



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0407NC-1 for Wilson County Public Schools

### A. Vision (40 total points)

|  | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)   | 10        | 10    |
| <p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A1(a). The applicant provided an excellent summary of their project, their core beliefs, and their intent to create a “cradle-to-career” learning program. The description provided detailed the vision for a program clearly aligned with the four core educational assurances. This information also introduced a research based philosophy of personalized learning with strategies in place to overcome the barriers of rural isolation.</p> <p>Five primary components are laid out with brief summaries of each. These indicate a well thought-out plan of action built upon past grant success and intensive work to collaborate with all local partners to support the schools.</p> <p>The vision section proposed a transformative change for the students in WCS through implementation of all five components of Project Greenlight. This includes 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.</p> <p>Based on the information provided this criterion was scored in the high range.</p> |           |       |
| (A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)  | 10        | 10    |
| <p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) The applicant proposed to serve all schools in the district. A gradual approach is planned starting in pilot schools which include a high school and its feeder campuses. They will then roll out the components of the project at the remaining schools. Rationale for which schools to begin was presented, including assurance that the schools are eligible to participate. This explanation of the vision was noted as a strength.</p> <p>(b) The list of schools is provided.</p> <p>(c) The applicant proposes to serve 9,627 students which is 100% of students in the district and 738 educators. A2 charts are provided with all demographic information for each school. These reflect high needs and high poverty statistics for most schools.</p> <p>Based on the information in a and c and the data on schools provided in the charts (b), this criterion was scored in the high range.</p>   |           |       |
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)  | 10        | 10    |
| <p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A(3). The applicant described an interesting scale up which includes the entire community. This will be achieved through a partnership with the community owned internet provider. Through this linkage the district will place internet in the homes throughout the community where there is currently no connectivity including the housing project which provides homes for very high poverty families. A stakeholder group was proposed to oversee this process and be responsible for management of the district wide reform. Professional development will be carried out through <i>trainer-of-trainer</i> models to support sustainability. An appropriate theory of change model is provided in chart format that clearly outlines the plan and the outcomes for this LEA wide reform vision. Additional information is provided in Section X: Competitive Preference that includes more detail on the partnership that will support scale up of technology access for students and families.</p> <p>Based on the information provided and the strengths as noted in A3, this criterion was scored in the high range.</p>                                     |           |       |
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)  | 10        | 8     |

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(A)(4)(a) The applicant provided targets for student improvement based on the 2011-2012 baseline year at approximately 9% growth each year. Summative assessments being used (at 8th, 10th, and 11th grades) are provided along with the methodology for determining status and growth. These included: ACT Battery of Tests including ACT, PLAN, and EXPLORE. For methodology: Percent of students achieving College Ready Benchmark Scores on all four subjects and Increase in students scoring at or above College Ready Benchmark Scores on all four subjects. State standards were not provided in the narrative to compare four year growth projections to state requirements. This was noted as a weakness.

(b) Reduction of achievement gaps or Math was estimated at approximately 1% for Hispanic and 2% for Black students and is based on students taking the End-of-Grade (EOG) and Tests of Reading and Math grades 3-8 are measured by proficiency and compared by race. Although the overall reduction is 1%-2% per year, the applicant provided the 2010-11 optional year which indicated a reduction of 3% for Hispanic and 1% for Black students in one year previously. This was an indication that the applicant knows their students and their capacity at this time for student improvement. Reduction of reading gaps was projected to improve as similar to the Math. It appears the applicant intends to reduce gaps and states rates that are achievable. It is not clear that the stated rates are ambitious enough. For example, the rate of improvement from the optional year to the current year is actually greater than the projected reductions through the grant period. This was noted as a weakness related to the ambitiousness of the projections.

(c) Graduation rates are projected to improve at approximately 3% each year. A breakdown of subgroups is provided and appears achievable.

(d) College enrollment data was provided based on cohort rate and reflects a dramatic gap between the overall rate and the subgroups. It was noted that there is a tremendous gap in the college enrollment of subgroups, specifically black and Hispanic. The projections do not close this gap to any great degree even after four years of the project. The data presented does not seem to calculate correctly when looking at the overall rate compared to the subgroups. This is noted as a weakness.

(e) Postsecondary attainment was not addressed which was optional.

Based on the information provided this criterion was scored in the high range though weaknesses were noted on a, b, and d.

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        | 14    |

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The applicant provided a listing of strategies used over the past four years to improve student achievement. Data was provided that indicated measurable improvements: 2008-2009, 43.9% of Black students graduated, and in 2012, that number grew to 67.2%, in 2008, 43.9% of Hispanic students graduated, and in 2012, that number grew to 67.1%, in 2008, 71.7% of White students graduated and in 2012, 80.7% of White students graduated. The overall graduation rate has improved dramatically over the past four years going from 58.2% in 2008 to 72.6% in 2012. No other data to indicate the record of success was provided in this section though in subsequent sections information on proficiency rates was provided that indicated dramatic improvements in math and reading.

(b) Data was provided for a low performing High School, Middle School, and Elementary School which showed growth over 3 years in math and reading proficiency.

(c) The applicant stated that district data managers work with students, educators, and parents to share data transparently including through the North Carolina Window on Student Education (NC Wise) and Common Education Data Analysis & Reporting System (CEDARS). Data managers also work with parents to help them navigate through the North Carolina School Report Cards website, which provides information about student achievement, attendance, class size, school safety, teacher quality, and school technology. Parents and students also receive yearly reports for each student from WCS that explain achievement levels and percentiles for proficiency. These strategies are appropriate to address this subcriterion though a weakness was noted in that though students have mobile devices there was no information on how the access to these allow opportunities for frequent student performance data to be shared with parents.

Based on the information provided this criterion was scored in the high range based on the strengths of a and b and the one weakness determined in c.

|  |    |    |
|--|----|----|
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)   | 5  | 5  |
| <p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) The applicant's Board of Education discusses the personnel salaries for all school-level instructional and support staff at each board meeting before the position is created and the salaries are captured in the Board meeting notes which are then published on the district website. In addition, support staff salaries are published in a community guide.</p> <p>(b) As reflected in (a) salaries are discussed at board meetings and published in the guide for instructional staff. Although not currently in place, the district is considering publishing actual salaries of personnel through the human resources website.</p> <p>(c) As reflected in (a) salaries are discussed at board meetings and published in the guide for teachers. Although not currently in place, the district is considering publishing actual teachers' salaries through the human resources website.</p> <p>(d) Currently, the district publishes actual non-personnel expenditures at the district level, including special programs, utilities, maintenance, etc. Expenditures at the school level are not currently made available to the public, but are shared upon request.</p> <p>Based on the information provided for a through d, this criterion was scored in the high range.</p> |    |    |
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)  | 10 | 10 |
| <p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant addresses this criterion at the state department of education level by providing reference to statutes that allow LEAs to have the power or duty to provide an adequate school system and for local boards of education to provide adequate school systems within their respective local school administrative units. The applicant also provides information that the state legislating body has specified that LEAs have the power to regulate policies and decisions of their choosing that will support personalized learning. In addition, as a RTT state, the North Carolina state board of education set forth goals that reinforce their support for LEA autonomy in implementing a personalized learning environment. The READY initiative in the state encourages LEAs in North Carolina to implement personalized learning, specifically the use of technology to improve instruction.</p> <p>Based on the strength of the policies in place at the state level in information provided, this criterion was scored in the high range.</p>   |    |    |
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)  | 10 | 10 |
| <p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) The applicant stated that the proposal represents the ideas and input of students, families, teachers, principals, business leaders, and community partners. Planning was begun with vision planning sessions with over 40 stakeholders which are listed and which include a broad representation of the community. This included nine students. The applicant then followed this initial session with focus groups, parent information nights, and teacher information nights. This process concluded with the Board of Education unanimously approving a resolution in support of the application on October 15, 2012.</p> <p>(ii) 100% of teachers approved the project elements.</p> <p>(b) Numerous letters of support are provided in the appendix materials.</p> <p>The response to this criterion was determined to be in the high range based on the strengths in a and b.</p>  |    |    |
| (B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)   | 5  | 4  |
| <p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal describes an example of the needs analysis through presentation of the process at the middle school. District leaders examined the existing programs and met with stakeholder groups including students, teachers, and parents to understand the needs. The applicant provides an example of these meetings which identified 12 major outstanding areas determined to be lacking.</p> <p>These needs included training on: differentiated instruction with Common Core Standards, in-class grouping strategies, classroom management strategies, using assessment data as formative in making instructional decisions, and eight additional topics.</p> <p>There seems to be a slight gap between the analysis of the needs which are very focused on the teacher needs and the strategy of community wide access which was mentioned as the key innovation but not tied to the needs analysis that was</p>   |    |    |

noted as a weakness.

The response to this criterion was determined to be in the high range based on their provision of a high quality plan for the analysis of the current status and the logic behind the proposed reform strategies including needs and gaps to be addressed. Only one weakness was noted.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a description of how they will implement their model but do not provide a high quality plan with key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and the parties responsible the activities. The credibility of the information provided in this section is addressed through the specific criterion:

C1(a)(i) The applicant proposes the implementation of a plan that blends both online and onsite learning that will be student-directed and student-centered but supported by high-quality teachers. Also proposed is a Personalized Learning Plan, which will provide a blueprint for graduating college- and career- ready students. Students will also engage in an “onboarding” experience that explains the relevance of learning and discusses their interests and backgrounds. The applicant states that educators will provide strong messages to students and parents about the global context of the instructional program.

(ii) The applicant’s plan is for teachers to embed college-and career-ready standards in lesson plans tied to learner profiles. Students use their learner profiles to design, monitor, and pace their educational programs, thus giving them better understanding of their progress toward achieving their goals. The plan includes using online learning as a cornerstone of the educational experience, so that students will be exposed to high quality digital content aligned to college-and career- ready standards. Expansion of broadband to student’s homes will allow learning to take place anytime and anywhere.

(iii) The applicant proposed that as students have a truer understanding about what school is supposed to help them do, they will be able to select areas of study that are interesting to them and aligned with their interests and desired careers. The applicant stated that instead of focusing on a deficit model, the staff will cultivate students’ cognitive and non-cognitive strengths and building education plans that match on areas of student strength.

(iv) The applicant will provide digital ways that students can connect with students in other countries to collaborate on projects, go on virtual field trips, and use search engines to research topics aligned with their interests. They proposed that integrating online learning will ensure that students will be able to access desired subject content if the district doesn’t offer a specific course in a particular discipline.

(v) The applicant stated that students’ personal learning plans will help them develop perseverance and problem solving. The proposed models of learning will allow teachers to facilitate or coach students instead of providing “one-size-fits-all” content for students who are then tested on content. Personal learning plans will include developing skills such as critical thinking, problem solving, and working as part of a team. Each student’s plan will include records of their unique strengths and will reinforce their academic goals, interests, and talents that they can apply toward college and work.

The narrative provided addresses the subcriterion at a minimal level, with more specific detail lacking related to a high quality plan.

C1(b)(i) Using technology and digital learning products, district educators select content that aligns with skill development for each individual student. Because students will have digital devices and the ability to use them at home students can pace their learning and use preferences to master content being taught in school.

The information provided does indicate sufficient access to personalized instructional content.

(ii) The applicant stated that learning and development goals will be taught using a variety of learning approaches, for example, student-led discussions and project based learning. The applicant also stated that in tech-rich learning environments, there is an opportunity for K-12 classrooms to function as college level seminars complete with workshops or sessions that students can elect to attend if the topics match their areas of interest.

Specific detail regarding other variety of instructional approaches is lacking for this subcriterion.

(iii) The applicant proposed a blended learning model where educators blend the best available onsite and online learning tools and programs. They stated that teachers may read reviews of products from other educators and test them for appropriateness. The district will also scale blended learning platforms that they are already using on the campuses where

this approach is being used that are working well for students. Both the online and offline content that teachers use with students will be based on college-and career-ready standards and will incorporate the Common Core State Standards as well as capabilities for intervention, assessment, data management, professional development, and school improvement.

Detail is lacking on how the district will make these resources available for all students and teachers.

(C)(1)(b)(iv)(A)(iv)(B) The applicant proposed to engage students not only through the content but also in tracking their own progress and development. The digital tools will provide students with immediate and real-time feedback and results which help them understand and track their progress and control their pace.

Specific digital tools are not described in detail.

(C)(1)(b)(v) The applicant described provision of student access to accommodations and strategies primarily through the use of the digital tools. The applicant stated that converting from textbook to digital learning will be especially helpful for high-need students such as English Language Learners and students with disabilities since they will be able to pace their learning and also identify their learning levels which teachers can then use to provide necessary accommodations.

No information is provided to address the needs of students with disabilities.

The narrative addressed the minimum requirements for each subcriterion and the scoring was determined to be in the medium range based primarily on the lack of a high quality plan that meets the RTT-D requirements.

(C)(1)(c) The applicant will provide students and parents training and support for tools through workshops as well as in-school supports. Technology facilitators will be assigned to each school to help and school leadership teams at each school will help determine what help is needed to support students and teachers in the shift to digital learning. This explanation lacks specific details to fully address the need for support.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides narrative descriptions addressing each sub criterion but does not provided a high quality plan with key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and the parties responsible for the activities. The credibility of the information provided is addressed aligned the specific criterion below:

C2(a) In this section the applicant proposed that the primary approach for professional development will be through educator coaching and collaboration. Utilizing a professional learning community is mentioned in C2(a)(ii) specifically, to build teacher capacity and awareness for supporting student progress but there is no detail provided in this section. Additional information is provided which was reviewed in C2(b). This information indicated an understanding of best practices in professional development of educators.

(i) The applicant will establish Coordinator positions to support leadership and coaching models. The district will then develop master teachers and leaders from within. Because they have experience with RTT through the state, this may be an effective approach though specific detail is lacking.

(ii) The applicant addressed this subcriterion primarily through the engagement of curriculum facilitators, technology facilitators, and media specialists in webinars or workshops offered on the best practices in personalized learning and teaching. The applicant also proposed that educators will collaborate and study new models for learning that encourage students to pursue their own interests and subjects in depth. Curriculum facilitators, technology facilitators and media specialists will work with teachers in professional learning communities to build their capacity and awareness for supporting student progress. These leaders will support teachers in understanding how to use assessments to motivate and engage students . The teachers will then be able to adjust content and instruction to fit the needs and interests of individual students both in and out of school. This is adequate to evaluate the applicant's intent to ensure teachers adapt content to individual needs.

(iii) The applicant described the professional development provided currently at an academy where they have been piloting the proposed approach if the RTT-D is funded. Teachers will learn to better utilize formative data to make instructional decisions. Information on the frequency of measuring student progress is not addressed.

(iv) The applicant described the NC Education Evaluation System (NCEES) which is the statewide principal and teacher evaluation system set forth by the state which was described as a rigorous, transparent and fair evaluation system. The applicant will encourage the use of data from teacher and principal evaluations to determine supports and recommendations for improving effectiveness. Student performance data is available through the use of digital and online educational tools, which will be used to inform teacher and principal evaluations. The description provided is appropriate for this subcriterion.

(C)(2)(b)(i) The applicant described strategies for establishing learning targets and assessments that will help teachers make instructional choices.

(ii) The applicant stated that teachers will have access to online educational resources and high quality offline instructional content and assessments that are aligned with college-and career-ready standards.

(iii) The applicant proposed that educators will constantly monitoring each student's learning profile using the real-time feedback and data outputted from online learning tools to discover needs and then match these needs to the learning tools.

(c)(i) The applicant intends to encourage leaders and leadership teams to use information and data to drive what structures they eventually select to implement in their schools to support personalized learning.

(d) The applicant proposed several strategies to support teachers in becoming more effective including: enhance incentive and supplement stipends for teachers at priority schools (schools with the largest numbers of high-need students), expand plan for teachers to add additional content areas to their licenses through 24 semester hours of coursework, provide training to teachers specifically about Common Core State Standards, promote a campaign around encouraging teachers to apply for and achieve National Board Certification, and to strengthen tuition reimbursement programs with higher education institutions for teachers. Additional appropriate strategies are also proposed.

Because the applicant does not provide a high quality plan with key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and the parties responsible for the activities, this criterion was rated in the medium 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:

A high quality plan was not provided though the applicant did provide somewhat generic descriptions under each subcriterion.

(a) The applicant stated that the Board of Education has existing practices and regulations which describe that WCS as a "learning organization" where all staff understands the purpose of the education program and is committed to helping students graduate ready for college and the workplace. Two Executive Directors are responsible for providing oversight at the elementary and secondary levels respectively. The applicant proposed to build upon its current practices to ensure they are consistent with supporting student centered education. There is insufficient information to determine how the Central office supports the model other than the two Executive Directors which was noted as a weakness.

(b) Each school will develop a School Support Team responsible for coordinating direct support to principals and schools. The School Support Team will look at student performance data weekly, monitoring performance and then providing the appropriate supports. (The applicant provides this brief statement about school level teams under the heading of (a)). The applicant stated that school leadership teams will be responsible for implementing procedures and practices that work best for their students. Examples are provided and may include policies around the amount of homework students have or schools may decide to eliminate homework altogether. School leaders will also be able to make their own decisions and policies around bell schedules, grouping, and the amount of seat-time that is required.

(c) The applicant stated that due to the diverse learning experiences of students, WCS educators will not be able to determine mastery based on the amount of time spent on a topic. School administrators will be able to craft their visions of what mastery looks like for their students in their professional learning communities.

(d) Applicant provided a description of flexibility in the amount of times students are assessed for mastery, assessment, and competency-based curriculum practices that move away from a one-size-fits all model and toward a personalized educational experience. The applicant cited new practices, assessments, educator collaboration, and the use of rubrics to allow personalized strategies for mastery of standards.

(e) The applicant described empowering teachers to identify if a student is struggling on their pathway to mastery and then providing the appropriate and necessary supports and interventions for students that are adaptable for their needs. The applicant did not adequately address providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners. This was noted as a weakness.

Because of the weaknesses cited and the fact that the applicant did not provide a high quality plan with key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and the parties responsible for the activities, this criterion was rated in the medium range.

|  |    |   |
|--|----|---|
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)   | 10 | 6 |
| <p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant did not present a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure though they did provide somewhat generic statements describing how they provide every student, educator, and level of the education system with support and resources.</p> <p>(a) The applicant stated that the access provided through the proposed connectivity will ensure that teachers and students can have access to high-quality online content to be used in instruction both in and out of school. The connectivity will allow for broadband for all WCS students and teachers, even to the most rural areas fostering digital literacy.</p> <p>(b) In addition to basic technological support, the applicant stated that they will ensure that all community partners who are working in the selected technology hubs will receive training and support on how to best use devices and online content. Parent Academies are proposed to address important topics on digital learning with supporting information provided in the appendix.</p> <p>(c) All technology devices and information systems that the applicant proposes will allow for parents and students to create, store, and disseminate data in a secure data format. The applicant will also adopt standards stating that any applications, tools, learning supports chosen will have the capabilities and functionality to import and export student data.</p> <p>(d)The applicant stated they develop an infrastructure that allows for schools to use interoperable and compatible data systems, including those that manage student information, learning materials, and financial data.</p> <p>Because the applicant does not provide a high quality plan with key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and the parties responsible for the activities, this criterion was rated in the medium range.</p> |    |   |

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

|   | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)   | 15        | 7     |
| <p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant did not provide a high quality plan with key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and the parties responsible for the activities to address this criterion. In this section the applicant refers to a plan but it is not evident in the narrative or the appendices.</p> <p>E1. Five components are described with elements of effectiveness and strategies for measuring progress. While these strategies include activities appropriate for monitoring progress and providing feedback for improvement they do not provide a rigorous continuous improvement process.This was noted as a weakness.</p> <p>Because of the lack of a high quality and rigorous plan for continuous improvement, this criterion was rated in the medium range.</p>  |           |       |
| (E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)  | 5         | 2     |
| <p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The group that created the mission and vision of applicant's proposal in the Vision Planning Session will serve as the primary stakeholder group for the project and will be responsible for oversight and communication efforts about the project's progress including maintaining the content of the project website which will be the main source for information about the initiative.</p> <p>The website and the email dropbox will updated weekly and the stakeholder group meetings will be open to the public. Appropriate strategies are listed for communication and engagement of parents, teachers, the community and various organizations. The primary weakness which result in a low evaluation of this criterion is the lack of a plan structured around goals, objectives, persons responsible and a timeline.</p> |           |       |
|   |           |       |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| (E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)  | 5 | 1 |
| <p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant will use the current state evaluation system for teachers. Highly effective teaching will be based on the Measures of Student Learning (MSL). The applicant will also use the current state evaluation system to determine the “highly-effective” status of educators based on a rating of distinguished in the current five standards with an aim to increase the number of teachers and principals who receive the distinguished rating across all five standards. The performance measures were outlined in the charts provided.</p> <p>The performance measures overall, and by subgroup, are provided in the E3 charts. This includes targets for each year and for the post-grant year. These were somewhat modest given the needs of the students. This was rated as a weakness relative to the requirement that the targets be ambitious.</p> <p>An appropriate rationale (a) was provided for each measure. Information is lacking on how the measure will provide formative information tailored to the plan (b) and how the measure will be reviewed over time (c).</p> <p>Because of the weaknesses in the ambitiousness and the inadequate information on a and c, this criterion was rated as low.</p>  |   |   |
| (E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)   | 5 | 1 |
| <p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant proposed a mixed method evaluation. For example, to evaluate the success of investments (AP Professional Development), the applicant will employ methods such as cognitive coaching for participating AP teachers to examine how effectively they apply the content they gain from program training. No thorough description of the mixed method strategies are presented other than this example which is inadequate and a significant weakness. This does not provide enough information for the applicant to make adjustments and revisions during implementation of the proposed project.</p> <p>The strategy for evaluation is described as a focus on baseline student, teacher, school, and district data across all components. Additionally, implementation and processes of each component and the entire initiative will be reviewed. To evaluate efforts around impact and sustainability, the applicant plans to use a cost-benefit analysis procedure. By focusing on evaluating performance and impact, the applicant will be able to make informed decisions about the best use of time, staff, funding and resources in the best interest of its students.</p> <p>The applicant proposed that Results of evaluations will be continually shared with stakeholders in an effort to increase support for improvement and impact. Outcomes of evaluations will drive decisions about human resources and compensation, modification of school structures, use of technology, and community engagement.</p> <p>Because of the weaknesses as noted and lack of information this criterion was rated as low.</p> |   |   |

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

|   | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)   | 10        | 7     |
| <p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>A complete budget narrative is lacking though information is provided in the required tables that allow evaluation of this criterion, overall.</p> <p>(a) The applicant provides the overall budget which includes a total of \$26,144,507. This includes approximately \$24 million from RTT-D and \$2 million from other funding sources. A one-time cost for implementing the infrastructure for connectivity is included. The budget includes personnel needed to carry out the project including a new Coordinator position and Facilitators who can support personalized learning and train teachers. The budget also includes travel and costs related to the extensive professional development training and coaching needed for teachers and leaders. The equipment costs reflect the additional digital devices needed for personalized instruction. The budget also supports supplies needed for workshops that will build capacity of parents and community members in supporting the project. The funding from other sources (approximately 2 million) represents the funding already being used at the middle school to provide students with individual devices.</p> |           |       |

(b) The overall budget and the project level breakdown provide enough information to determine that the project is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal as it is presented throughout the narrative.

(c) This subcriteria is lacking in evidence though, (i) a description of all of the funds requested from RTT-D to be used in supporting the project is presented. The \$2.1 million funding is described as the value of the devices being currently used but a source to identify these funds (ii) for this funding is not provided. Therefore a weakness was noted.

Because there is not a complete narrative and inadequate information is provided for (c) the criterion was rated as medium.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided only minimal information to support sustainability. They described this aspect by providing further information of the proposed components. Personnel were addressed as either start-up or for those vital to fund after federal funding ends but no plan was described to fund them. Training will be sustained as coaches and trainers are trained they will then train future cohorts. Advisory boards will continue to meet after the grant period.

The applicant states the technology will be sustainable because fiber optic technology is a one-time investment. The devices for students and teachers will be sustained by encouraging participants to "bring their own." This seems inadequate to truly sustain a system of learning dependent on the technology. This does not address obsolescence which is a key aspect of sustaining technology.

The applicant did not provide a high quality plan with key goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and the parties responsible for the activities to address this criterion and thus, sustainability was rated in the medium range.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

|   | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points) | 10        | 6     |

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

(1) Throughout the application, the applicant discusses the partnership with two organizations, the county housing authority and a community internet provider that serves the county. This section provides adequate detail of how a coherent and sustainable partnership will be used to support the project components. A narrative description with data is provided with sufficient detail to determine a program strength in this area. A weakness regarding the partnership with the internet provider was determined after reviewing the budget. Because the funding for the connectivity will come from the grant, it appears that the partnership is more of a vendor relationship. Internet connectivity is provided by the City to the entire community free of charge currently. Grant funds will cover costs of fiber optic cable to the housing authority which will allow them to have connectivity through the City.

(2) Three educational results and one family and community result are identified. The desired results are presented but not as measurable outcomes. This was noted as a weakness since accomplishment of the results stated in the generic statements as provided by the applicant will be difficult to ascertain.

(3) (a) Insufficient information is provided to determine how the partnership would address this subcriteria.

Related to subcriteria 3(b), one subpopulation facing significant challenges that would benefit are students affected by poverty, though there is not enough evidence in the plan to track progress or the impact of the partnership on this subgroup. The applicant states that district will work with the Housing Authority to set ambitious yet achievable goals. Since these are projected to be established after the grant is funded there is not enough evidence provided to determine if these will be ambitious and achievable.

(c) The strategy to scale impact of the partnership will be through training mentors at the new hubs to provide training to facilitate and support individualized instruction. The applicant also proposes to enable staff to serve pre-K students and parents during the school day through the connectivity at the housing project in an effort to boost student's readiness for kindergarten which is noted as a strength.

(d) No information is provided to determine how this will improve results over time though clearly, if more pre-k students are exposed to learning opportunities by their parents then they will enter school with a greater likelihood of success. A weakness was noted because of insufficient information.

(4) The applicant states that the partnership would will allow staff to be trained on technology and personalized learning platforms so they can better assist the students they currently work with, within participating schools. Four other ways are listed to support students and families which would integrate education and student support.

(5) The partnership provides infrastructure for connectivity to a housing authority where many of the lowest income students and families reside. The intent for connectivity allows students and parent's access to academic resources of the school and student achievement data as well as education for parents. This does not build the capacity of the staff by providing them with tools and supports which is an important aspect of this criterion as noted in subcriterion a, b, c, and e. The partnership does address d. as it clearly supports the engagement of parents and families as they gain greater access to the school programs and resources.

(6) The applicant identifies six performance measures which they state are provided in measureable terms on the charts in Section E. A review of these charts revealed that these children are included in the overall performance targets for the grant and are not delineated separately. Because that section (E) and the performance measures, specifically, were rated as not meeting the standard of ambitious and achievable, this subcriterion was determined to be insufficient and a weakness noted.

The competitive preference was rated in the medium range. The applicant clearly proposes a partnership that would help low income families. A detailed plan is lacking which would have generated strengths. Specific weaknesses were noted including inadequate information to track outcomes, and a more detailed description of the role of the partner providing internet connectivity.

### Absolute Priority 1

|                     | Available   | Score   |
|---------------------|-------------|---------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | Met/Not Met | Not Met |

#### Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

It is clear that the applicant understands the concepts of personalized learning and as a school in a RTT state they have experience on a limited basis (at their middle school), to the principles of a personalized learning system. They fail to present a coherent and comprehensive approach to address how it will build on the core educational assurance areas, to create learning environments that are designed 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. It is also not clear how their approach will 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. Because of these weaknesses it was determined that the Absolute Priority was not met.

|       |     |     |
|-------|-----|-----|
| Total | 210 | 143 |
|-------|-----|-----|



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0407NC-2 for Wilson County Public Schools

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

|  | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points) | 10        | 8     |

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The five priority areas of the Wilson County Schools' proposed Project Greenlight plan effectively address the four core educational assurance areas as defined in the notice. The proposal has identified key outcomes as well as providing a short narrative description of each.

The first component of the plan will address equity access through technology. This is intended to also address the turning around of low-performing schools but the narrative in this section did not elaborate on how that link would bring about improvement for those schools.

The second component of college- and career-readiness is based mainly on college level class offerings both in the traditional structure and on-line. This section did not address the career-readiness of all students.

The third component is focused on personalized learning for students. Personalized learning plans for each student is mentioned but details of how that will be adopted are not outlined in this section. The considerations of blended learning offerings, differentiated instruction, data for informed decision-making, and deeper instructional roles for the teacher will be helpful if implemented in concert with a well-developed plan.

The fourth priority of effective teaching is proposed to be implemented through professional development that appears to be well-rounded with support to learn more about technology, personalized learning, and college- and career-ready standards.

Growth and success for students is suggested to be the component that will ensure sustainability through data tracking systems, transparency of student data, and personalized learning plans.

The applicant has identified critical considerations for developing a comprehensive and coherent reform vision for the district but has not clearly outlined the major steps for moving forward resulting in a score in the high range of 8 out of 10.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has listed the schools, participating students, participating educators, and the percentages of high-need and low-income students. The applicant has indicated that all 25 schools in the district will participate as an intentional effort to provide equity but some schools will serve as pilot schools. The lists and data for this section of the application are complete but the decision-making process on pilot schools selection in starting the initial stage of implementation was not explained. With this minor omission of information, the applicant has scored in the very high range with a score of 9 out of 10.

|   |    |   |
|---|----|---|
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
|---|----|---|

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant effectively provided a graphic flow chart that emphasizes the components of the plan with short descriptors and a resulting outcome of students graduating as college- and career-ready. Details were also provided in the narrative that show expansion of the internet connections to low-income housing students and families for equity in connectivity and access. Although the high speed communications network expansion will provide an important link in the system, this section did not address the scaled up and meaningful reform of student learning outcomes. For addressing the criterion in most of the elements as found in A3 but not fully addressing the LEA-wide reform and change, the applicant has scored in the upper level of the medium range for a score of 7 out of 10.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The Wilson County school district is proposing to raise proficiency levels as tracked on summative assessments to a minimum level of 55% over the next five years at grades 8, 10, and 11. The decreasing achievement gap, even over time, remains at a different level for Hispanic students as compared to white students than for the black students compared to the white students. The graduation rates for sub-groups are also at levels that range from 58 to 89 percent with the Hispanic and black rates at 78% compared to 89% of white students. The A4d chart shows a higher college enrollment rate for the black student population than any other subgroup.

The data provided for this criterion appears to be complete but at a slightly low or inconsistent target for all subgroups for a slightly lower than maximum score of 8 out of 10.

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 has presented an extensive list of evidence that demonstrates efforts to improve student student learning and achievement through technology, professional learning communities, collaborative planning and partnerships, and teacher support but the results of these individual efforts are not discussed, although the increases in graduation rates over the last four years is impressive. Turnaround efforts at three schools (an elementary, middle school, and high school) are evidenced by data that shows significant growth in math and English language arts scores with a minimum of 20% growth to a high level growth at 51%.</p> <p>The applicant reports that student performance data is available digitally but the extend of how that is communicated to parents and students is unclear. It appears that educators have access to a system that presents information in a variety of formats for educator use.</p> <p>This criterion was addressed in all aspects but the information that was not provided on the extent of information provided to parents and students has resulted in a score that is at the slightly lower end of the high score level for 13 out of 15.</p>  |           |       |
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)   | 5         | 2     |
| <p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has described the process by which the four categories of school-level expenditures from state and local funds are made available to the general public. The main vehicle for communication is information posted on the website as a district aggregate but the expenditures are not reported by school. School level information on non-personnel expenditures are available by request but that makes the transparency somewhat less so.</p> <p>The district publishes the same aggregate information in a district guide for the community, provided as an insert in the local newspaper, but the narrative does not indicate how often this guide is sent out. This is not clear as to the extent of the availability of the guide and, therefore, the amount of transparency involved.</p> <p>Actual figures for the four categories of expenditures are not provided in this application.</p> <p>The applicant has made available the minimum amount of information on this criterion that includes a description of the extent to which the applicant has already made available the four categories of school-level expenditures from State and local funds but the omission of additional information and evidence of the actual funding amounts and some low levels of transparency have resulted in a score in the low range of medium for 2 out of 5 points possible.</p> |           |       |
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)  | 10        | 10    |
| <p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided a narrative that outlines several indicators of conditions and policies that support autonomy for schools to be in a position of implementing personalized learning environments. The citations include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the structure of the North Carolina Public Education system as outlined in general statutes ( North Carolina General Statutes Chapter 115C)</li> <li>• North Carolina General Assembly statutes</li> <li>• North Carolina State Board of Education - Project Greenlight plan and mission</li> <li>• North Carolina State Board of Education (SBE) Race to the Top state goals</li> <li>• the leadership of North Carolina State Governor, Beverly Purdue</li> <li>• The Business Education Technology Alliance state initiative</li> <li>• the READY initiative of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI)</li> </ul> <p>These numerous citations provide a variety of evidence of existing conditions and autonomy that will support a reform program centered on personalized learning environments for a maximum score of 10 out of 10.</p>  |           |       |
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)  | 10        | 6     |

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The report provides an impressive profile of stakeholders that came together for a full-day meeting to outline the vision, mission, and belief statements for Project Greenlight as well as parent information meetings for the i2PLAN initiative regarding digital resources for students, personalized learning, and blended learning models. The Board of Education unanimously approved a resolution in support of the district's application for Race to the Top - District funding. Letters of recommendation for this project are impressive and broad-based in support.

The evidence of educator support showed very supportive teachers who will welcome personalized learning environments in their schools as well as utilize digital learning devices in the classroom but the language is so vague that it is not clear exactly what teachers are supporting. No evidence of support for the overall plan from the local bargaining units or from 70% of the teachers in the participating schools was presented.

In spite of all of the goals from the various stakeholder groups that will complement the program, it is unclear how much coordination was garnered from the various groups for a single plan and a single set of objectives. It is unclear if these groups were united in the understanding of a single coherent effort in meeting a coordinated set of goals. Evidence of stakeholder engagement and support from all groups is unclear as to the extent.

The unclarity of the coherence of the objectives as supported by the various groups and the omission of clear bargaining unit (or 70% of all teachers) support has resulted in a score in the medium range of 6 out of 10 possible.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The district has developed an impressive list of professional development needs that will be critical to implementation of personalized learning environments with the appropriate technology. The professional development needs appear to be very comprehensive and thoughtfully considered in preparing the instructional staff to support learning plans. The move toward blended learning plans will require adjustments to teaching strategies and greater collaboration among the education specialists and those elements are listed. Discussion of the logic of the gaps identified is somewhat sparse.

The analysis of the needs and gaps does not address the types of processes that will need to be developed in working with students on personalized learning nor does it discuss the logistical issues associated with a new system such as scheduling, work spaces, teacher roles and responsibilities, etc. The gap and need analysis does not appear to involve other stakeholder groups such as parents and community partners with any definitive outcomes.

The professional development analysis is a good start in discussing the ways to address the gaps and needs but more in-depth discussion with a broader range of stakeholders will need to be scheduled as a part of the process. This criterion has scored in the high range of 4 out of 5 due to the effective steps taken in starting this process.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal identifies many critical learning goals that will be accessed by technology through strategies such as 21st century skills, project-based learning, and individual learning plans. The plan relies heavily on technology for curriculum and content delivery. Teacher support and assistance appear to be less designed at this time. A dual enrollment program that is currently in existence at one of the schools in the district is purported to have some transferable structures that will assist in district-wide program development.

The deep understanding of personal learning interests is defined in the proposal as learning styles and self-directed access to content but the role of the teacher as a facilitator in the process is not clearly addressed. The individual learning plans are described as based on student goals but it is unclear what process will be used to help the student set goals, identify personal interests, and determine knowledge and skills needed for goal accomplishment. Deep learning is not addressed in terms of skill development such as problem-solving and constructing learning through scaffolded content nor is it addressed in developing content-specific pathways.

The narrative outlines some good suggestions as to how technology can provide access and exposure to diverse content and the implication that this will result in project-based learning is positive. The narrative states that traits and skills such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving will be inherent in the

proposed system that accesses on-line resources but the narrative does not make this connection clear. Teacher guidance, a critical part of this process, is not detailed in this section.

The narrative states that content for each student will require preparation on the part of the educators to either find the appropriate programs (on-line or as a blended program) or to be able to assist the students in finding content to match their educational pathways . The proposal does acknowledge that teachers will be investing time and effort to researching available programs and, in some cases, creating digital resources for the student. It would be easy to underestimate the time commitment for this and the plan does not suggest how teachers will use time available during the school day or be compensated for time above and beyond a reasonable work day.

Work plans will have incremental steps for content mastery but teacher feedback is not addressed as to how often or what type of systematic review structure will be introduced. High-need students will be addressed through the same type of teacher review process. Although support is described in the narrative as available, specific workshops and training and support sessions are not outlined logistically with respect to time frames such as a regular schedule or with consideration as to how technical support might be made available.

For each section of this criteria, the proposed plan seems to have a reasonable set of guidelines that could be developed into a more comprehensive plan but due to the lack of some of the detail that would help to support the student learning in this plan, the score for this section is in the lower end of the high range scoring at 15 out of 20.

|   |    |    |
|---|----|----|
| (C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points) | 20 | 12 |
|---|----|----|

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The plan emphasizes professional development for high-quality teaching and leading in technology and digital content, data analysis and use, Coordinators will work with the teachers from within the system in a coaching model and through professional learning communities. The applicant states that teachers will be working collaboratively in teams to establish learning targets based on Common Core standards. The district-wide sharing of digital resources is characterized in the application as providing a basis for sharing information between educators as well as for a communication platform on which students and parents will be able to monitor and review progress toward student goals. The applicant also has identified optimal learning strategies such as inquiry-based learning and student-led discussions as part of the deeper learning experiences of the students. The applicant has provided some details on the on-going monitoring of student learning progress in various sections of the application.

The applicant does not directly address how students will demonstrate understanding of how their learning goals are related to college- and career-ready goals. The strategies for parents and students to access their personalized sequence of instructional content and skills with specificity is unclear. Accommodations for high-need students has not been outlined as to how and when that would occur.

This criterion is scored for 12 out of 20 due to some lack of detail in procedural strategies and structures.

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

|   | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points) | 15        | 11    |

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The central office has been organized in a way that supports a School Support Team that will focus on elements of the proposal that require on-going monitoring. The applicant reports that school administrators will have flexibility in making site decisions in structure.

Factors on how demonstration of mastery were listed as driving forces but there was no definitive plan that proposed to explain how the factors such as formative/summative assessment, educator collaboration, multiple ways to assess, and rubric design would be examined, planned, organized, or implemented. The plan states that flexibility will allow for learning to be personalized according to student needs and the plan states that teachers will be empowered to find learning resources as appropriate to student needs but the parameters of how that will happen are not presented.

Although the policies appear to be flexible and informally communicated to stakeholders, there is no evidence of formal policies in place to assure that flexibility, autonomy, program adjustments, and stakeholder input will be on-going considerations of the program. It does appear that stakeholders have been a part of the planning process and these

considerations are a part of the proposal.

This criterion was met with a score at the high end of the medium range with consideration to a lack of details and explanations for a score of 11 out of 15.

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

10

8

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant plans to make digital accessibility available to the community. There are existing workshops for parents that will provide access to the digital infrastructure to support personalized learning. In addition, the applicant proposes other vehicles of communication and support such as a document on Frequently Asked Questions, technical assistance webinars, and email support.

The district states in the plan that there will be an appropriate format to support teacher data exchange as well as access for students and parents. It is proposed that standards will be developed to regulate this part of the project.

The applicant has proposed LEA and school infrastructure supports for personalized learning with appropriate access, technical support, and informational systems but the applicant has not addressed how student data will be in an open format for curricula access nor has the applicant discussed the use of data for systems review and improvement such as human resources, budgeting, or school improvement efforts with any detail. Most parts of the criterion were addressed but there was a lack of discussion on the use of data in open format exportable information and as an interoperable system for a mid-range score of 8 out of 10.

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

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The proposed project lists a variety of effective channels of communication such as surveys, workshop evaluations, public forums, and focus group but there is no indication of the frequency these measures will be employed or, in fact, if any of these opportunities will be offered more than once. It is questionable as to how this information will be gathered as timely and regular feedback on progress toward progress goals. There does not appear to be a formal structure for the monitoring, measuring, and public sharing of information that will be communicated to all stakeholders. It is not clear what reports will be shared on the website or how often those would be updated.

Professional development efforts are effectively presented as comprehensive and promising as far as bringing results to the continuous improvement process. Some of the measurements regarding student enrollment in advanced and challenging classes is one measurement but successful completion of those classes would provide greater information on student achievement.

While all elements of the criterion have been addressed and the format is clearly presented by the five components, there was some lack of detail on how the quality of the project investments would be monitored, measured, and publicly shared resulting in a score of 11 out of 15.

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

5

3

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with stakeholders have been described in this section as various meetings but the proposal omitted information on frequency and scheduling of the meetings. It is noteworthy that the proposal has indicated that meetings will be open to the public. The applicant has been scored in the middle range as 3 out of 5 due to the comprehensive list of stakeholder group meetings but it remains incomplete due to the lack of information on the frequency or on-going nature of the meetings.

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

5

4

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The performance measures for teachers and principals that are highly effective and effective are sufficiently addressed through the use of the North Carolina teacher and principal effectiveness rating system.

Performance measures for students in K-2 are appropriate for reading and referrals for social-emotional and behavior issues. Performance measures for students in grades 4-8 are appropriate for monitoring learning progress and the health and social-emotional well-being of the students. The larger number of performance measures for students in grades 9-12 are appropriate and cover critical areas of student achievement including assessment data and dropout rate.

The applicant has provided targets for improvement over time, short rationales for measurement selection, and some information regarding how the measure will provide information to the project. In other parts of the application, there are numerous references as to how the information will be reviewed but there is little information on what actions will follow determinations of insufficient progress.

For this criterion, the applicant has scored in the high range of 4 out of 5 due to the minor omissions.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal plan for evaluation of the effectiveness of investments has several critical elements in place but the lack of definitive information on how, when, and to what extent the evaluation measures will be implemented provides a somewhat weaker picture of the overall evaluation process. The elements of cognitive coaching, data across all components, cost-benefit analysis, and collaboration with stakeholders and evaluation organizations provide a well-rounded system but the details on how this process will be implemented leave a somewhat unclear understanding of evaluation measures. Other parts of the application list additional measures such as surveys, focus groups, and public forums for discussion that will help in addressing the variety of measures.

This criterion scores in the high range of 4 out of 5 with the lack of detail.

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

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The proposed budget clearly identifies Race to the Top funding priorities and provides a rationale for the five components of the project and the associated costs. Some one-time expenditures are identified. The budget amounts appear to be reasonable and rational in both the development and the presentation. The funding appears to be sufficient to meet all proposed aspects of the program including development and implementation. Sustainability is addressed in the subsequent section of the proposal but the elements that will be required for sustainable program structures have been considered in this proposal.

With the minor exception of some of the one-time expenditures identification, this criterion has earned a high score of 9 out of 10 possible.

|  |    |   |
|--|----|---|
| (F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points) | 10 | 8 |
|--|----|---|

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has proposed a logical and sustainable plan for maintenance of the project efforts to continue after the grant funding period has ended. The district states that personnel that are vital to the project will continue to be funded through the district. The training of trainers model will provide on-going improvement over time and gain momentum through this expansion model. The intent to maintain advisory and stakeholder groups will be critical and the plan addresses this as a part of the sustainability plan. The technology is indicated to become a regular budget line item for the district. Although the plan does not mention formal agreements that will be developed to ensure on-going assumption of budget items, the elements that will need to be addressed have been identified. The plan does not identify potential sources of new funding.

This criterion has been met for identification of budget items that will need on-going funding for sustainability for a high score of 8 out of 10 but the lack of specifics for the three years after the term of the grant has resulted in a lower than maximum score.

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

|  | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)  | 10        | 8     |
| <p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided a strong description of community alignment of technological resources with the local housing authority for low-income housing and the local provider of internet connectivity for some of the highest-need students. This partnership will focus on providing accessibility to internet resources for the applicant that includes social, emotional, and behavioral development support programs for students after school hours and academic resources. Elsewhere in the application, the applicant has proposed to have students complete on-line coursework with availability at all times. The proposal also intends to help parents become media literate to support their students in skills and knowledge acquisition.</p> <p>The applicant has identified desired results that are related to technology accessibility acquisition for specific population groups that involve skills building with technology as well as exposure to educational resources. Tracking methods appear to be sufficient and appropriate for each age-level group including assessments, learning plans, and surveys. An advisory group of stakeholders would be formed to implement and evaluate the support system that addresses individual student needs</p> <p>The Competitive Priority Preference description has identified ambitious yet achievable performance measures that address the use of technology and attitudes but do not address academic skills acquisition, although this is addressed in other parts of the proposal. The system for developing the staff capacity to assess needs and assets, identify and inventory needs, engage parents, and routinely assess the applicant's progress is not clearly developed with detail or procedures.</p> <p>The Competitive Priority Preference section of this application has scored in the high range of 8 out of 10 for a reasonable plan with some scarcity of detail in the building of capacity.</p> |           |       |

Absolute Priority 1

|   | Available   | Score   |
|---|-------------|---------|
| Absolute Priority 1   | Met/Not Met | Not Met |
| <p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has not presented a coherent and comprehensive proposal that addresses the core educational assurance areas to support personalized learning environments for all students. There is no presentation of a plan that is developed with the required components of timelines, activities, deliverables, and persons responsible.</p> <p>Although the proposal intends to align the core educational assurances, there is little discussion of details on how technology and access to the internet will bridge the gaps for students and how this will support learning. There is no discussion of the development of a structure in which student learning in a variety of strategies will be developed, monitored, and implemented.</p> <p>The applicant has not provided evidence that the development of a personalized learning environment for all students has been the focus of a plan that is comprehensive and coherent. The absolute priority has not been met.</p> |             |         |

|       |     |     |
|-------|-----|-----|
| Total | 210 | 160 |
|-------|-----|-----|



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0407NC-3 for Wilson County Public Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

|  | Available | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| (A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)   | 10        | 5     |
| <p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The vision stated by Wilson Public Schools (WCS) is founded on equity and access, which they plan to address by providing access to the internet to all WCS families as the RTTT plan is implemented. The vision incorporates plans to increase the number of students who graduate college and career ready, implement personalized learning plans, provide professional development for teachers to implement on line learning, increase their ability to utilize 21st century technology tools, and understand college and career ready standards. The final component of the vision is to implement data systems to be used by all stakeholders.</p> <p>This section scores in the medium range because it does not articulate clearly how the vision of providing access to technology (internet and devices) for all students and homes in WCS will tie directly to accelerating student achievement with high academic goals for all students. The four core assurance areas are mentioned as included in the technology access with all increases in student achievement to be attributed to this increased internet access by students and homes in the WCS. The total points in the medium range were not assigned because the plan does not clearly demonstrate that just having access to technology will increase student learning.</p> |           |       |
| (A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)  | 10        | 7     |
| <p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section is scored in the medium range because no data about how the school list and pilot school list was determined was provided by Wilson County Schools (WCS). WCS state that all 25 schools in the District will participate in the RTTT plan. There is to be a gradual implementation with a pilot program consisting of 1 high school and its 6 elementary and middle feeder schools. There is no data provided about how/why the pilot schools were selected, nor is there any information provided about the length of the pilot program and when the remaining 18 schools will begin to participate in the plan.</p> <p>The total number of students participating in the plan is provided along with a list of schools at each level and a table showing the number of students coming from low income families and the number of students who are identified as high need students. The accompanying tables also list the number of educators who will participate. The tables list the data categories (student enrollment, high risk students, low income students, ethnicity) by school name.</p>   |           |       |
| (A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)  | 10        | 2     |
| <p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section scored in the low range because it does not clearly identify how district wide change will be implemented. Professional development is mentioned, however there is no list of specific professional development needs that have been identified or method for training all educators in the District. The main goal of the plan is to provide internet connectivity access to all homes. There is no data supplied in this section that ties this access to a reform model that specifically shows positive impact on increasing achievement for all students in the District.</p>  |           |       |
| (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)  | 10        | 6     |
| <p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section is scored in the medium range because the performance on summative assessments expectation is listed only for grades 8, 10, and 11 on the ACT Battery of Tests (ACT EXPLORE and ACT PLAN. There is no information provided regarding summative assessments in grades K-7, and 12. In addition, the ACT Battery of Tests are used to identify student status as ready for college and do not specifically translate to competency of Common Core standards. There is no indication if these assessments are taken at grades 8, 10, and 11 by all students or some students as no "N" is provided.</p> <p>Achievement gaps are noted on tables for grades 3-8 (inclusive, not by grade) with the results on the NC End-of Grade (EOG) in both math and reading. Achievement gaps for grades 9-12 are not addressed.</p> <p>There is a table provided indicating high school graduation rates (current and expected by 2016). The beginning data shows a graduation rate of 72.6% in 2012. The data is broken down into sub groups. The goals indicate an expected growth of 2% annually through 2016 for a total of 81%.</p>  |           |       |

College enrollment counts are also listed with goals through 2016. The beginning data shows overall college enrollment at 87.4% in 2012. The expected growth through 2016 is 97.4 %. There is a disconnect between the graduation rate % and the college enrollment %, as the college enrollment reflects and almost 15% higher number than the graduation rate does.

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        | 6     |
| <p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section is scored in the medium range because student achievement data is not provided showing growth in student learning over the previous 4 years. Data showing growth in the graduation rate since 2009 is provided. Success in working in increasing performance in underperforming schools is provided with data about 2 elementary schools identified as Title I Reward Schools for the turnaround of their student achievement. One high school was recognized as a Turnaround School by the state in 2011. None of these 3 schools are participants in the beginning pilot program schools for plan implementation. The District uses Education Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS) which provides diagnostic reports over time. There is no indication about how often this information is generated or whether it is used specifically in the Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) to provide data driven instruction to individual students as part of their personalized learning plans. There is also no information provided about when/if EVAAS data is shared with students or parents. Technology managers in the DCS Department of Accountability and Technology work with parents, educators, and students to share data through the North Carolina Window on Student Education (NC Wise) and Common Education Data Analysis &amp; Reporting System (CEDARS) and to assist parents understand the data provided on the North Carolina School Report Card website. There is no indication of how data from either NC Wise or CEDARS is used with parents, students, or by educators to assist planning personalized learning plans.</p> |           |       |
| (B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)   | 5         | 2     |
| <p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section scores in the low range because it does not provide the actual salary figures requested in any of the 4 categories. WCS states it has partnered with the Wilson Education Partnership (WEP) to publish a guide titled The Wilson Education Partnership Community Guide to Understanding our School Budget, which explains how the budget works and also lists salary figures within it. The guide is provided to the community as a newspaper insert. School level expenditures are not made available to the public, but may be requested.</p>   |           |       |
| (B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)  | 10        | 7     |
| <p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section scores in the medium range because information by WCS indicates they have autonomy under legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement personalized learning environments as described in their plan. WCS states that Project Greenlight aligns to NC State Board of Education (SBE) goal of graduating student college and career ready because they will be able to use technology in a global society. The focus of the WCS plan is access to technology. The connections that align the technology to increased student learning and implementation of personalized learning environments is not clearly stated. The plan does clearly state that access to the technology is planned to assist in the implementation of personalized learning for all students.</p>   |           |       |
| (B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)  | 10        | 7     |
| <p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section scores in the medium range because even though there was a group of over 40 stakeholders gathered to begin the planning process and determine the vision, there was no information provided about how this group of 40 was selected by WCS. In addition to this there is no signature in the assurances page indicating support from local teachers bargaining group or evidence that a minimum of 70% of teachers support the proposal in its entirety. There were teacher focus groups held that indicated support for personalized learning groups and utilizing digital devices in their classrooms. There is no data supplied indicating the number of teachers who participated in these focus groups or list of schools indicating all schools were involved in the discussion. There are letters of support from state and local government officials, higher education entities, and the</p>   |           |       |

business community.

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

5

2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

This section is scored in the medium range because the information provided indicates that the needs identified for successful implementation were gathered from schools/teachers who met in focus groups. The list of needs provided came from 1 group of middle school teachers. This indicates a lack of information/data gathered from all schools used in determining the list of needs/priorities for the plan implementation. WCS states that without access to devices personalized learning will not be a possibility and this is why the expansion of internet access is necessary for student achievement. There is a statement that needs identified by students and parents were also considered, however no information about what this list might include is part of this section.

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

|                             | Available | Score |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-------|
| (C)(1) Learning (20 points) | 20        | 12    |

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section scores in the medium range because there is a lack of clarity about when personalized learning plans will be set up, who will work with the student to develop and implement their plan, how data will be used to determine individual learning goals for the student, how the need for interventions will be determined if goals are not being met, and how the plans will meet the requirement for rigorous courses designed to graduate students who are college and career ready.

WCS states their curriculum has been aligned to Common Core standards and New Essential standards adopted by the state of North Carolina. Students will use their individual learning plans to design, monitor, and pace their educational programs and this will help them understand their progress. On line learning will be the cornerstone of their learning. There is no information about what sources will be used, whether this will be K-12 or a variation thereof.

The students implementing their personalized learning plans will have deeper learning experiences because they will select areas of study that are interesting to them and aligned with their passions and desired careers. There is no data provided about what grade level(s) will be designing their own learning to this extent. There is no mention of rigorous coursework aligned to meeting the Common Core and graduating college and career ready. There is no indication of how the plans will be monitored by teachers or how interventions will be implemented in the event of academic need.

Access to technology in learning is to further access and exposure to diverse content because it allows students to elect what content they want to study. There is no listing of how diverse on line learning sites will be selected or evaluated for how accurate the information provided is or whether the content is appropriate for the age and/or experience of the learner.

There is no evidence provided that just having a device will increase responsibility and professionalism on the part of the learner and thus meet the requirement to graduate college and career ready.

WCS will encourage students to engage in authentic learning opportunities, such as experiments and independent study projects. The school leader and teachers are responsible for providing high quality instruction and ensuring all children's needs are met. The opportunity for K-12 classrooms to appear like college level seminars complete with workshops or sessions that students can elect to attend if the topics match their interest. Within this structure teachers are to create an appropriate learning environment, identify student needs, deliver high quality instruction, and monitor progress and adjust instruction as needed. There is no clearly stated structure for how this is to be accomplished for all students or how teachers will be prepared to teach in this new structure of learning at all levels.

There are no clearly stated criteria to use in identifying what high quality content is to look like as teachers and students are putting it together for their classroom and individual learning plans. There is a statement that both on line and off line content will be aligned to college and career ready standards and incorporate the Common Core.

Personal learning plans will be the main avenue used to provide student feedback on their learning. There is also a plan to allow the results of instructional games that the students use as resources to provide immediate and real-time feedback to the student. There is no discussion about implementation of any formative assessment program to document student progress and to use as data for teachers to plan interventions as needed.

The students will participate in blended learning and have the ability to use digital and web based software to assess their learning. They will have the results and because it comes in a timely manner they are to be able to manage their personal

learning plan. There is no indication of what grade level this will be implemented in or how the expectation of implementation of college and career ready goals and Common Core standards is a part of this.

WCS plans for the transfer from textbooks to digital learning to assist ELLs and disabled learners to see where their difficulties are and to pace their learning and also identify their learning levels which teachers can then use to provide accommodations. There is little discussion about how this can all be used to meet the academic needs of all learners and expect high academic achievement for all students.

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

20

8

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section was scored in the medium range because:

WCS states that all teachers will receive training and become members of professional learning communities to strengthen their effectiveness. There is no description, timeline, or evaluation provided for when/how this activity will take place.

The professional development plan for WCS teachers is to provide training for all teachers in how to effectively implement personalized learning in their classrooms. They will also be trained in how to use and implement technology into their teaching strategies. There will be coordinator positions established to support leadership and coaching models to design and build a strong staff at each school. There is no information provided about the number and qualification of the coaches, a schedule of training, the number of teachers or how teachers will be identified to work with the coaches or how this process will be evaluated. Training to provide assistance in using data to plan instruction and to make use of formative and summative assessment data will be provided by the WCS Office of Technology. Additional training in successful alignment/implementation of college and career ready goals is necessary for teachers. There is no information about who will receive this training (grade levels, courses), what the timeline for implementation is, how this will be evaluated as it is implemented.

The NC Education Evaluation System (NCEES) will be utilized to provide data about needed trainings to make teachers and principals more effective. The training to support this will be on line. There is no evaluation for how success of this component will be measured.

Teachers will work together in teams to establish learning targets based upon the Common Core, they will also work to implement college and career ready strategies in the classrooms. The teachers will be able to choose what they think will meet the learning needs of their students from a variety of on line sources. There is no structure about how this will be implemented, when, rubric for choosing sources for their students to utilize or evaluation process to monitor success of the sources.

Teams will work together to select high quality learning resources that support learning inside and outside the classroom. Facilitators will guide teachers through process of selecting and planning for use and encourage sharing of information among co workers. There is no timeline, selection criteria, evaluation process listed for this item.

WCS states it will constantly monitor student learning profiles and using real-time feedback and data being received from online learning tools to discover needs and match tools to the needs. This description is a vague statement and does not provide any assurance of the use of any formative or summative information based upon the Common Core or college and career ready strategies.

WCS will continue to support school leaders and leadership teams with coaching regarding their leadership development. There is an annual Leadership Academy for school leaders. There is no information provided stating who the school leaders are, how they are identified, and how many are invited to attend.

Continuous improvement activities are to be monitored by school leaders when evaluating the NCEES documents for teachers.

Plans to sustain personalized learning by continuing training and workshops for school leaders. There are also plans to continue to meet with the Wilson Educational Partnership (WEP), a group of 25 business leaders.

WCS plans to use student performance data from the EVAAS, to pinpoint areas of teacher effectiveness. They will support success with stipends, provide incentives and supplement stipends for priority schools (schools with highest number of high need students), assist teachers in expanding their licenses through 24 semester hours of coursework and assist in preparing for the Praxis 2 exam which measures knowledge of subjects. There are also plans to provide scholarships for WCS high school students to become educators. These are positive strategies that provided support for teachers as they work to increase their effectiveness and increase student achievement.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

|   | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points) | 15        | 11    |

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

WCS will develop a school support team charged with coordinating direct support to principals and schools. These positions are currently under the Department of Instructional Services. The School Support Team will examine student performance data weekly, and provide appropriate supports. It is unclear about who these supports would be provided to (principal, teacher, or student). All departments are expected to embrace the concept of facilitating personalized learning.

WCS has empowered school leaders to make decisions based on the best interests of their students. The School Leadership Teams are responsible for implementing procedures and practices that work best for their students (ie, homework). Schools are also allowed to determine such things as bell schedules, grouping, and the amount of required seat time.

School leaders will provide avenues for students to demonstrate mastery in several ways, which may include both formative and summative assessments, projects, and using rubrics designed to show what students must know and be able to demonstrate. The information included in this section provides necessary information about how student learning will be monitored.

This section scores in the medium range because of insufficient information about the number of staff involved in School Leadership Teams and any evaluation of their success.

|  |    |   |
|--|----|---|
| (D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points) | 10 | 7 |
|--|----|---|

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

WCS states it will provide alternate avenues for struggling students but there is no clear indication about how this will occur. No discussion about implementation of Response to Intervention practices (RTI), Tier 1, 2, 3 interventions, Positive Behavior Instruction Support (PBIS), how current data will be used to plan implementation of revised personal learning plan to include interventions.

WCS plans for parents, educators, and community members to have access to data to better support student success. This is to be accomplished through internet access as provided by Project Greenlight. Digital device (none specific identified) access to all students has been identified as a need, so students can implement their personalized learning plans. This is to increase the students fluency in the use of technology.

Assistance is to be provided to students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders in the use of the technology and troubleshooting. There will be staff to provide both on line and off line assistance. The Parent Academy workshops will include sessions to support personalized learning and teach basic computer skills to parents. WCS IT staff will develop a list of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) that will be maintained on the district website.

WCS will support and encourage parents and students to monitor student data on a regular basis. The access to data systems will support interoperable and compatible data systems. This will provide an avenue for all who need to access student learning data the ability to do so from multiple platforms.

This section scores in the medilum range because of the focus on technology to the loss of focus on increasing student academic performance, high expectations for all students, meeting college and career ready standards and the Common Core.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

|   | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points) | 15        | 10    |

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

WCS provides a comprehensive list of components that are to demonstrate continuous improvement over time, however they do not provide any documentation about why/how these components were included on the list. There is an incomplete description about how the information will be monitored, measured, and shared with the public including all stakeholders. This section scores in the medium range because of the lack of the monitoring and measuring documentation required.

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

5

5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

WCS provides a complete plan for sharing information and communicating with all stakeholders. There are provisions for parent meetings and trainings; teacher participation in focus groups; representation from District office department; student participation in focus groups, surveys, reports, and trainings; monthly updates at the Governing Board meetings; communication and participation of business, higher education, and community organizations through focus groups and Board meetings; and city and county government entities who are involved because Greenlight is a city owned network. The information provided in this section scores in the high range.

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

5

3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

This section scores in the medium range because the data provided detailing the number and percentage of effective teachers and principals is supplied along with the number of students identified by subgroup is provided. Measurements listed for K-3 provide timely information about student progress in reading. The North Carolina Essential Standards for mental and emotional health is used to measure the well-being of students and may result in referrals for assistance.

The students in grades 4-8 demonstrate they are on track by results of the ACT EXPLORE assessment which is taken in the 8th grade. There is no information about progress of students in grades 4-7 provided in this section.

High School student information (9-12) includes number/percentage of students who complete and submit Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) form. Student scores on the ACT college entrance exam is tracked to demonstrate college career readiness. The number of students earning a score of 3 or higher taken on one or more Advanced Placement (AP) exam for a course taken while in high school. The number of students who have taken at least one International Baccalaureate (IB) class while in high school. There is no expectation of the student taking or scoring at an expected rate of the IB exam. There is no summative assessment data listed for meeting Common Core and college and career standards for all students at the 9-12 grade level.

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

5

1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

This section scores in the low range because of the following: The data provided to demonstrate the effectiveness of the investments is vague and incomplete. There are no specific rubrics to use by teachers, principals, or district leadership in place to demonstrate the effectiveness of Greenlight. There is a lack of data tied to implementation of student success with the implementation of personal learning plans in an ongoing basis by specific formative and summative assessment at all grade levels. The professional development plan is not specifically listed with items determined by data demonstrating the need (rather than the desire) for some kind of training. The use of cognitive coaching is a positive way to demonstrate the effective implementation of skills that are learned during professional development activities. There is no mention of responsible parties for conducting evaluations and reporting information out to all stakeholders.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

|   | Available | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| (F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points) | 10        | 2     |

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section scores in the low medium range because of the following: The budget/narratives are to be found in section XI of the application. The overall budget request is for \$26,144.507 from RTTT grant awards. It identifies one time costs of

\$16,000,000 for implementation of the Greenlight structure, with the remaining funds identified for use in professional development, purchase of digital devices, and effective teaching professional development. The digital devices are for implementation of personalized learning for students. The budget pages provide specific information about how all of the funds will be dispersed in support of the stated goals of the plan. The funding listed for professional development is confusing as it requests funds for 4 coaches to travel to WCS twice yearly to provide onsite coaching. The plan earlier stated that no outside consultants would be required in the model they were implementing. The description of "various conferences" used to describe costs for other professional development staff, facilitators, may need to attend is vague and incomplete. There is also incomplete information provided about the number/type of digital devices to be obtained at an annual budget of \$1,000,000. In addition, this purchase is listed as a lease, so concern about sustainability is raised if this program is to continue upon the end of the grant. There is also incomplete documentation in the section outlining needs for workshop supplies for parents and community stakeholders (includes printing, furniture, office space, and technology costs at \$100,000/year).

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

10

5

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section scores in the low range because the personnel identified as continuing with the project after the conclusion of the grant were listed as some who may be considered to be vital to Greenlight. The comments about sustainability of the Greenlight infrastructure is also a concern, as WCS states it plans to support the sustainability of the use of digital devices through encouraging "bring your own technology" efforts for students and teachers where possible and reprioritizing funds where possible to maintain and renew existing and new lease agreements. The Greenlight and digital device access are the main components of the plan, there should be specific plans listed here detailing how WCS will continue these components after they have been in place. WCS does have a plan to continue the professional development for training effective teachers. It will also continue with Advisory Boards and stakeholders in conjunction with the WCS Board to continue to plan and provide oversight for Project Greenlight.

### Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

This section scores in the low range because: WCS has formed partnerships with the Wilson Housing Authority and Greenlight to implement this plan. There are a large number of students who live in the various Housing Authority sites within the District. There is a lack of computer/internet access for residents/students who live in the Housing Authority, so Greenlight will provide community learning hubs at each of 3 Housing Authority locations where students can access technology and web based learning tools. The Greenlight is the city owned fiber optic communications system that brings cable, internet, and telephone services to residents and businesses of Wilson.

There is a statement that Greenlight will provide free connectivity to WCS students and teachers in Wilson County. There is also a statement in this same section stating that Greenlight will extend the connectivity ring to the entire county and provide a discounted rate to families regardless of income. These statements appear to contradict each other.

At the beginning of the proposal WCS indicated that the plan will roll out with 7 pilot schools. There was no data provided to show how these schools were selected (other than feeder schools for elementary and middle schools into 1 high school). It remained unclear throughout the proposal how long the pilot was to run, as well as when the remaining schools in WCS will be included.

In order to integrate with each other, Greenlight will allow staff to be trained on technology and personalized learning in order to provide additional support to families and students. This allows the hub centers to facilitate student learning. Parents are also able to access technology here and receive support in how to use the information they receive.

An advisory group composed of members across the partnership will be established to plan and evaluate the implementation and success of the project. All stakeholders are to be included in the discussions.

The plan for partnering with Greenlight and the Housing Authority is to increase access for students to technology, to increase parent access to technology, and increase educational engagement as a result of greater access.

## Absolute Priority 1

|                     | Available   | Score   |
|---------------------|-------------|---------|
| Absolute Priority 1 | Met/Not Met | Not Met |

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

This proposal does not meet the requirements because it does not meet specific needs to achieve success in all required priority areas. There is a main focus on implementing access to internet/technology/online learning/digital devices that does not translate in the application to a focus on implementing student personalized learning plans in a clear and focused manner that involves the student, parent, and teacher in examining data in a timely manner, providing interventions as indicated by data, focusing on academic success demonstrated by formative and summative assessments based upon Common Core and college and career standards. There is no clear outline of when personalized plans would be implemented for each student (grade level), no specified intervals for teacher involvement in the plan development and implementation.

The data charts outlining student achievement are incomplete. There are no summative End of Grade reports/goals listed for students above 4th grade.

The desire for teachers to be effective is stated in the implementation of the teacher evaluation system and professional development opportunities to enhance classroom skills. The professional development plan should be clearly stated, with measurable goals tied to increases in student achievement and based upon needs identified with data (evaluation instrument, classroom observations, etc). There should also be a clearly defined evaluation for all professional development that ties the successful implementation in the classroom to the success of the professional development activity.

There was evidence provided that WCS is looking at data systems, but the timeline for purchase, training, and implementation was unclear.

The main focus of the proposal was to provide internet access and devices to students. There was not enough connection to this activity tied to implementation of Common Core and college and career ready standards and increased student graduation rates and college going number increases. The assumption of WCS that access to technology will increase student achievement was not supported with a specific clearly defined learning/teaching plan tied to high expectations for success for all students.

|       |     |     |
|-------|-----|-----|
| Total | 210 | 110 |
|-------|-----|-----|