest and reliable communication that has built trust and confidence between internal and external stakeholders. The District has defined a process that will continue to serve as the foundation for the successful results that the District has experienced using this model.</li> <li>• The District will continue to use its plan of action for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders utilizing the following: call outs, memos,, community engagement meetings, stakeholder meetings, study sessions, and board meetings.</li> <li>• The Applicant's proposal describes the District process which uses its Parent Community Liaison, the Community Engagement Committee, school level parent coordinators and administrators to provide ongoing meaningful input. These mechanisms as included in the Applicant's proposal will ensure at the highest level strategies that will provide effective ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.</li> </ul>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Applicants' proposal met the requirements outlined in the Grant's notice. The Applicant presented 13 performance measures that were data driven and substantiated with thorough rationales for each. The performance measures focused on Personalized Learning Environments to ensure success for all students with all students being College and Career Ready. The District supports a comprehensive K-12 focus to address its systemic change. Thus the performance measures incorporate expectations for all grade levels.</li> <li>• Each performance measure includes a detailed data supported rationale; how each measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative information that is in alignment with the proposed plan and its theory of action; and how each performance measure will be reviewed .</li> <li>• The following rationales were used for performance measures which are in alignment with the District's guidelines and the grant notice: effective professional development, highly effective teachers, correlation between good attendance and student achievement, creation of individualized plans to address students' strengths and challenge areas, strong content</li> </ul>		

and skill acquisition, student motivation and engagement, career awareness, and college and career readiness.

- The application reflected rigorous but appropriate goals as well as being ambitious yet achievable. This conclusion is reflected in the data analysis and the success of strategies from the past.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

- The Applicant's evaluation of Race-to-the-Top initiatives was limited in the alignment of specific measurements to its program components. This makes it difficult to assess the effectiveness of the components delineated in the plan.
- The Applicant indicated in the proposal that "the ultimate evaluation of RTTT-D initiatives will be increased student achievement and growth." The Applicant did indicate the summative and formative measurements for student achievement. The information that the Applicant provided in the Personalized Learning Environments Plan lacked specificity in the data to be gathered and evidence of mastery.
- The aforementioned observation about the lack of defined assessment milestones is also noted in the detailed budget analysis.

### F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- The Applicant's budget reflected the requests directly related to the RttD monies award to retain the additional personnel. The Applicant's budget as presented depends solely on the award of the RttD monies. The budget presented all budget categories for a 4 year tenure. Based on the information provided and the lack of specificity of the requests, it is difficult to indicate the implementation of the model and will likely not happen if additional RTTTD funds are not granted.
- The Applicant's proposal did not provide sufficient information to support the plan's implementation.
- The applicant's plan did not address a monitoring plan for the RTTT-D funds.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- The Applicant did not address the sustainability of the project goals in a comprehensive manner. The Applicant did not provide responses to support from the state and local government . The Applicant shared that the District's grant writing team will continue to search for additional grant opportunities to sustain current initiatives. Based on the limited information provided by the Applicant, it is difficult to speak to the sustainability of the project at the tenure of the funding.

### Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	3

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

- The Applicant identified two partnerships that play an integral role in the educational support to students. One is the Reading Is Fundamental initiative in all elementary schools. This was organized by the Delta Sigma Theta organization. The measure that will be used to determine the effectiveness of the intervention is the increase in number and percentage of students reading on grade level as evidenced by CRCT. The second partnership is with Fort Valley State University which has implemented the Near Peer Grant which uses college students to serve as mentors and provides dual enrollment opportunities for high school students. Macon College and Middle Georgia Technical College also offer students the opportunity for dual enrollment. The Applicant's District has identified 6 performance measures

and identified accountability measures to obtain data about the specific intervention activity. The desired results were statements such as: increased graduation rate; increased reading scores etc.

- The Applicant's information did not provide sufficient data to address the requirements as outlined in the grant notice. The information was sparse and vague. The Applicant's information did not show a connectivity of the partnerships plan to the proposal.

### Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

- The Applicant's proposal addressed the core educational assurance areas throughout its plan. The proposal incorporated the reform goals from the District and State which are being aligned to the College and Career Readiness Standards. The application fully addressed the correlation existing initiatives with newly defined strategies. These actions ensured a greater sense of ownership among the stakeholders producing a greater possibility of successful results.
- The Applicant described fully the opportunities that were provided to facilitate collaborative planning with a team of varied stakeholders. Assessment tools by service providers and surveys were used to gather perceptions and ideas to develop this plan.
- The Applicant incorporated all elements of effective strategic plan planning, The foundation was based on assessment of needs, data analysis and interpretation, measurable goals and identifiable deliverables, standards for mastery, provision for capital and human resources, effective staff and stakeholders' development, built in monitoring intervals and opportunities for revisions.
- The grant notice focus on implementing personalized learning environments was ambitious yet achievable because it provides for self advocacy and ownership by each stakeholder. The common goal of ensuring all students to be College and Career Ready is unifying and justified for global citizens success.

Total	210	138
-------	-----	-----

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

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	0

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The Applicant did not submit the Optional Budget Supplement.



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0455GA-2 for Peach County School District

### A. Vision (40 total points)

--	--	--

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant sets forth a list of strategies that builds on its work in four core educational assurance areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace. These standards include: Common Core State Standards (CCSS), Preview, Prepare, and present, and teachers aligned assessments to standards.</li> <li>• Building data systems that measure student growth and success. One example is the Georgia Statewide Longitudinal System (SLDS) which manages data, including individual student data records.</li> <li>• Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals. Examples include: three day common core summit for ELA and math teachers, and monthly collaborative meetings, and the Teacher Keys Effectiveness System (TKES).</li> <li>• Turning around lowest-achieving schools. Examples include: Georgia College and Career Readiness Performance Index (CCRPI), a Summer Bridge Program, three new academies for secondary students, Increased Learning Time (ILT), and Project-Based Learning (PBL).</li> </ul> <p>The narrative mentions the applicant's Personalized Learning Environment Plan (PLEP). Then, the applicant refers to a PLEP chart located in the Appendix. The applicant, while listing many strategies, is vague in its development of a comprehensive and coherent reform vision.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The applicant describes the process they used to select participating schools. Examples include: teachers and administrators analyzed 2011-2012 state assessment data, a joint discussion about achievement gaps, and a determination of achievement gaps at each school.</li> <li>• The applicant provides a list of participating schools.</li> <li>• The applicant provides a complete table that lists the total number of participating students, participating students from low-income families, participating students who are high-need students, and participating educators.</li> </ul>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides an inadequate plan for describing how the reform proposal will be scaled up. The applicant's proposal does not address scale up because it includes all of the schools in the district.</p> <p>The applicant provides a plan that will help the applicant reach its outcome goals. The applicant lists some goals in the narrative but the same goals are not found in the PLEP in the Appendix and this is a discrepancy and is confusing. Additionally, the goals in the narrative are lacking student learning outcomes.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance based on the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Performance on summative assessments. The applicant plans to utilize the two following assessments: Criterion Referenced Competency Test (CRCT) and the End of Course Test (EOCT); includes overall and subgroup information.</li> <li>b) Decreasing achievement gaps. The applicant adequately plans to compare highest achieving subgroups and the lowest achieving subgroups.</li> <li>c) Graduation rates. The applicant provides an achievable growth projection in its high school graduation rates moving from 61.9% to 83.7%. However, the applicant does not address subgroups.</li> <li>d) College enrollment. The applicant provides an achievable growth projection in its future college enrollment. However,</li> </ol>		

the applicant does not address subgroups.

The applicant provides complete information when responding to certain selection criteria. However, due to the fact that the applicant does not address subgroups throughout this section, a lower score will be assigned.

The applicant chose to not address the optional postsecondary degree attainment category.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	10
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To provide evidence of student learning outcomes the applicant provides data from both the CRCT and the EOCT data; the applicant provides a table in the Appendix of student scores that cover at least four years. However, the table does not include high school graduation rates or college enrollment; therefore, the information is insufficient.</li> <li>To show that the applicant has achieved ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools, the applicant provides a list of improvements. These improvements include: three themed academies, Project-Based Learning (PBL), a 1:1 technology initiative, Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), and the Teacher Keys Effectiveness System (TKES). However, it is unclear whether all of these reforms have been in place for at least four years.</li> <li>The applicant makes student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. Examples include, standardized test reports, student progress reports, student report cards, Parent Portal (which is updated daily), and teacher utilization of the State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS).</li> </ul>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides information which supports an appropriate level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments, including by making public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration.</p> <p>The applicant provides a table in the Appendix which provides the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff.</li> <li>Actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only.</li> <li>Actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only.</li> </ul> <p>However, in addressing the district's non-personnel expenditures at the school level, the applicant states that this information is available only upon request by parent members or community members. This policy is incompatible with transparency.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant demonstrates evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All district policies are aligned with Georgia State Code and Georgia State Board policies.</li> <li>All district policies are reflective of the district vision, mission, and goals.</li> <li>The district has the flexibility to modify current policy and to create additional policies to meet the individual needs of its students.</li> </ul>		

- The district has the flexibility to develop procedures as needed to effectively implement appropriate instructional practices.

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

10

6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates adequate evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal and meaningful stakeholder support for the proposal. This includes the following:

- The applicant provides an adequate description of how families, teachers, and principals in participating schools were engaged in the development of the proposal. This includes: a community stakeholders meeting attended by twenty-six internal and external stakeholders and seven committee members, and school-wide faculty meetings. However, there is no evidence of student participation.
- The applicant states that high percentage, 94.22%, of the district's teachers support the RTTD proposal and this exceeds the 70% required for proposal submission.
- The applicant provides several copies of their letters of support in the Appendix. There are letters of support from key stakeholders. However, there is no evidence of letters of support from parent organizations or from student organizations. Additionally, there is no evidence that the letters were written individually or reflect authentic support for the proposal. Therefore, this is not evidence of support from key stakeholders and a lower score will be assigned.

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

5

5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a high-quality plan for an analysis of the applicant's current status in implementing personalized learning environments. Examples include:

- implementation of Increased Learning Time (ILT) which is based on students' individual needs.
- complete remediation and enrichment activities for middle school students.
- Summer Bridge Program for secondary students.

The applicant identifies needs and gaps and they include the following:

- teachers will implement RTI with adequate fidelity.
- comprehensive summer programs will be expanded for all grade levels to address regression.
- parents will understand Common Core Standards.
- parents will understand the integration of technology into curriculum and instruction.

The applicant supplied all of the components of a high quality plan. For example, the applicant provides complete and thorough information for all of their goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	16

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment.

a) With the support of parents and educators, all students:

i) Understand that what they are learning is key to their success. Excellent examples include: rigorous coursework and the completion of world languages courses.

ii) Identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards. Comprehensive examples include: completion of career pathways, career development, and opportunities to explore career and postsecondary education options.

iii) Are able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest. Examples include: parents/guardians, counselors, and advisors will help the students design a plan that combines the student's interests, skills, and academics.

iv) Have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning. The applicant does not address diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives in its PLEP.

v) Master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving. The applicant does not address these seven skills and traits directly in its PLEP. However, these skills and traits are sometimes implicit in PBL and RTI.

b) With the support of parents and educators, there is a strategy to ensure that each student has access to:

i) A personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals and ensure he or she can graduate on time and college- and career-ready. Examples include: Career Awareness opportunities, Teachers as Advisors program, employment of two Graduation Coaches, and the Summer Bridge Program.

ii) A variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments. Examples include: PBL, Kindle Fires and books in ELA classrooms, and a Learning Support Academy administrator..

iii) High-quality content, including digital learning content. Applicant is vague on the details of its digital learning content.

ivA) Frequently updated individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery. Adequate examples include: GaDOE data training workshop for teachers, teachers develop the skills to disaggregate and analyze assessment data by school, grade and subgroup as a means for continuous improvement.

ivB) Personalized learning recommendations based on the student's current knowledge and skills. Applicant provides complete plans to have middle school students develop Individual Career Plans that will align with student interest and skills.

v) Accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students. The applicant does not explicitly address strategies for high-need students as they indicate that all of their students will benefit from PLEP. Therefore, this will result in a score reduction.

c) Mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning. Goal #6 of the PLEP states, "To train students to effectively utilize available technology resources to organize self-directed online learning, including tools they employ to gather information, conduct research, and present their findings." This appears to adequately address this selection criteria.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has a plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready.

a) All participating educators (as defined in this notice) engage in training, and in professional teams or communities, that supports their individual and collective capacity to—

i) Support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies. The applicant provides evidence that its teachers are participating in district monthly collaborative meetings to plan differentiated lessons.

ii) Adapt content and instruction, providing opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches. The applicant demonstrates the implementation of PBL in its PLEP as Goals #4 and #5.

iii) Frequently measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards. Goal #2 of the applicant's PLEP: "To train teachers to systematically gather, analyze, and use relevant data to measure student progress to inform instructional practice, and to provide constructive feedback to both students and parents."

iv) Improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback provided by the LEA's teacher and principal evaluation systems. The applicant does not address teacher evaluation or principal evaluation in its narrative or its PLEP. However, the applicant addresses the teacher evaluations (TKES) and school leader evaluations (LKES) in another section of this proposal (A1).

b) All participating educators (as defined in this notice) 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 defined in this notice). Those resources must include—

i) Actionable information that helps educators (as defined in this notice) identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests. Examples include: Instructional Facilitators who work with teachers on development of instruction to meet the individual needs of the students, learning aspects of brain research and interdisciplinary instruction.

ii) High-quality learning resources, including digital resources. The applicant presents a strategy under its Goal #1 that states, "Effectively integrate instructional technology to promote student engagement, learning, and increase achievement. The applicant, while somewhat vague about the details, plans to "replace and increase digital resources to ensure equitable access."

iii) Processes and tools to match student needs with specific resources and approaches to provide continuously improving feedback about the effectiveness of the resources in meeting student needs. The applicant presents a plan to continue its use of SLDS and GSGM to help teachers design more differentiated instruction; the GSGM allows teachers to track student progress over time.

c) All participating school leaders and school leadership teams (as defined in this notice) have training, policies, tools, data, and resources. The training, policies, tools, data, and resources must include:

i) Information, from such sources as the district's teacher evaluation system (as defined in this notice), that helps school leaders and school leadership teams (as defined in this notice) assess, and take steps to improve, individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate, for the purpose of continuous school improvement. The applicant states that implementation of TKES has been challenging. The applicant does not provide additional information,

ii) Training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps. The applicant includes in its proposed PLEP plans to utilize data to shape continuous improvement.

d) The applicant has a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals, including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects, and specialty areas. The applicant provides a new Teacher Induction Plan in the Appendix. Additionally, the applicant provides information about incentives for teacher retention. The incentives include: Excellence in Education and New Teacher of the Year Award. However the applicant does not address hard-to-staff schools, hard-to staff subjects, or hard-to-staff specialty areas.

#### D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

#### (D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure.

a) The applicant provides evidence of an organized District office that will provide support and services to all participating schools. The applicant provides an organizational chart in the Appendix. The applicant provides evidence that the District is well organized both vertically and horizontally. The applicant also provides an extensive review of key job

descriptions.

b) The applicant provides evidence of school leadership teams in participating schools with sufficient flexibility and autonomy. Examples include: autonomy over school calendars, assessment calendars that are coordinated, school administrators create master schedules for each schools, and school principals work collaboratively with the Director of Human Resources.

c) The applicant provides evidence that students have the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic. Examples include: the Learning Support Academy and the use of OdysseyWare software.

d) The applicant provides evidence that students have the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways. Examples include: Increased Learning Time (ILT), utilization of technology as a tool for intervention and learning, and Project-Based Learning (PBL).

e) The applicant provides evidence that schools are providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners. Examples include: differentiated instructional practices and tier intervention plans.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence that it has plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.

a) The applicant provides evidence that its Parent Resource Center (PRC) provides information and resources to schools, parents, and the community. However, the applicant does not provide evidence that the necessary content, tools, and other learning resources, both in and out of school, of the PLEP will reach parents, educators, and other stakeholders through its PRC.

b) The applicant provides evidence that some technical support is provided by the current instructional technology specialist. The applicant presents its plan to increase its number of instructional technology specialists with RTTD funds.

c) The applicant presents a plan without information about a technology system that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format.

d) The applicant presents a plan that adequately addresses student information data. However, the applicant is vague about human resources data.

### E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a clear approach to continuously improve its plan. Strategies include:

- Monitor: district personnel will conduct monthly school monitoring visits at each school, state monitoring visits occur throughout the district, and the district will conduct an annual needs assessment.
- Measure: district plans to continue to effectively monitor and measure progress and share this information publicly.
- Publicly share: district plans to disseminate information through Board meetings, parent meetings, school leadership meetings, School Council meetings, Community Engagement meetings, civic organizations, and collaborative planning sessions.

Despite this applicant's strategies to monitor and measure aspects of this proposal, the applicant does not provide specific evidence of how it will monitor and measure investments such as investments in professional development, technology, and staff.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a plan to utilize strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. Examples include:

- community engagement meetings
- stakeholders meetings
- School Board meetings
- school-based parent/community liasons
- school newsletters
- school websites

Despite this applicant's strategies to publicly share throughout the improvement process, the applicant contradicts itself when it states, " Effective communication is the responsibility of both internal and external stakeholders in the continuous improvement process."

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures.

All Performance Measures include the rationale for that measure.

Application Population: All. The applicant provides the following information about its first two Performance Measures, "Peach County piloted the TKES evaluation system during the 2011-2012 school term. Baseline data from Georgia's Teacher Keys Effectiveness System will be used once the data is released from the state."

Application Population: K-12. The applicant proposes to measure the percentage of participating students with ten or less absences.

Application Population: K-8. The applicant proposes to measure the percentage of students attaining proficiency or better in mathematics. The data will be obtained through: the District GKIDS report, District benchmarks/SLO Assessments (Student Learning Objectives), or CRCT scores.

Application Population: 3-12. The number and percentage of participating students who are on track to college- and career-readiness. The data will be based on the applicants track indicator.

Application Population: K-12. Percentage of school discipline referrals. The data will be reported in Infinite Campus.

Application Population: K-5. Percentage and number of students participating in at least two career awareness lessons. Applicant is unclear about how it collect this information.

Application Population: 8. Percentage and number of students how have an individual graduation plan. Applicant is unclear about how it collect this information.

Application Population: K-12. Percentage and number of students participating in Increased Learning Time (ILT). Applicant is unclear about how it collect this information.

Application Population: 3. Number of students who are reading on grade level as measured by CRCT.

Application Population: 9-12. Percentage and number of students attaining proficiency or better on Math 1 EOCT. Data will be obtained through SLDS and through System Media Drive.

Applicant provides no evidence of a 9-12 Performance Measure that indicates the number and percentage of participating students who complete and submit the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) form.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides some plans to evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities.

The applicant describes the importance of employing technology to its proposal. One example is the 1:1 technology initiative. The applicant goes on to state that the effective use of technology will be measured through the TKES and through

increased student achievement and growth.

The applicant describes the importance of the modification of school schedules and provides the example of its Summer Bridge Program. The applicant evaluates the effectiveness of the Summer Bridge Program with participation rates and attendance rates.

The applicant describes the importance of professional development to its proposal. However, the applicant is unclear about its plans to evaluate its professional development activities.

The applicant describes the importance of utilizing staff more productively when it proposes to expand the placement of Graduation Coaches to the middle and elementary schools. However, the applicant is unclear about its plans to evaluate its Graduation Coaches.

The applicant's proposal is lacking details about evaluating the effectiveness of working with community partners, compensation reform, and modification of school structures

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: Throughout the applicant's budget narrative and tables there is no evidence of following funds which will support the project: district funds, State funds, and other Federal funds.  The applicant's proposal is insufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal.  The applicant provides a rationale for how it plans to use RTTD funds. However, the applicant provides no descriptions of district funds, State funds, or other Federal funds.  The applicant inadequately addresses to identify funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	4
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant provides an insufficient plan for the sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. Examples include: additional grant opportunities, improving STEM academy to qualify for other initiatives, and reliance upon Federal programs.  The applicant's proposal is lacking information about its plans to utilize financial support from State and local government leaders.  The applicant chose not to provide an optional budget for three years after the term of the grant.		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	2
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: The applicant provides information about community partnerships: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delta Sigma Theta has organized the Reading is Fundamental initiative in its elementary schools.</li> <li>• Macon College and Middle Georgia Tech Institute both allow secondary students to enroll in courses for college credit.</li> </ul>		

- Fort Valley State University implements the Near Peer Grant.

The applicant provides eleven population-level desired results instead of the requested ten. However, the population-level desired results do not include the required result designation (e.g. educational vs. family and community).

The applicant provides information about its partnerships would measure results and improve results over time. However, none of them are in relation to the three community partnerships listed in (1).

The applicant provides no evidence about how it would address social-emotional and behavioral needs of its students through its partnerships.

The applicant provides no evidence of how it would build the capacity of its staff through its partnerships.

The performance measures of the proposal are not connected to its community partnerships.

### Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

#### Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The proposal does not coherently and comprehensively address how it will create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and teachers.

The applicant provides an insufficient plan to expand student access to the most effective educators, to decrease achievement gaps across student groups, and to increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

The applicant consistently fails to respond, at all, to several of the selection criteria and, therefore, fails to develop a comprehensive plan for RTTD funding.

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



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0455GA-3 for Peach County School District

#### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The vision sets forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision. The application shows evidence that it is working in the four core educational assurance areas. The approach to the goals is clear and credible. The approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests is clear and concise.</p> <p>All of the elements of a comprehensive and coherent reform vision are present, so a score of 10 is awarded.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The extent to which the applicant's approach to implementing its reform proposal (e.g., schools, grade bands, or subject areas) will support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation of that proposal, including—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) There is evidence that the process used to select schools to participate was collective and precise. It was determined in the process that all schools have achievement gaps.</li> <li>(b) There is a complete list of the schools that will participate in grant activities</li> <li>(c) The table containing the total number of participating students participating students from low-income families, participating students who are high-need students , and participating educators shows evidence that the students served makes the applicant eligible to apply.</li> </ul> <p>A score of 10 was applied due to all of the components of the criteria being met.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan (referred to as the PLEP), includes goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and parties responsible, all of the elements of a high quality plan. There is evidence of a description outlining how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform. The reform supports district-wide change in that all schools are included in the application. The logic model (PLEP, in the appendix) is complete in describing student learning outcomes.</p> <p>A score of 10 for the high quality plan that covers all aspects of the criteria was assigned.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The extent to which the applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals that are equal to or exceed State ESEA targets for the LEA(s), overall and by student subgroup (as defined in this notice), for each participating LEA in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) There is evidence that performance on summative assessments, as part of the plan, has ambitious yet achievable goals. The applicant does not include stat ESEA targets, so it is not possible to determine how ambitious the goals are. Student subgroups are listed in the chart.</li> </ul>		

(b) The goals for decreasing achievement gaps are ambitious and achievable. However, the State ESEA target is not given, so it is unclear whether or not the goals meet/exceed state goals.

(c) Graduation rate increases are shown in the chart to be ambitious and achievable. Again, the applicant did not include the State ESEA Targets, so it is not possible to determine whether or not they meet/exceed state rates.

(d) There is evidence that the increases in college enrollment rates are ambitious but achievable. Again, the applicant did not include the State ESEA Targets, so it is not possible to determine whether or not they meet/exceed state rates.

The evidence presented is clear, concise and shows goals that are attainable and ambitious. The evidence is missing State ESEA target information for all of the elements, for which 2 points was deducted. A score of 8 was awarded for this criteria.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

There is a clear record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching.

The response met all of the criteria with the exception of high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates, for which 5 points were deducted.

(a) evidence, including a description and a chart demonstrates the applicant's ability to improve student learning outcomes and close achievement gaps, as evidenced in increases in percentage of students meeting or exceeding the state goal. There is no evidence regarding high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates;

(b) There is detailed evidence that the LEA has made significant reforms in its lowest-performing school (Peach County High School)

(c) The applicant makes all performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. Test scores are made available to students, parents and educators. All 3 groups have access to online performance data, including grades, test scores and assignments.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4
--	---	---

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrates a high level of transparency regarding finances. One point is deducted due to not being able to determine if salaries in (a) are from F33 survey.

The applicant shows evidence of a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments. These are made available to the public through television and open public meetings, newspapers and the district's website. The Superintendent presents at monthly meetings.

(a) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff, are made public, but it is not clear if they based on the U.S. Census Bureau's classification used in the F-33 survey of local government finances.

(b) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only are made public through the vehicles described above, as are actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only and actual non-personnel expenditures at the school.

The application states that grant budgets are made available upon request by parents/community members, indicating that grant financial information is not as transparent as other non-grant information.

The response is high quality in that the district exhibits a high level of transparency regarding finances - there are several ways that they show evidence of that in the ways that they make it public. However, since they do not readily make grant information as available a score of 4 was assigned.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is evidence that the district has sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal. Peach County District has procedures in place that ensure flexibility of policies and procedures as needed to increase learning.</p> <p>All of the evidence is present to show that this criteria has been met - a score of 10 is assigned.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	8
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) Although there is evidence and a description of how stakeholders were involved in the development of the proposal and how they were involved in providing feedback, they are described as "internal" and "external". It is not clear if any were students or familieis.</p> <p>(ii) There is evidence that over 93 percent of teachers from participating schools support the proposal</p> <p>(b) There are letters of support from such key stakeholders as parents and parent organizations, student organizations. However, they are all the same, having been derived from a "boilerplate"</p> <p>Since (a) did not differentiate stakeholders to indicate if students and parents were involved, 2 points were deducted.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan addresses needs and gaps and gives a detailed, high-quality plan for implementing personalized learning environments.</p> <p>Individual Learning Time was implemented during the 2011-12 school year and has been continued into the current school year. Personalized services, such as tutoring and/or remediation are provided to students on an individualized basis both during the school day and before and after school. Through the use Instructional Facilitators specific student needs were determined. Average attendance to the program is currently 90% and the plan will continue to use this program.</p> <p>Goals specific to needs assessments are in the plan, including a needs assessment before the project begins.</p> <p>Activities to achieve these goals increase include the implementation of RTI with fidelity, increasing formative data to determine needs, and communication to all stakeholders.</p> <p>Deliverables and timelines are well defined in the logic diagram. The deliverables show evidence that needs and gaps will be assessed at several points in the project implementation, including through data, RTI, and targeted learning to teachers on gathering, analyzing and utilizing formative data. The timelines are reasonable, although they mostly list the entire four-year grant period.</p> <p>A score of 5 was assigned for the submission of a high-quality plan to provide for an analysis of the applicant's current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic behind the reform proposal contained within the applicant's proposal, including identified needs and gaps that the plan will address.</p>		

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

	Available	Score

(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	19
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan is high-quality as it includes goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and parties responsible. There are two elements of the criteria that were not mentioned - accommodations for high need students and evidence that students are exposed to diverse cultures, contexts, etc. One point was deducted for the omission of these elements, for a score of 19 due to the high quality of the plan.</p> <p>(a) There is a high-quality plan that includes a way that students, with the support of parents and educators,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals, as they take part in the BRIDGE program and counselors provide information to elementary students.</li> <li>(ii) Beginning in middle school, all students Identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements, understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, Progress toward these goals is measured annually.</li> <li>(iii) Student are able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest - the plan shows evidence that students choose their learning paths based on interest</li> <li>(iv) There is no evidence that students have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning; and</li> <li>(v) Although the plan speaks to students mastering critical academic content, such as math and ELA, there is no evidence that students will develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving;</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The plan shows that all students will have access to an individualized, personalized course of study to ensure that they are college and career ready</li> <li>(ii) The plan includes evidence that students will have access to differentiated ways of learning and quality learning</li> <li>(iii) There is evidence that high-quality content, including digital learning content such as technology improvements in the classroom, laptops for students, and kindles are to be used and are to be aligned with college and career ready standards.</li> <li>(iv) There is evidence of ongoing and regular feedback, including             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(A) Frequently updated individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards</li> <li>(B) Personalized learning recommendations based on the student's current knowledge and skills, college- and career-ready standards</li> </ul> </li> <li>(v) There is no evidence of accommodations or high quality strategies for high-need students.</li> </ul> <p>(c) The plan includes mechanisms a to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning.</p>		

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	19
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan is a high-quality plan in that it includes goals, activities, deliverables and parties responsible. The plan addresses all aspects of this criteria and would earn a perfect score if not for the lack of evidence in (d), for which 1 point was deducted.</p> <p>(a) There is evidence that all participating educators engage in training, and in professional teams, including mentors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Educators receive support through mentors, collaborative teams and professional development to support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments</li> </ul>		

(ii) The plan provide evidence that educators are able to provide opportunities for students to learn through individual and group lessons and tasks based on their academic needs and interests.

(iii) The applicant uses CCGC and the state's longitudinal database to measure student progress toward college and career-ready goals

(iv) Through the Teacher Induction Plan at the district and the state's teacher and leader assessments. It is not evident whether the evaluation systems use frequent feedback.

(b) (i) Educators are trained to use actionable information, provided via technology teams, to identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests;

(ii) The plan includes high-quality learning resources , including digital resources such as kindles and laptops, to deliver content that is based on college and career readiness.

(iii) There is evidence processes and tools to match student needs - for example, collaborative teams that meet to assess student needs and design personalized learning, graduation coaches, counselors are trained to provide resources. Continuous feedback is not addressed as part of the plan.

(c) All participating school leaders and school leadership teams (as defined in this notice) have training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and accelerates student progress through common and individual tasks toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice). The training, policies, tools, data, and resources must include:

(i) The district uses the state assessment system for both teachers and leaders , which has an element to provide feedback

(ii) The plan shows evidence of training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps, including new teacher induction, professional development on every aspect of personalized learning.

(d) The is no evidence that the applicant has a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals

#### D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

##### (D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

There is a high-quality plan in place to support project implementation. The plan shows evidence that every student, educator are provided with support and resources.

The components of the criteria are all addressed, show evidence and are comprehensive. Therefore, a score of 15 was assigned.

(a) The district office is organized to provide support for the implementation of the project, as supported in the evidence and organization chart

(b) The principals at each school are given autonomy to plan calendars and courses and to manage their own funding

(c) The district uses software to help students earn credits (retrieval), project based learning and even uses technology for homebound students to attend class

(d) There is evidence that students have the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways, using project based learning, cooperative learning groups, differentiated instruction and other methods of personalized instruction.

(e) There is evidence that the plan contains learning resources and instructional practices for all students - including

students with disabilities and English learners. There is an ESL coordinator that is trained in personalized instruction and facilitates parent communication.

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

10

2

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant was awarded a score of 2 due to not showing evidence for a, part of b, c or d. There is no evidence of comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide support and resources. Although training is available to stakeholders, the response for technical support availability is absent. The response to this criteria is inadequate.

(a) There is no evidence that students, parents, educators and other stakeholders have access to content, tools and other learning resources both in and out of school. The applicant's response does not fully address this component of the criteria.

(b) The plan addresses and shows evidence of students, parent and other stakeholder availability of training, which is adequate. However, the plan does not address technical support availability for parents and other stakeholders

(c) Although the district utilizes several data systems for students, teachers, parents and leaders, there is no evidence that information can be exported in an open data format and used in other software or learning supports.

(d) The district does not use interoperable data systems, and in fact uses many different data systems that are not able to share data.

### E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The approach to continuously improving the plan is clear and concise, and meets the criteria's requirements. A score of 15 is awarded.

Progress and opportunities for improvement are shared publicly at several different venues, including board meetings, parent meetings, community and civic organization meetings. This is where the investments funded by Race to the Top-District will be shared, as well as their quality.

The plan has strong points such as benchmarking, progress monitoring, and modifying instructional practices based on data. Timely feedback will be shared in several venues - classroom, teacher groups, state assessment meetings, and parent meetings.

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

5

5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

There is evidence for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. This includes focus groups, parent/community liaisons, electronic mailboxes, open forums on initiatives and other. Parents and external stakeholders are included in high quality communication through focus groups, open board forums, and community engagement representatives, to name a few. These forms of communication and engagement show evidence of the district's commitment to continuously improve its plan.

Since the applicant's approach is clear and high-quality, and gives evidence of quality ongoing communication and engagement with all stakeholders, a score of 5 was assigned.

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

5

5

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The plan's performance measures are all ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and for all subgroups.

- (a) The rationale for selecting each measure is detailed, clear and concise
- (b) Each of the performance measures documents how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan
- (c) Each of the performance measures documents how the measure will be reviewed and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

The applicant has a total of 13 performance measures.

Since all of the criteria's components have been address and the responses are high quality, a score of 5 has been assigned.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant's response does not address evaluation of effectiveness of RTT-D funded activities. Rather, it gives evidence of existing professional development and technical support. The response does not give any evidence that there are activities in place that evaluate the effectiveness of RTT-D funded activities. The response lists current professional development underway, but does not speak to activities that would be implemented as a result of the award.</p> <p>Since the effectiveness of RTT-D activities and investments was not addressed, a score of 0 was assigned.</p>		

**F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)**

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant's budget is excellently prepared and presented - it is clear, concise and complete.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) all of the the funds are identified (there are only Race to the Top - District funds in the budget)</li> <li>(b) the budget is reasonable and sufficient to implement the proposal</li> <li>(c) The response provides a clear and thoughtful rationale for each category                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) all of the sources of funds and their description are complete (only Race to the Top - District funds are included)</li> <li>(ii) One-time investments are not differentiated as such</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>One point is being deducted for failure to identify one-time investments.</p>		

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>There is a brief discussion of possible funding sources after the term of the grant, including Title funds and state funds. However, there is no high-quality plan for sustainability.</p> <p>A high quality plan for sustainability of project goals will include, at a minimum, goals (not mentioned in response to (F)(2), activities to sustain the project goals (not addressed in the response), deliverables (not specifically responded to), and timelines (not included in response). As part of a possible response to deliverables, some Title funds were mentioned. The quality of this information was weak. The other elements of the plan are absent.</p> <p>A score of 2 is awarded for discussion of possible funding sources as part of deliverables, although weak.</p>		

### Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Since only one half of the elements were addressed and satisfied a score of 5 was assigned to this criteria.

(1) There is a complete and clear description of the sustainable partnerships that the applicant has formed with community organizations and higher education institutions

(2) Population-level results, including elementary students being able to read and increasing college and career readiness, are identified. They align with the applicant's Race to the Top - District plan.

(3) Describe how the partnership would –

(a) The selected indicators would be tracked using the same systems planned for in the Race to the Top-District proposal

(b) The applicant proposes to use the data to target its resources in order to improve results for participating students, but does not show evidence that there is special emphasis on students facing significant challenges, such as students with disabilities, English learners, and students affected by poverty

(c) There is no evidence that the applicant will develop a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students

(d) The plan includes how the partnership would improve results over time;

(4) There is some evidence that the partnership with Fort Valley Community College would integrate education and other services for participating students through the college student mentorship program.

(5) Describe how the partnership and LEA or consortium would build the capacity of staff in participating schools (as defined in this notice) by providing them with tools and supports to –

(a) there is no evidence of this element

(b) there is no evidence of this element

(c) there is no evidence of this element

(d) there is no evidence of this element

(e) there is no evidence of this element

(6) there is no evidence of this element

### Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's responses are complete and coherent and address all of the required elements regarding personalized learning environments. The Personalized Learning Plan (PLEP) builds on core educational assurance areas as evidenced in the implementation of Project Based Learning (PBL), job-embedded professional learning for teachers, curriculum alignment, differentiated instruction, the design and implementation of effective and balanced assessments and implementation of Summer Bridge Program. Student learning will be accelerated and deepened through project based learning, as evidenced professional development plans to train teachers to deliver PBL alternatives, and teacher collaborations to plan PBL. Digital resources such as Kindles and e books, as well as an instructional technologist will also deepen and accelerate student

learning. The responses show that the plan was well thought-out, well organized and evidence is provided to substantiate the plan. The plan includes supports for students and educators that are aligned with college-and-career ready standards, as evidenced in the employment of graduation coaches, and career awareness opportunities beginning in elementary school. The Absolute Priority has been met.

Total	210	171
-------	-----	-----