



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0177GA-1 for Camden County Board of Education

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant presents evidence that its current efforts are aligned with the proposed project, addressing each core educational assurance area is separately addressed. For example, the applicant successfully explains that its current focus of high academic achievement supports students becoming college- and career-ready. The applicant supports its focus by providing appropriate strategies to accomplish this focus.</p> <p>The applicant provides convincing strategies that will transform the current structure that supports the applicant's vision. Addressed specifically are the acceleration of student achievement and deepening student learning. Not specifically addressed by the applicant is how equity is going to be increased. The applicant does not demonstrate how it will consider student academic interest in its approach.</p> <p>The applicant lists several appropriate components specific to both students and teachers that describe what the personalized classroom experience is going to be like.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant's approach to implementing its reform proposal will support high-quality LEA-level and school level implementation.</p> <p>a) The applicant does not sufficiently describe a process it used to determine that all of its schools will participate in the proposed reform. The applicant refers to an internal stakeholder that determined the schools collectively meet the competition's eligibility requirements.</p> <p>b) The applicant appropriately provides a list of schools that will participate in grant activities.</p> <p>c) The applicant effectively lists the total number of participating students, participating students from low-income families, participating students who are high-need students, and participating educators. In addition, the applicant effectively describes what student subgroups make up the high-need students category. The applicant inappropriately counts some students twice as the total number of students from the low-income category plus the number of students from the high-need category exceeds the total number of students served in this grant.</p>		
<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant provides a high-quality plan that includes goals, activities that include rationales for activities, timelines, and deliverables. However, the quality of this plan is not consistently evident throughout the plan.</p> <p>Some activities in the plan are not given sufficient time to help the applicant reach its outcome goals. For example, the applicant proposes to pilot select blended learning classes in middle school where the applicant allots two months to pilot blended learning classes and make refinements.</p> <p>Some activities in the proposed plan are inappropriately sequenced. For example, the applicant proposes to integrate blended learning approaches with its current learning paths starting in August of 2014, but the blended learning approaches are not piloted until 2015.</p>		

Some activities in the plan are not described with sufficient detail. For example, the applicant states that from the beginning of the term of grant and on an ongoing basis, the use of SEM strategies will be implemented and refined by grade levels. The applicant does not sufficiently describe the sequence with which SEM is integrated into the various grades.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

- a) The applicant effectively provides performance as measured by summative assessments for grades three through nine. The applicant does not sufficiently describe how it measures performance for students in grades Kindergarten through second grade and students in grades ten through twelve. The annual goals are not ambitious enough to result in improved student learning and performance. For example, the expected growth for American Indian/Alaskan students in grade three, in the area of English Language Arts is expected to gain a total of three percentage over five years.
- b) The applicant provides percentages of anticipated decreases in the achievement gap. The decreases of the achievement gap are unrealistically high and are not accompanied by rationales for determining the high decrease of the achievement gap over the term of the grant. The goals of decreasing the achievement gap for American Indian/Alaskan for example, by nearly 50% with seems unrealistic.
- c) The applicant projects very low increases in its graduation rates which are neither appropriate nor ambitious. For example, the graduation rates for students with disabilities are to increase by less than three percent over five years and still under 40%.
- d) The applicant inappropriately projects the college enrollment as not increasing at all for minority groups such as Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaskan, and Multi-racial which supports that the applicant's vision is unlikely to result in student learning and performance and increased equity.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

- a) The applicant states that steady increases have been made, however the supporting evidence does not document the increases but only shows scores from years 2008/09 and 2012/13.
- b) The applicant lists its Outcome-Based Continuous Improvement Processes, Response to Intervention, Smaller Learning Communities and Project Starr as the reform strategies that lead to the current improvements. The applicant does not describe a clear connection between the stated initiatives and the achievements. It is not clear whether the two schools that were listed as examples achieved their status due to these four initiatives. Only two schools are listed as examples of how reform efforts lead to them being named Reward Schools by the state for improvements made. The data provided is not segregated by campuses and the applicant's lowest performing schools are not identified making the distinction of whether they are achieving ambitious reforms impossible.
- c) The applicant appropriately describes the data that is available to educators in the form of a data management system to update and monitor student performance. Students and parents have access to this tool as well but the applicant does not clearly describe how student and parent access to this tool will inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. The applicant appropriately lists the data that students and parents have access to which includes individual course scheduling, attendance records, class assignments etc.

<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
---	----------	----------

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not provide the four separate distinctions of salaries and expenditures in its description of data that is made available to the public. The applicant lists a website where it says the documentation is found. Simply listing a website where the information is located is insufficient and does not describe the extent to which the applicant makes the data available.

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

**10**

**3**

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant appropriately describes that its state law allows for students in grades eleven and twelve to earn credits in a non-traditional way and thus supporting the applicant's implementation of personalized learning plans.

The applicant lists several successful conditions and sufficient autonomy that supports its state's Race to the Top implementation, but the applicant does not specifically describe how these conditions and autonomy will support the currently proposed project. For example, the applicant states that a waiver for ESEA requirements allows for the freedom to implement Flexible Learning Plans instead of Supplemental Education Services providers. The relevance of using Flexible Learning Plans to this proposed project is not clearly described. The applicant describes that it will pilot the state's new teacher and leader evaluation system, however, a clear link between the new evaluation system and how it supports the implementation of the proposed project is unclear.

**(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)**

**15**

**7**

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant describes that a leadership team consisting of various LEA-level departments developed the proposed reform, however, the applicant fails to demonstrate how students and parents were engaged in the development of the proposal. The applicant states the general public was invited to a stakeholder meeting, but it is unclear whether students and parents were included. The meeting was advertised only electronically which will limit out-reach only those stakeholders who have access to e-mail.

The applicant appropriately demonstrates the support of more than 70% of its teachers.

Letters of support depict the commitment of various stakeholders, and a detailed description of their commitments to the project makes their level of involvement evident.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not sufficiently describe a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. The applicant frequently states that it will meet the criteria required in this section but does not sufficiently describe its approaches that would support a high-quality plan.

- a)i) The applicant describes how learning will engage and empower all learners. The applicant does not sufficiently describe how learners understand that what they are learning is key to their success. There is also no indication on how high-need students make that connection. The applicant does not address how parents support its approach.
- a)ii) The applicant describes the use of a digital device to be used by students to manage their learning. No evidence shows how the digital device can have application in all grades. The applicant does not describe how students will learn to structure their learning and only states that data systems are available.
- a)iii) The applicant explains that the electronic devices will provide activities, resources and materials for students to further study but fails to address how deep learning occurs as a result.
- a)iv) The applicant fails to address student access to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives, and instead provides a list of learning paths for its secondary students that does not support this criterion.

a)v) The applicant describes how the enrichment component of its proposal will address the development of such traits as critical thinking. The applicant leaves the learning of critical content un-addressed.

b)i) The applicant provides unrelated information in this section that does not meet the requirements of this criterion. Instead of describing students' access to personalized sequence of instructional content, the applicant stresses the implementation of an enrichment model where a connection between the model and access to the instructional content is not made.

b)ii) The applicant appropriately provides a rubric that details the instructional approaches proposed and the environments in which these approaches can be successfully implemented.

b)iii) The applicant appropriately states that college- and career ready standards are going to be aligned with high-quality content and made available in digital format. The applicant does not provide an example of how this alignment will be achieved.

b)iv) The applicant describes several tools that will enable teachers to provide students with personalized feedback. A detailed description on how this will be implemented with students in all grade levels is lacking.

b)v) The applicant provides several appropriate strategies to accommodate high-need students but does not provide the relevance on how these strategies help ensure students are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards.

c) The applicant lists several ways through which students receive support. The applicant states that students receive support from counseling and behavioral therapy providers which is unrelated in regards to training and support on how to use tools and resources to manage learning. Other appropriate strategies include the use of hands-on training for students in the classroom, hosting technology nights for parents and providing ongoing technical support.

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

**20**

**4**

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

a)i) The applicant fails to address how the stated efforts will support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student's academic needs and help ensure all students can graduate on time and college- and career-ready. Instead, the applicant re-states its global goals and how they support the district vision but not the requirements of this grant.

a)ii) The applicant provides insufficient evidence regarding the training teachers will receive to adapt content and instruction in response to students' needs. The applicant's answer is unclear and re-states the same programs such as the School wide Enrichment Model that were described earlier in the application. The applicant describes learning activities for teachers in the context of what is recommended by researchers as part of the programs that are listed.

a)iii) The applicant confusingly discusses its state's Student Longitudinal Data System that collects assessment data, attendance and other data without making the connection to frequently measuring student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or graduation requirements. Also no connection is made how data would be used to accelerate student progress and the improvement of teacher practices. Fragmented approaches such as the development of Student Learning Objectives plans are promising but lack purpose and relevance for effective implementation. The applicant states that tests such as the ACT, the PSAT, the PLAN and the EXPLORE provide a gauge for college- and career-readiness. These tests do not measure students' progress toward college- and career-ready standards that can be used to accelerate student progress.

a)iv) The applicant does not provide evidence on how data from educator evaluation systems will be used to improve practice.

b)i) The applicant states that teachers are trained to use data systems such as the Data Director. The applicant does not describe which of the systems listed provide teachers with actionable information.

b)ii) The applicant provides a limited use of resource for teachers to obtain learning resources. One learning resource is describe as the digitally generated feedback from the student learning portfolio and does not provide relevance to the college- and career-ready standards.

b)iii) The applicant failed to address how the previously identified resources are effective to meet students' needs. Instead, the applicant lists more strategies and approaches.

c)The applicant does not address the training, the policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment.

d) The applicant provides a high-quality plan that meets the criteria as a high-quality plan as defined in this notice as it contains all of the required components. The applicant appropriately lists many activities that demonstrate that training is provided to teachers to increase their effectiveness. Not clearly described are the rationales for the activities and how they increase teacher effectiveness. For example, under the applicant's rubric of high-quality professional learning, the deliverable is simply stated as "district level professional learning community". The applicant's plan does not include a description on how it will increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals in hard-to-staff schools, subjects, and specialty areas.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>While the applicant describes how personalized learning will be facilitated, the plan lacks key goals, activities to be undertaken, and the rationale for the activities, the timelines and the deliverables. The applicant appropriately lists the parties who are responsible for implementation.</p> <p>a) The applicant appropriately states that new supports and services will be integrated to the infrastructure of the current central office and explains that a team will be formed to oversee the implementation of the proposed project. In addition, staff will be hired to implement the proposed project.</p> <p>b) The applicant provides sound evidence of how flexibility and autonomy are provided so that school leadership teams can create the unique infrastructures that best meet their students' needs.</p> <p>c) The applicant provides a feasible example of a program called Edgenuity that allows students to earn credits based on mastery.</p> <p>d) The applicant effectively demonstrates the use of a state-wide units assessment tool that conducts standard checks.</p> <p>e) The applicant appropriately details several learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable for all students. Those include the use of smart boards and instructional practices such as Response to Intervention.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>While the applicant does not extensively describe the access parents, educators, and other stakeholders have to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources, the plan is sufficient to demonstrate that the school infrastructure supports personalized learning.</p> <p>a) The applicant lists a limited amount of access for parents to access support and resources. For example, the applicant only describes parent access to technology-based resources such as student data. The distinction what is available in school and out-of school is not made.</p> <p>b) The applicant sufficiently describes the supports that are offered to all stakeholders.</p> <p>c) The applicant lists several data systems that allow for exporting data.</p> <p>d) The applicant specifies that an inter operable data system is developed by the state and will be used as part of this proposed project.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>

**(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant states that it will utilize an outside evaluator to receive competently analyzed information that is unbiased and allows for mid-course adjustments. The purpose of the continuous improvement process is to be able to make changes to the proposal as needed in an ongoing fashion. An outside evaluator may not have access to the feedback teachers, parents, students, and other stakeholders provide that would prove to be essential to the program's effectiveness. Completely analyzed data from the outside evaluator may not be timely in that important program changes may be delayed due to not having data readily available. The continuous improvement process must allow for all stakeholders to provide input.

The applicant fails to provide a high quality plan consisting of a rigorous continuous improvement process as it does not contain the required components as defined in this notice.

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

5

5

**(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides a high-quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. This is evident through a clear description of deliverables, detailed timelines, the persons responsible for implementing the activities and the specific goals they relate to.

For example, the applicant effectively states the overarching goals of the proposed project and provides clear and appropriate activities that increase the communication and engagement of each stakeholder group to meet the proposed project goals. The following activity effectively demonstrates this: "Implement school-based Personalized Learning Communities to oversee PULSE implementation at each school and communicate and engage staff in action plan implementation". In addition to this clear action, the applicant appropriately provides a timeline for the implementation of the activity, lists the persons responsible for the implementation and the specific goals the activity address.

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

5

1

**(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

All: The applicant provides a list of how many students are currently served by highly effective teachers and principals and effective teachers and principals. The rubric appropriately includes the numbers of students by subgroups. The applicant does not provide a rationale for selecting the 2% increase for each year. The applicant unconvincingly lists the same percentage of highly effective teachers and principals and effective teachers and principals for all student subgroups. For example, students with disabilities have the same percentage of highly effective principals and teachers as well as effective teachers and principals as all students. The applicant's proposed increase of 2% per year is achievable but not ambitious. The applicant does not describe how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern. The applicant appropriately states that its current data system is not fully operational yet, but the applicant does sufficiently address how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress. The applicant inappropriately skips the 2012-13 school year in its data presentation.

PreK-3: The applicant proposes to increase the percentage of students who score proficient on its state assessment tool. The applicant does not provide a rationale as to what criteria was used to establish the measures. The anticipated increases vary by subgroup and while they are achievable, they are not ambitious. The applicant, for example, anticipates an increase in reading scores in the subgroup of Asian Pacific Islander from 95.6 % to 96.9% after a period of four years. The non-cognitive indicator for this grade level is insufficiently stated as "the number of discipline referrals". This indicator is inappropriately state in actual numbers and not percentages which provides an insufficient measure. The anticipated results of the non-cognitive indicator are neither achievable nor ambitious. They are not achievable because they do not include an appropriate projection using percentages and it is not ambitious because the measure starts with a baseline of 170 and ends with 170 at the end of the term of the grant. The applicant does not describe how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern. The applicant does not address how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

4-8: The applicant appropriately provides the number and percentage of participating students who are on track to college- and career-readiness. The applicant lists the indicator as the percentage of students scoring proficient on the state assessment tool in reading. The applicant does not state whether this indicator is a leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan. The performance measure is achievable as the projected growth is minimal. The measure is not ambitious as the anticipated growth for students of mixed race is only 1% over the course of four years. The applicant

does not indicate how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern; and how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress. The applicant inappropriately states "the number of discipline referrals" as its non-cognitive indicator without providing an explanation whether the indicator is a leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan. The applicant provides no rationale for selecting the measure and the targets. The measures are achievable because the targets are set very low. The measures are not ambitious as they do not represent a significant decline over the period of the grant.

9-12: The applicant lists the number and percentage of participating students who complete and submit the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) form. The projected growth for students completing FASFA applications is not ambitious. A 5% increase over 5 years is insufficient. The applicant lists the number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness based on the applicant's on-track indicator. The percentages of students who are on-track to college- and career-readiness are inappropriately stated as the same for all subgroups. The applicant proposes at least one measure of career-readiness in order to assess the number and percentage of participating students who are on track to being career-ready. This measure is appropriately listed as the results of end of course exams. The applicant provides a rationale for selecting this measure. The target measures are achievable as well as ambitious. The applicant does not propose how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern. The applicant does not demonstrate how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation over time. The applicant proposes a grade-appropriate academic leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan and also a grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan. The rationales for these indicators are appropriately described and the target measures are achievable and ambitious.

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

**5**

**2**

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant provides the components of a high-quality plan but lacks the rigor with which the effectiveness of the investments are to be evaluated. For example, key objectives such as producing data collection tools to collect and manage data are not sufficiently rigorous. The applicant states that the evaluator will develop a series of tracking spreadsheets for ease of organizing and collecting school-level data that will be updated annually. The applicant does not effectively describe details of who will develop these spreadsheets, what specific student data they will capture and how the data will aggregated so that it can be used to make adjustments and revisions to the proposed project during implementation. The time line for this specific action is stated as annually which is not timely enough to make continuous improvements to the plan.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant appropriately describes all funds that it will use to support the project. The applicant effectively describes that its management team will support the proposed project through in kind contributions. The budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the applicant's proposal.</p> <p>The applicant clearly describes all of the funds that are being used. For example, an appropriate amount for the cost of the counselors that the military will provide to the applicant's military-connected students, is appropriately identified. Also clearly identified are Title I funds that are going to contribute to the implementation of this proposed reform.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant describes a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. Specifically, the applicant describes what steps are needed after the term of the grant to sustain the project. Appropriate time lines and goals accompany these activities. In addition, the applicant appropriately identifies the need to conduct a post-grant project evaluation to determine what components of the project were successful and should be continued. The applicant effectively describes a potential budget based on its anticipated project outcomes.

The applicant states that in-kind funds as well as Title-I funds will be used to fund the project past the term of the grant but does not specifically address how much of these funds will be contributed and for what expenses they will be used. The applicant does not sufficiently describe how the plan to sustain the project's goals after the term of the grant is supported by State and government leaders.

**Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant sufficiently demonstrates how it will integrate public resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools' resources.

1) The applicant provides a clear and thorough description of its partnership with the U.S. Department of Defense and the Magellan Health Services. The proposed services will be provided under the collective name of Military Life and Family program.

2) The applicant appropriately identifies three population-level desired results. These desired results clearly align with the applicant's proposed project goals of decreasing the achievement gap and decreasing behavioral difficulties. The desired results include a component that provides appropriate support to families.

3) The applicant demonstrates how it will track the academic achievement of the population to be served through this partnership. In addition, the applicant proposes to track the three population-level results through student surveys to determine if students are satisfied with the services they received. The applicant does not specifically address that it will determine the extent to which the achievement was narrowed and behavioral difficulties decreased as a result of the services received through the partnership. The applicant appropriately discusses the use of data to determine which students from the targeted population of military connected students will be referred for the services provided through the proposed partnership. The applicant does not provide sufficient evidence of how data from student surveys and other data would be used to provide targeted resources to the target population. The applicant appropriately describes a strategy to scale-up its current partnership by providing six additional counselors at each of the participating schools so that more students can receive counseling services. Results are anticipated to improve over time as the partnership employs effective practices such as collecting data through its PULSE management team and its school-based personalized learning committee meetings, for example.

4) The applicant effectively demonstrates that the integration of educational services and other services for participating students takes place through a variety of methods and activities. For example, counselors provide services to individual students and in groups and teachers are trained to provide appropriate interventions to the targeted population in the classroom.

5) The applicant does not effectively address how it would assess the needs and assets of participating students. Also not specifically addressed by the applicant are how the partnership identifies and inventories the needs and assets of the school and community. The applicant lists strategies that addresses the inventory of needs and assets of the community in relation to its proposed reform but not in relation to the partnership under this competitive preference. The decision-making process proposed by the applicant is relevant to proposed reform but not in relation to the partnership. Also not sufficiently relevant to the partnership are the applicant's descriptions of parent and family engagement as well as the routine assessment of the applicant's progress in implementing its plan.

6) The applicant effectively outlines the identification of annual performance measures for the proposed population-level and the description of desired results for students.

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant addresses the proposed project coherently and comprehensively that it will build on the core educational areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching. This is evident through the applicant's detailed vision is providing strategies that will transform the structure that supports the applicant's vision. Also appropriate for implementing this proposed reform are the applicant's description of LEA and state-wide policies that support the implementation of the proposed reform. The applicant effectively and convincingly proposes to use proven strategies such as Response to Intervention to significantly improve learning and teaching. The applicant provides a model of ongoing communication that will support and sustain the implementation of the project. The budget is appropriately detailed and funds are sufficient to support the project's outcomes.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>103</b>
--------------	------------	------------



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0177GA-2 for Camden County Board of Education

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

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>

**(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

A 1). Articulating a Comprehensive and Coherent Reform Vision

The Camden County Schools (CCS) has proposed a project titled PULSE: to build upon the transformative improvements to teaching and learning in the District. *Personalized and United Learning through Schoolwide Enrichment* has been designed to meet Absolute Priority 1- Personalized Learning Environments - of the RTT-D grant competition. PULSE is grounded in the Schoolwide Enrichment Model and customized to support each student using real-time data, cutting edge technology, and professional learning.

(a) PULSE builds on work done in the CCS District during the past five year in the four core educational assurance areas as evidenced by:

1). College and Career Ready Standards and Assessments - The CCS District has focused on high academic achievement through state and national standards, and proposes to build on this by integrating digital content and the SEM to ensure deeper exploration and differentiated instructional practices.

2). Data Systems that Measure Student Growth - PULSE will build on the Outcome-Based Continuous Improvement process use of data systems currently in place by using coaches and interventionists to support real-time, assessment-driven instruction in customized learning environments.

3). Recruiting, Rewarding, and Retaining Effective Teachers and Principals - PULSE will build on the CCS focus of

employing and training quality staff through the integration of new teacher and principal evaluation systems and the use of intensive professional learning to reposition teachers as facilitators of learning.

4). Turing around Low Achieving Schools - The CCS proposal will focus on all 9,000 students in the District by personalizing the learning environment so ALL students have the tools, instruction, and support needed to succeed.

;

(b) Articulates a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests.

The PULSE proposal has articulated a clear and credible approach for accelerating achievement, deepening learning, and increasing equity. The reform vision for PULSE was designed by using the National Education Technology Plan to articulate six primary assumptions. Chief among these assumptions is the potential impact of technology as learning and teaching will not be bound by time, space, place, or path. The PULSE proposal for this use of technology to transform teaching and learning is based on nine research-based best practices in educational technology implementation. In addition, the Schoolwide Enrichment Model (SEM) will serve as the framework for the CCS approach to personalized learning.

The PULSE proposal provides specific examples of how their theoretical models will be unpacked. Key types of learning activities specified in the proposal include Type I General Exploratory Activities, Type II Group Training activities, and Type III Individual and Small Group Investigations of Real Problems. Lastly, the PULSE proposal provides an articulated approach to Student Learning and Teaching with very clear examples of the activities and initiatives to be used for implementation.

(c) Describes what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments.

The PULSE proposal provides a very clear vision for the transformations in teaching and learning that students and teachers will experience through personalized learning environments if the proposal is funded. Specific examples of new classroom experiences students and teachers will participate in are articulated.

This section receives a perfect score because all criteria were supported by convincing evidence necessary for a comprehensive and coherent reform vision.

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

**10**

**10**

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

A 2). Approach to Implementation

The CCS Approach to implementation will support high-quality district and school level implementation of the proposal by

(a) A description of the process that the applicant used or will use to select schools to participate. The process must ensure that the participating schools collectively meet the competition's eligibility requirements

The PULSE proposal provides sufficient evidence that all schools, grades, and subject areas in the CCS District will be impacted by the grant if funded. In addition, the PULSE design team confirmed that all schools collectively meet the RTT-D eligibility requirements.

(b) A list of the schools that will participate in grant activities

All schools that will participate in the grant activities have been identified in the proposal.

(c) The total number of participating students, participating students, from low-income families, participating students who are high-need students, and participating educators. If participating schools have yet to be selected, the applicant may provide approximate numbers.

A table in the PULSE proposal includes the total number of participating educators and students (including student sub-groups) across all 12 schools in the CCS District provides sufficient evidence to meet this criteria.

This section receives a perfect score because all criteria were supported by convincing evidence.

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>A 3). LEA-wide Reform and Change</p> <p>The PULSE proposal is a high-quality plan describing how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools, and will help the CCS District reach district-wide outcome goals.</p> <p>To personalize learning for all students using the Schoolwide Enrichment Model the PULSE proposal identifies four key goals:</p> <p>1). Use of multiple paths and contexts to personalize learning, 2). Increase educator effectiveness through intensive professional learning, 3). Customization of the student learning environment, and 4). Integration of technology to transform teaching and learning through a personalized sequences of instruction aligned with high-quality content and skill development. In addition, the PULSE proposal provides an excellent logic model to improve student learning outcomes for all CCS students illustrated with strategies, actions, outputs, outcomes, and long-term impact. Also articulated in the proposal, which adds strength, is a succinct explanation of management structures designed to support District- wide reform.</p> <p>A comprehensive high-quality plan describing how the proposal will be brought to scale, and ultimately reach project goals, is included including all components of a high-quality plan as required, i.e. major activities, deliverables, timelines, and parties responsible for successful implementation.</p> <p>This section receives a perfect score because all criteria for LEA -wide Reform and Change were supported by convincing evidence.</p>		

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
--	-----------	----------

<p><b>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>A 4). LEA-wide Goals for Improved Student Outcomes</p> <p>The CCS District, through its PULSE proposal, crafts an excellent vision that is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals that are equal to or exceed State ESEA , overall and by student subgroup in the following areas:</p> <p>(a) Performance on summative assessments defined in the PULSE proposal include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grades 3-8, English Language Arts and Mathematics, and Georgia End of Course Tests, Math I and 9<sup>th</sup> Grade Literature. The methodology used to determine Growth is well defined, i.e. mean growth percentiles calculated as the difference in proficiency for each respective grade level. However, the PULSE proposal does not provide a definition of Proficiency for the State of Georgia. Stating this methodology is imperative to determine ambitious yet achievable goals.</li> </ul> <p>(b) The methodology for determining achievement gaps is defined in the proposal as the difference in the performance between each subgroup within a LEA and the statewide average performance of the LEA's or state's highest achieving subgroups in reading or language arts and math as required by the ESEA as evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goals for decreasing achievement gaps are proposed. Post-Grant goals for all sub-groups indicate growth is expected, however, achievement gaps will remain, i.e. Graduation rates for White students is 76.41 baseline expected to grow to 81.10 post-grant. The graduation rate for Black students is 71.14 baseline and expected to grow to 75.51 post grant. The gap between white and black students in the baseline year is 5.27 and the gap between white and black students in the post-grant year is 5.59. This gap is projected to get larger during the grant period rather than smaller. This same pattern occurs with other measures used to analyzed the student achievement of student sub-groups.</li> </ul> <p>(c) Graduation rate goals are included in the proposal as evidenced by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rates for all students and sub-groups are expected to increase.</li> </ul>		
--	--	--

(d) College enrollment rates as evidenced by

- The methodology and data source for college enrollment rates are both included in the proposal.

This section is scored in the high range. Points have been deducted because the goals for measures that would indicate achievement gaps are closing do not indicate the gaps will actually close.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>

### (B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

#### B 1). Demonstrating a Clear Track Record of Success

(1) The PULSE proposal provides a clear record of success during the past four years in advancing student learning, achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching, and includes a description, charts or graphs, raw student data, and other evidence that demonstrates CCS' ability to—

(a) Improve student learning outcomes and close achievement gaps including by raising student achievement, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment rates as evidenced by:

- To improve student learning outcomes with a student population of diverse high-need students the CCS District implemented an Outcome-Based Continuous Improvement process which identified five areas for reform. Systemwide improvements came about through the implementation of Smaller Learning Communities and Response to Intervention. Various forms of assessment provide evidence of a clear record of success during the past four years. 1). Criterion-Referenced Competency Tests, 2). End of Course Tests, 3). Graduation Rates, 4).College Readiness and Enrollment Rates. The PULSE proposal provides excellent data to provide the necessary evidence, and includes a supporting narrative that does an excellent job of describing the gains made to demonstrate a clear record of success in the CCS District during the past four years.

(b) Achieve ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools or in its low-performing schools as evidenced by

- The naming of two district schools as Reward Schools by the state of Georgia. The Reward category recognizes those schools exhibiting greatest performance or largest academic gains among students in the previous three years. The PULSE proposal cites several districtwide reform efforts as the reason for the success of the two schools, as well as throughout the entire district, i.e. 1). CCS Outcome-Based Continuous Improvement Process, - Five focus areas were identified each with related goals. However, there is no data presented to indicate if, and to what extent, progress was made on the goals. 2). Response to Intervention, - Is identified as a data-driven education reform methodology that uses systemwide screenings to assess student needs and provide instruction designed to meet those needs. However, no data is presented to indicate what academic achievement gains have been made as a direct result of RTI. 3). Smaller Learning Communities. a project funded by a federal grant that enabled CCS to create a Ninth Grade Academy and five career academies. The academies are dedicated to future employment pathways. Again, no data is presented to indicate success with this program. 4). Project STARR - Strengthening Technology and Academic Rigor and Resources - a \$2.5 million grant from the DOD. Eleven of the twelve District schools received funding from this grant. Data is presented to indicate an increase in the percentage of the students who meet or exceed the two grant objectives.

(c) Make student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services as evidenced by:

- The CCS District does an excellent job of making student performance data available to students, educators, and parents The District communication plan includes a technology-enabled data management system that provides access to students, educators, and parents. In addition, Districtwide performance data is released publicly on CCS website through links to the state of Georgia's K-12 school report cards and the College and Career Ready Performance Index. The communication system in place makes it very easy for the data to inform and improve participation, instruction, and services.

This section is scored in the high range. Points are deducted because there is no data presented to indicate if, and to what extent, academic achievement was made as a result of CCS Outcome-Based Continuous Improvement Process, Response to Intervention, and Smaller Learning Communities.

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

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

B 2). Increasing Transparency in LEA Processes, Practices, and Investments

A high level of transparency in CCS processes, practices, and investments, including by making public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration is presented. This information includes a description of the extent to which the CCS District already makes available the following four categories of school-level expenditures from State and local funds:

- The CCS District fully discloses its Strategic Plan, Outcome-Based Continuous Improvement Process, board documents, and public data portals. In addition, an annual report is released by the district which provides progress data for each of the five strategic focus areas, student achievement, and expenditures. Fiscal Investment Transparency is also a priority for the District and an annual budget adoption process is followed. Through the Camden County Schools' website the public has direct access to:
  - (a) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff, based on the U.S. Census Bureau's classification used in the F-33 survey of local government finances
  - (b) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only;
  - (c) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only; and
  - (d) Actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level.

This section receives a perfect score because all criteria were supported by convincing evidence

<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
--	-----------	-----------

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

B 3). State Context for Implementation

Successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments are described in the PULSE proposal. The PULSE proposal identifies seven initiatives that in total provide the necessary conditions and sufficient autonomy for successful implementation. Those initiatives include:

- State of Georgia Race to the Top Plan which targets four areas of reform. Common Core Standards, Great Teachers and Leaders, Data Systems, and Turning Around Lowest Achieving Schools.
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act Waiver which will allow CCS to implement personalized learning strategies.
- Georgia's Move on When Ready Act which allows students in grades 11 and 12 to earn credit toward high school graduation through equivalent postsecondary coursework.
- College and Career Ready Performance Index which is a statewide accountability system and provides a view of each school's success and weaknesses in meeting standardized performance assessments.
- Teacher Key and Leader Keys Evaluation Systems. Through this system educators are evaluated on 10 performance standards related to professionalism, instruction, communication, and data usage.
- Common Core Curriculum. Adoption of the system was completed in all CCS buildings in 2013.
- Comment Period - The PULSE proposal has met the comment period requirements of the RTT-D application.

All of the evidence in this section provided by CCS are legal mandates from the State of Georgia. As such, these legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements must be met by all accredited schools in the state, and as such will allow the CCS District the autonomy necessary to fulfill the PULSE plan if funded.

**(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)**

**15**

**14**

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

**B 4). Stakeholder Engagement and Support**

Meaningful stakeholder engagement throughout the development of the proposal and meaningful stakeholder support for the proposal has been demonstrated in the CCS PULSE proposal by an articulated pre-planning process prior to proposal development. A District Advisory Council was created to complete the proposal which was informed by school-level needs, successfully implemented and piloted interventions and research-based strategies. The PULSE model was then presented to all educators and 79% of all teachers approved of the proposal.

(a) The PULSE proposal provides a description of how students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools were engaged in the development of the proposal and, as appropriate, how the proposal was revised based on their engagement and feedback. There is no evidence in the proposal to indicate whether or not feedback from students and families was used to revise the proposal .

(ii) For LEAs without collective bargaining representation, at a minimum, evidence that at least 70 percent of teachers from participating schools support the proposal

(b) The PULSE proposal provides sufficient evidence of letters of support key stakeholders as parents and parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, the business community, civil rights organizations, advocacy groups, local civic and community-based organizations, and institutions of higher education in Appendix H.

This section is scored in the high range because of evidence of meeting the criteria is provided , except there is no evidence to indicate whether or not feedback from students and families was used to revise the submitted proposal.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

C 1). Learning

The PULSE proposal has a clear and comprehensive approach to learning that engages and empowers all learners, in particular high-need students , in an age-appropriate manner. The CCS approach will engage and empower all learners, particularly high-need students. Multiple options will enable students to accelerate learning based on individual interests and progress while pursuing a rigorous course of study aligned to college and career ready standards.

(a) With the support of parents and educators, all students in the CCS will:

(i) Understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals as evidenced by:

- The implementation of four well crafted guiding principles that will replace dependent, passive learning with engaged, independent, enriched learning. 1). Learning experiences will be constructed based on the interests, abilities, and learning styles of students, 2). Meaningful learning outcomes, 3). Learning experiences that focus on both enjoyment and academic goals, 4). Thinking skill acquisition and enhanced knowledge grown from instruction that comes from the learner's own construction of meaning.
- Use of the Schoolwide Enrichment Model to serve as the framework for student learning and focuses on personalization and differentiation.

(ii) Identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements, understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goal as evidenced by:

- 1:1 student to device and technology integration to empower students to take ownership of their learning and develop self-directed goals linked to college and career ready standards.
- Use of SLDS and Data Director will be used to create learning and development goals based on a variety of data tools.
- Development of an e-portfolio for individual student development of goals, interests, academic strengths, learning styles, and preferred modes of expression.
- Twelve well developed examples of potential electronic student learning portfolio components have been included in the proposal.

(iii) Are able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest as evidenced by:

- The e-portfolio created for each student will be used to electronically match individual student interests and strengths to data bases of high-engagement activities, resources, materials, and opportunities for further study.
- Electronic resources will allow each student to engage in and experience self-directed learning based on their style that is classified and cross-referenced by subject areas, Common Core Standards, and grade levels.
- Ten excellent examples of educational activities to support deep learning are presented in the proposal.

(iv) Have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning as evidenced by multiple options to accelerate learning as evidence by:

- Ninth Grade Academy/Career Clusters
- Advanced placement / Dual Enrollment
- Work-Based Learning for apprenticeships and internships.
- Virtual Academy for exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives. (Grades 3-12)

(v) Master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving as evidenced by:

- The use of SEM to integrate and apply enrichment activities from the Triad Model to personalize and provide in-depth learning for students.
- Triad Model Learning Activities are included in the proposal that demonstrate the acquisition of content and the development of essential skills.
- The use of SEM Enrichment Clusters during Triad Model Learning Activities to further personalize learning for groups of students who share common interests.

(b) With the support of parents and educators, CCS will provide to each student

(i) A personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals and ensure he or she can graduate on time and college- and career-ready as evidence by;

- A research-based enrichment learning system that uses computer-generated assessments of a student's strengths, and a search engine that chooses high-interest content through a storehouse of resources and activities.
- Project-based learning

(ii) A variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments as evidenced by:

- The use of a technology leveraged learning platform, to move teachers from a traditional role to that of facilitator and assists with the variety of current student achievement levels in the CCS District.
- The PULSE proposal identifies, and explains, four Blended Learning Options that will be made available to students.

(iii) High-quality content, including digital learning content as appropriate, aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements as evidenced by:

- The use of SEM with instructional communication technology will assist in differentiating instruction, curriculum planning, and individual small group project-based learning.
- The Teacher Resource Link, available through GA DOE will assist teachers to match an appropriately challenging curriculum with student ability through alignment to GA Performance Standards, Common Core Standards, and

National Educational Technology Standards.

(iv) Ongoing and regular feedback, including,

(A) Frequently updated individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards , or college- and career-ready graduation requirements as evidenced by:

- An interconnected feedback system to enable fundamental decisions about learning to be informed by ongoing individual student data for continuous improvement by frequently monitoring student progress.
- The use of Data Director to synthesize multiple types of standardized and local student assessments.
- The use of statewide Student Longitudinal Data System to provide several years of an individual student's summative assessment data and attendance.

(B) Personalized learning recommendations based on the student's current knowledge and skills, college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements , and available content, instructional approaches, and supports as evidenced by:

- An electronic portfolio of individual student development goals, interests, academic strengths, and learning styles will be designed for each student
- Beginning in 9<sup>th</sup> grade - CCS Teacher as Advisor program to examine progress and enable feedback to ensure a clear understanding of where they are, what they need to do to graduate, and the development of their readiness for college and careers.
- The use of five College and Career Readiness Tools to create Personalized Recommendations.

(v) Accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements as evidenced by:

- Response to Intervention and Early Intervention Program
- Flexible Instructional Grouping
- ESL
- Onsite Credit Recovery
- Ombudsman Program

(c) Mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning as evidenced by:

- Face to Face Supports such as the Teachers as Advisors program begun with the assistance of a Smaller Learning Communities grant., Transition Coaches to support middle and high school students to develop an individualized plan for each student to ensure college and career ready preparedness, and Child and Youth Behavioral Military and Family Life Counselor Program for military dependent children.
- Electronic Student Learning Portfolios to travel with students through their school career.
- Technology Tools and Training such as 1:1 student to device ratio and instructional technology integration, and technology family nights.

This section receives a perfect score because all criteria were supported by comprehensive and achievable evidence for the development of a high-quality plan for improving learning by personalizing the environment to ensure all students have the support they need to graduate college and career ready. Through the use of phased-in, grade-level pilots and implementation, this plan includes key activities related to the transformation of high-quality blended learning approaches, enhancement of multiple student learning and support paths, and the implementation of the Schoolwide Enrichment Model. All components of a high quality plan as required in the application have been met at a high level.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>
--	-----------	-----------

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

C 2). Teaching and Leading:

The PULSE approach to teaching and leading will help educators improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements by enabling the full implementation of personalized learning and teaching for all students, in particular high-need students such that:

(a) All participating educators in the CCS District will engage in training, and in professional teams or communities, that will support their individual and collective capacity to

(i) Support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student's academic needs and help ensure all students can graduate on time and college- and career-ready as evidenced by:

- PLC's embedded that are embedded in the day-to-day operation of student learning and teaching, and are results driven as the PLCs are directly tied to the District's Outcome-Based Continuous Improvement process.
- Teacher and Leader Evaluation Systems that will provide support to increase educator capacity and continuously improve the implementation of personalized learning environments.
- High-Quality Professional Learning through evaluation that will support development of individual and collective recommendations and interventions for educators. Examples of Professional Learning Topics include; co-teaching/collaborative instruction, instructional technology integration, and hybrid blended learning models.
- Coaching and Instructional Capacity will be enhanced by the use of lead coaches to oversee personalized learning/technology coaches at each school, small group and individualized instruction with instructional interventionists, and transition coaches to support students at teachers at the middle and high school levels.
- Technology Integration that will support the integration of data and networks, computer hardware, interoperable software, information resources, middleware services and tools, and devices.
- Student Progress Data Systems by two key tools, Data Director, an online data and assessment management system application, and Student Longitudinal Data System which tracks summative assessment data, attendance, and grades, students learning objectives, college and career ready performance index, LEXILE reading scores, etc. These tools assist in integrating student progress data, at the individual, classroom, school, and district levels to meet student academic needs and improve instructional practice.

(ii) Adapt content and instruction, providing opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches (e.g., discussion and collaborative work, project-based learning, videos, audio, manipulatives) as evidenced by:

- Use the SEM as the framework to adapt content and instruction to support optimal student learning which is designed around student interests, learning styles, and modes of expression.
- SEM Application of Technology - Use of a computer generated assessment of students strengths, an e-portfolio for students and a search engine that chooses high interest materials and activities to personalize and provide in-depth learning
- Enrichment Triad Model - Enables teachers to adapt content and opportunities for student to engage in common and individual tasks to response to their interests.
- Curriculum Enrichment Modification which include adjustments to levels of required learning so all students are challenged
- Enrichment Clusters - Groups of students who share common interests and will be designed based on an inductive approach to solve real-world problems through the development of authentic products.

(iii) Frequently measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards, or college- and career-ready graduation requirements and use data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators as evidenced by:

- Student Longitudinal Data System from GA DOE
- District Online Data System (Data Director) to synthesize multiple types of assessment data.
- Student Learning Objectives - district-developed, content-specific, grade level measures
- Student Growth Percentile - Growth model for accountability, instructional improvement, and educator effectiveness.
- College and Career Ready Performance Index from GA DOE
- College and Career Readiness Tools - EXPLORE, PLAN, ACT

(iv) Improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback provided by the LEA's teacher and principal evaluation systems including frequent feedback on individual and collective effectiveness, as well as by providing recommendations, supports, and interventions as needed for

improvement as evidenced by:

- Teacher Keys Evaluation System - Includes teacher assessment on performance measures and student growth and academic achievement measure.
- Leader Keys Evaluation System - Includes leader assessment on performance standards, student growth and academic achievement, and student achievement gap measures

(b) All participating CCS educators will have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements. Those resources will include—

(i) Actionable information that helps educators identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests as evidenced by:

- Data Director will be used to integrate data as leading indicators for school improvement and student progress, which defines, measures, and monitors data often overlooked to provide a more detailed picture of student performance.
- Student Longitudinal Data, Teacher Keys Evaluation, and Leader Keys Evaluation Systems will provide information to accelerate student progress.
- Actionable information will be provided by Student growth percentiles, student learning objectives, LEXILE Reading Scores, RTI, Formative and Summative Assessments, and the College and Career Ready Performance Index.

(ii) High-quality learning resources (e.g., instructional content and assessments), including digital resources, as appropriate, that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements, and the tools to create and share new resources as evidenced by:

- Results from student learning portfolios will be used to electronically match individual student interests and strengths to technology-enabled databases of high-engagement activities, resources, and materials.
- High-quality learning resources through the Teacher Resource Link which aligns K-12 digital resources to Georgia Performance Standards, Common Core Standards, and National Educational Technology Standards for Students.

(iii) Processes and tools to match student needs as evidenced by:

- E-portfolios of individual student development goals, interests, academic strengths, and learning styles will be used to match student needs. Results from student learning portfolios will be used to electronically match individual student interests and strengths to technology-enabled databases of high-engagement activities, resources, materials, and opportunities for further study.

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

(i) Information, from such sources as the district's teacher evaluation system that helps school leaders and school leadership teams assess, and take steps to improve, individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate, for the purpose of continuous school improvement as evidenced by:

- TKES and LKES will use multiple data sources to gauge educator effectiveness.
- The PULSE proposal identifies five tools to support teacher effectiveness for continuous school improvement
- The PULSE proposal identifies five tools to support leader effectiveness for continuous school improvement
- Revision of the Superintendent's evaluation process to provide a rigorous, transparent, and fair assessment using student outcomes growth, district effectiveness, culture and climate, feedback from stakeholders.

(ii) Training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps

- Outcomes Based Continuous Improvement process based on high academic achievement, quality teachers, administrators, and staff, supportive learning environments, effective/efficient operations, and strong parental and community support.
- The PULSE proposal includes a model of district practices to inform progress of their continuous improvement process.

(d) The applicant has a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals including hard to staff schools, subjects, and specialty areas as evidenced by:

- The PULSE proposal details an excellent high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from highly effective teachers and principals. Major components of the plan include teacher evaluation and effectiveness, leader evaluation effectiveness, high-quality professional learning, individual and collective teacher and leader capacity, student progress data systems, and technology integration.
- The PULSE plan for Teaching and Leading includes all components of a high-quality plan as required by the RTT-D application.

This section receives a perfect score because all criteria were supported by convincing evidence for the development of a high-quality plan for improving learning by personalizing the environment to ensure all students have the support they need to graduate college and career ready. Through an approach to teaching and leading this plan will ensure the successful implementation of personalized learning environments through PLC's, teacher and leader evaluation systems, high-quality professional learning, coaching and instructional capacity, technology integration, and student data systems.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

D 1). LEA Practices, Policies, and Rules

The CCS District has crafted a high-quality plan to support the implementation of PULSE through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed. This includes the extent to which—

The CCS has practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning by

(a) Organizing the LEA central office, or the consortium governance structure to provide support and services to all participating schools as evidenced by:

- A well designed plan for the integration of existing central office infrastructure with new supports and services provided by the PULSE, proposal if funded.
- Current - CCS Board of Education received GASBA recognition as Board of Distinction by providing oversight that allows autonomy of school district leadership which ensures the philosophical foundations are in place for the necessary autonomy.
- Additional Support and Services if Funded - PULSE staff, and other management team members, will be responsible for project accountability, strategic direction, fiscal and operational oversight, and continuous improvement, 1 FTE project director, 1 FTE district-level network administrator are sufficient to ensure successful implementation.

(b) Providing school leadership teams in participating schools with sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school-level budgets as evidence by:

- Leadership teams at each school develop well articulated action plans guided by five focus areas outlined in Outcome-Based Continuous Improvement Plan.
- Professional Learning Communities will have the flexibility to determine which combination of blend learning options best meet the unique needs of their individual students.
- Each PLC will conduct a school-based assessment and develop a phased implementation process to ensure quality implementation and refinement

(c) Giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic as evidenced by:

- Credit Recovery
- Virtual Learning through both Georgia Virtual School program and a Virtual Learning academy built and customized for CCS to expand on-line course offerings.
- Advanced Placement
- Dual Enrollment through partnerships with Altamaha Technical College, College of Coastal Georgia, and Valdosta State University.

(d) Giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways as evidenced by:

- Schoolwide Enrichment Model which empowers teachers to direct aligned content at different levels for each student based on mastery and achievement levels.
- Standard Assessments K-5 include Elementary-Assessments for Learning, DIBLES, unit assessments, constructed response, and math fluency checks. MS and HS include unit assessments termed standards checks, Formative Assessments for Learning, and common formative assessments to assess students' level of mastery.
- Course Content - Credit may be earned three ways passing the course, passing End of Course Test, and passing related portion of the High School Graduation Test
- Postsecondary Content - AP Courses, and dual credit courses. Multiple standardized assessments are used to allow students the opportunity to demonstrate their capacity to master postsecondary content.

(e) Providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners as evidenced by:

- CCS, through PULSE, will implement a variety of practices and policies that facilitate fully accessible personalized learning activities for ALL students.
- PULSE project director will monitor program implementation to ensure equitable participation in program activities.
- CCS has established special appeals procedures for staff, families, and individuals who feel they have been discriminated against.
- Blended learning options will be implemented to ensure accessibility of resources to all students.

This section provides strong evidence for the development of the necessary LEA practices, policies, and rules. The proposal, however, does not meet all of the required components of a high-quality plan. While the goals, activities and rationale for the activities, and the overall credibility of the plan are comprehensively expressed with high-quality, there is no succinct timeline, deliverables, or parties responsible specifically identified.

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
---	-----------	-----------

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

D 2). LEA and School Infrastructure

The PULSE proposal is a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.

The CCS and school infrastructure supports personalized learning by—

- (a) Ensuring that all participating students, parents, educators , and other stakeholders (as appropriate and relevant to student learning), regardless of income, have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation of the applicant's proposal as evidenced by:
  - A significant number specific activities and initiatives whereby students, parents, educators, and community partners have access to learning resources.
- (b) Ensuring that students, parents, educators , and other stakeholders (as appropriate and relevant to student learning) have appropriate levels of technical support, which may be provided through a range of strategies (e.g., peer support, online support, or local support);

- Technical Support for Leaders - PULSE Management Team, project director, lead personalized learning/technology coaches, network administrator, and digital service learning technicians.
- Technical Support for Teachers - Personalized learning coaches, Professional Learning Communities, professional learning options, Beginning Educator Mentor Program, and TKES.
- Technical Support for Students - 9<sup>th</sup> Grade Academy, career academies, e-portfolios, virtual learning facilitators at the Virtual Academy, 1:1 student to device ratio, technology family nights
- Technical Support for Parents - Parent resource centers, parent involvement calendars, parent nights, parent compacts, and parent resource brochures.

(c) Using information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format and to use the data in other electronic learning systems (e.g., electronic tutors, tools that make recommendations for additional learning supports, or software that securely stores personal records) as evidenced by:

- Parents and students will have access to a variety of secure information technology system options such as Data Director, PowerSchool, Skills Tutor, Edgenuity, EXPLORE, and PSAT, etc.

(d) Ensuring that LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems (e.g., systems that include human resources data, student information data, budget data, and instructional improvement system data) as evidenced by:

- The student management system Data Director will house formative, summative, and norm referenced test results and inform the Balanced Scorecard outcome measurement system to drive systemwide improvement.
- PULSE will expand the depth and reach of the above mention tools through the introduction of electronic student learning portfolios.

This section receives a perfect score because all criteria were supported by convincing evidence for the development of a high-quality plan for ensuring the CCS District and school infrastructure to support the implementation of personalized learning by three high-quality plan components: 1). Orientation for CCS leaders, educators, staff, and stakeholders to PULSE strategies, 2). The integration of PULSE strategies into existing policies and rules, and 3). The implementation of PULSE within CCS and school-level practices.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>

### (E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

E 1). Continuous Improvement Process

The PULSE proposal has detailed a plan for implementing a continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals, and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. The plan addresses how the applicant plans to monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top – District as evidenced by:

- Partnering with an independent evaluator in order to analyze information throughout the grant period for the purposes of making mid-course adjustments and corrections. All stakeholders will be engaged in identifying the essential evaluation questions and assessing progress toward program goals and objectives. Specific components of the Continuous Improvement Process include: 1). Needs Assessment via a forum for stakeholder input and reflection. 2). The Logic Model will be revisited quarterly and updated as necessary. Inherent to the logic model is a feedback loop to facilitate informed decision-making for continuous improvement. 3). Fidelity Index - which will capture the fidelity of each core component of the PULSE proposal to program design and management plan. In addition, classroom observations will be used to develop the fidelity measure 4). Communication and Data Display - to ensure a transparent communications process a virtual console will be designed to provide a forum for reflection and exchange of ideas, display up-to-date data on program benchmarks, and show links to assessments, surveys, community partners, and other resources.

The PULSE proposal for their Continuous Improvement Process, specifies the use of an outside evaluator. The feedback elements in the proposal are very well explained and provide an excellent framework. The feedback elements include: a). Needs Assessment on an annual basis, b). Logic Model - will be revisited quarterly, c). development of a Fidelity Index to determine implementation fidelity of each core component of PULSE using the data provided through transcripts, meeting minutes, attendance logs, and four to six classroom observations per year. What this plan does not include is frequent feedback from teachers and principals as to the quality of the development and implementation of personalized learning communities. This type of feedback loop is necessary for a continuous improvement process. The PULSE plan is strong on evaluation, however, this section is about continuous improvement and not evaluation thus the score in the mid-range.

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

5

5

**(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

E. 2). Ongoing Communication and Engagement

The CCS proposal PULSE contains high-quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. The plan meets all of the high-quality plan requirements of the RTT-D application as evidenced by:

- Monthly management team meetings
- Monthly PLC meetings
- Quarterly sustainability planning
- Monthly joint professional development
- Quarterly evaluation team monitoring and reporting
- The use of the Outcomes-Based Continuous Improvement process which enable the district to inform internal and external stakeholders by identifying the practices necessary to increase student performance and close achievement gaps.

This section receives a perfect score because all criteria were supported by convincing evidence for the development of a high-quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement through three activities: 1). Internal stakeholder engagement and communication, 2). Family engagement and communication, 3). Community Engagement and communication.

This section receives a perfect score because of the quality of the evidence provided and it contains all of the required elements of a high quality plan.

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

5

4

**(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

E 3). Performance Measures

Because the CCS plan represent the best thinking at a point in time, and may require adjustments and revisions during implementation, the PULSE proposal contains a clear approach to continuously improve its plans.

The PULSE proposal specifies ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required performance measures as evidenced by:

(a) Its rationale for selecting that measure:

- The PULSE proposal identifies excellent rationale for all required and applicant proposed performance measures. a). Percentage of students in Grade 8 passing at least four courses in four content areas will serve to measure the extent to which students in grades 4-8 are on track for college and career preparedness, b). Percentage of graduates completing a CTAE pathway, or advanced academic, fine arts, or world language pathway to serve to orient students to career options and how to obtain those options, c). Percentage of students entering TCSG/?USG not requiring remediation , scoring 22 out of 36 on ACT, or scoring at least 1550 out of 2400 on SAT will measure the extend to which in grades 9-12 are on track for college and career preparedness.d). Percentage of students in grades 3 and 8 scoring Meets or Exceeds on reading and math CRCT's to measure student academic proficiency and growth, e). Percentage of students in grade 9 scoring Meets or Exceeds on the Math IEOC to t measure student academic proficiency and growth,
- The last performance measure - number and rate per 100 students of annual disciplinary referrals to measure socio-emotional health. While the reduction of disciplinary referrals is an excellent goal, there is not a correlation between the reduction of disciplinary referrals and the improvement of socio-emotional

health.

(b) How the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant’s implementation success or areas of concern.

- The PULSE proposal identifies how each performance measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative information. a). Percentage of students in Grade 8 passing at least four courses in four content areas will serve to facilitate student mastery of course content, ). Percentage of graduates completing a CTAE pathway, or advanced academic, fine arts, or world language pathway to serve to heighten student awareness and self-knowledge around career options, c). Percentage of students entering TCSG/USG not requiring remediation , scoring 22 out of 36 on ACT, or scoring at least 1550 out of 2400 on SAT will facilitate student mastery of course content ,d). Percentage of students in grades 3 and 8 scoring Meets or Exceeds on reading and math CRCT's will improve student academic achievement, e). Percentage of students in grade 9 scoring Meets or Exceeds on the Math IEOC will result in improved academic achievement. f). The number and rate of annual disciplinary referrals will contribute to student's academic achievement and socio-emotional well-being.

(c) How it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gage implementation progress.

- The PULSE proposal identifies how the CCS will review and improve the performance measures over time.a). Percentage of students in Grade 8 passing at least four courses in four content areas will be used to compare with other indicators of being on track. Those other indicators were not identified. , b). Percentage of graduates completing a CTAE pathway, or advanced academic, fine arts, or world language pathway to serve to orient students to career options and how to obtain those options will used to compare to teacher impressions of student career preferences. Teacher impressions are not a valid and reliable measure. , c). Percentage of students entering TCSG/USG not requiring remediation , scoring 22 out of 36 on ACT, or scoring at least 1550 out of 2400 on SAT will be used to compare of other indicators of being on track for college and career readiness. The other indicators are not identified. .d). Percentage of students in grades 3 and 8 scoring Meets or Exceeds on reading and math CRCT's will be compared to GPA and with Student Learning Objectives embedded in the TKES. e). Percentage of students in grade 9 scoring Meets or Exceeds on the Math IEOC to t measure student academic proficiency and growth, f). The number and rate of annual disciplinary referrals will contribute to student's academic achievement and socio-emotional well-being will be measured by an annual student survey designed to elicit student impressions of their socio-emotional well-being. Student impressions are only one indicator and other types of measures should also have been included.

This section is scored in the high range. Section a Rationale is well done. Section b is well done except for the last performance measure on student discipline. A more robust measure an age-appropriate non-cognitive indicator of growth (e.g., physical well-being and motor development, or social-emotional development) for grades K-3, 4-8, and 9-12 should have been identified for use. Section c is very limited in the identification of how the performance measures will impact the project over-time.

<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
--	----------	----------

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

- E 4). Evaluating Effectiveness of Investments.
- E 4). Evaluating the Effectiveness of Investments

The PULSE proposal presents a high-quality plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities, such as professional development and activities that employ technology as evidenced by:

- Use of the program logic model as the basis for mapping each activity and investment to the four program goals and corresponding benchmarks is very well articulated. The evaluation will use a mixed methods approach and draw from multiple data sources: 1). Monitor progress and the extent of fielding of implementation, 2), Measure student achievement and teacher effectiveness, 3). Gage participant reaction to investments in PD, technology, and staff support, and 4). Communicate progress toward goals and invite feedback.
- Use of a Regression Point Displacement design to compare Camden County achievement, achievement gap, and progress on Georgia's College and Career Readiness Performance Index is an excellent measure and will be successful.

This section receives a perfect score because all criteria were supported by convincing evidence for the development of a high-quality plan for evaluating effectiveness of investments through data collection and management, fidelity of implementation, and data analysis and reporting.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>F 1). Budget</p> <p>The PULSE budget</p> <p>(a) Clearly and succinctly Identifies all funds that will support the project (e.g., Race to the Top – District grant; external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds) as evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RTT-D funding request is \$19,999,136</li> <li>Other funds used to support the project include; CCS, Title I, State of GA RTT initiative, Dept of Defense Education Activity project, Educational Special Purpose Local Option Sales Tax, and Military and Family Life Counselor Program.</li> </ul> <p>(b) Is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant’s proposal as evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PULSE proposal will impact all educators, students, and their families in the District. RTT-D funding will provide approximately \$500.00 per student per year during the four year grant period.</li> </ul> <p>(c) Clearly provides a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities by</p> <p>(i) An excellent description of all of the funds (e.g., Race to the Top – District grant; external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds) that the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal, including total revenue from these sources as evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Funds - The PULSE management team is responsible for project accountability and fiscal oversight and will link PULSE to other CCS initiatives. IN addition, the current CCS technology coordinator will oversee all technology initiatives throughout the District and will manage all PULSE technology purchases.</li> <li>Title I - Teachers will support efforts to individualize instruction for every student by either reducing class size or supporting individualized instruction for high-need students requiring focused support.</li> <li>State of GA Race to the Top Initiative - Even though not a participant CCS will benefit from the following tools: TKES, LKES, K-12 Statewide Student Longitudinal Data System, Teacher Resource Link</li> <li>DoDEA - CCS was awarded project STARR to improve student achievement in math and science with a focus on military dependent students.</li> <li>E-SPLOST - Locally generated dollars used to increase technology access for CCS students at a 1:1 student to device ratio.</li> <li>Military and Family Life Counselor - Through partnership with DOD, CCS working to establish a partnership to provide Military and Family Life Counselors.</li> </ul> <p>(ii) Identification of the funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grant period, as described in the proposed budget and budget narrative, with a focus on strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments as evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Table 36 CCS RTT-D Total Budget Narrative.</li> </ul> <p>This section receives a perfect score because all criteria have been met with an excellent array of budgetary evidence.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

F 2). Sustainability of Project Goals

The PULSE proposal includes a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. The plan includes support from State and local government leaders, financial support, and a description of how the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use the data to inform future investments. The PULSE proposal addresses how CCS will evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes that informs their post-grant budget. An estimated budget for the three years after the term of the grant that includes budget assumptions, potential sources, and uses of funds. Evidence that supports this criteria includes:

- The sustainability plan will be developed based on the characteristics of a high-quality plan to include 1). A strong program leadership to motivate and guide key stakeholders, 2). A clear direction and vision of what needs to be improved or changed, 3). Genuine commitment from community stakeholders, 4). Community collaboration, 5). Funding alternatives, and 6). Strengthened organizational capacity and infrastructure.
- The CCS sustainability plan will include the following elements: 1). Creation of a database which includes current and potential financial partners 2). A detailed report that describes the effectiveness of past investments to inform long-term investments in personalized learning strategies and technology integration, 3). An assessment of program modifications made during the grant period to evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes for continuing effective strategies.

This section receives a perfect score because all criteria were supported by convincing evidence for the development of a high-quality plan for sustainability of PULSE goals after the term of the grant. High-quality plan components include 1). The assurance of quality financial management of the project, 2). The identification and prioritization of the most critical and effective project components, 3). The identification and support for critical components beyond the life of the grant.

**Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

Competitive Preference Priority:

The PULSE proposal includes a clear and concise plan that meets the Competitive Preference Priority by:

(1) CCS has provided a clear description of the coherent and sustainable partnership to support the plan described in Absolute Priority 1 that it has formed with public or private organizations, such as public health, before-school, after-school, and social service providers; integrated student service providers; businesses, philanthropies, civic groups, and other community-based organizations; early learning programs; and postsecondary institutions as evidenced by:

- A robust partnership with the U.S. Department of Defense and Magellan Health Services to provide additional socio-emotional support for military-connected students at six CCS attendance centers, supportive interventions for military families to address social and emotional stressors related to relocation, deployment, and reintegration, and assistance for CCS educators, staff, and administrators in meeting the needs of military connected youth and families.

(2) Identify not more than 10 population-level desired results for students in the LEA or consortium of LEAs that align with and support the applicant's broader Race to the Top – District proposal as evidenced by:

(a) Educational results: An excellent ounseling program for military-connected student to further personalize CCS learning environments

(b) Family and community supports results: Military families will be provided high-quality socio-emotional support through the partnership.

(3) The partnership will:

(a) Track the selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all children within the LEA and at the student level for the participating students as evidenced by:

- An excellent array of tools such as: PowerSchool, Student Track, Data Director, and the GA Student Longitudinal Data System to track the selected indicators to allow for tracking of indicators in relation to the school population at large.
- Indicators include student growth percentiles, student learning objectives, college and career ready performance index, standardized tests, and formative/summative assessments.

(b) Use the data to target its resources in order to improve results for participating students with special emphasis on students facing significant challenges, such as students with disabilities, English learners, and students affected by poverty (including highly mobile students), family instability, or other child welfare issues as evidenced by:

- Counselors at the six participating schools will prioritize service provisions by level of need as demonstrate through student performance data, feedback from educators, and requests for counseling and support.

(c) Develop a strategy to scale the model beyond the participating students to at least other high-need students and communities in the LEA or consortium over time as evidenced by:

- A very significant and positive activity will be the infusion of six additional counselors focused on serving the military-connected student subgroup will provide existing counselors at participating schools with increased capacity to serve all students regardless of subgroup. Further positive out-reach will include non-military students that will also be served by the partnership through group-based staff at participating schools.

(d) Improve results over time as evidenced by:

- Evaluation of the program will assess the effectiveness of the services to support the socio-emotional needs of military-connected students. Well articulated tools to improve results over time to be incorporated include periodic evaluation reports, PULSE Management Team meetings, logic model modifications, and annual student, parent, and teacher satisfaction surveys.

(4) Describe how the partnership would, within participating schools, integrate education and other services (e.g., services that address social-emotional, and behavioral needs, acculturation for immigrants and refugees) for participating students

- The partnership as proposed will provide an excellent format for relationship building as military and family life counselors will be supported by the Kings Bay Naval Facility School Liaison Officer who will serve as a member of the PULSE management team. To ensure integration of education and other services, Military and Family Life Counselors will serve as members of school-based Personalized Learning Committees and provide feedback to educators regarding best practice for military-connected students.

(5) The PULSE proposal describes how the partnership and CCS will build the capacity of staff in participating schools by providing them with tools and supports to

(a) Assess the needs and assets of participating students that are aligned with the partnership's goals for improving the education and family and community supports identified by the partnership as evidenced by:

- Using the assessment and analysis of data through RTI and PLC's at each school will assess student needs to determine what level of instructional and socio-emotional support will benefit students on a weekly basis. Determination of necessary support for students on a weekly basis is outstanding.

(b) Identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community that are aligned with those goals for improving the education and family and community supports identified by the applicant as evidenced by:

- The redesign of the instructional environment through a well-defined combination of blended learning options. Examples include time-technology swaps, collaborative instruction and co-teaching, and subject specialization.
- Each targeted school will conduct their own assessment of assets and areas of improvement.

(c) Create a decision-making process and infrastructure to select, implement, and evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating students and support improved results as evidenced by:

- The central decision-making infrastructure for CCS is the Outcome-Based Continuous Improvement process based on five strategic focus area. This process enable CCS to continuously improve school and individual military-connected student progress by identifying the training, systems, and practices necessary to increase student performance and close achievement gaps.

(d) Engage parents and families of participating students in both decision-making about solutions to improve results over time and in addressing student, family, and school needs as evidenced by:

- A CCS stakeholder meeting was held to engage parents and students and assist with determining the reform strategies that would best meet the needs of families served.

(e) Routinely assess the applicant’s progress in implementing its plan to maximize impact and resolve challenges and problems as evidenced by:

- A professional external evaluation team will perform ongoing assessment to PULSE and partnership programs.

(6) Identify its annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population-level and describe desired results for students as evidenced by:

- Three performance based measures, with baseline and target data points, are well articulated and will undoubtedly measure the effectiveness of the partnership plan.

This section receives a perfect score because all criteria have been met at a very high level which will ensure that the activity as proposed will be highly successful if the application is funded.

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>
<b>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</b>		
Personalized and United Learning through Schoolwide Enrichment is a comprehensive plan submitted by the Camden County Schools, Camden, GA. The plan meets Absolute Priority 1 - the development of Personalized Learning Environments that will significantly improve teaching and learning through the use of real-time data, cutting-edge technology, and professional learning for all staff.		

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>192</b>
--------------	------------	------------



## Race to the Top - District Technical Review Form

Application #0177GA-3 for Camden County Board of Education

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score

<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant clearly outlines in this section of the proposal how they will build upon their work in the four core educational assurance areas, using the PULSE (Personalized and United Learning through School wide Enrichment) that will take the foundational work that has been done in the four areas, correlated to a chart that demonstrates the strategic focus areas and goals that this district has developed since 2008.</p> <p>The applicant has a well thought out and systematic plan to accelerate student achievement and increase equity through personalized student support. Their reform vision is leveraging and integrating technology, and they believe that this platform will transform teachers from traditional roles to one of flexible, facilitator roles in the classroom. They show a model of the CCS Personalized Learning Approach, showing the past, present, and future of their strategies to accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning. Their School wide Enrichment Model, or SEM, is the framework personalizing strategies that use high end learning strategies and accelerated content. From this point, the learner has multiple ways in which to learn.</p> <p>The applicant outlines the classroom experience for both students and teachers by the use of a table, which details the components that will help connect both learners and their educators, accelerating learning at higher levels.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant outlines a compelling and detailed vision for personalized learning reform. They address each subcategory in this section in detail, and cover all aspects of this section, giving the reader a clear picture and road map of their reform vision. The above factors give the applicant a score of 10 for this section.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant is including all 9, 158 students that are in their district in this grant proposal. The applicant gives a broad overview of this section, listing the schools that are participating by name, and have inserted a table that outlines the participating students from each school, and gives the raw data as far a participating students, high need, low income, and total number of all students involved.</p> <p>Although the information is concise, a more through explanation describing further the school selection would have given a clearer picture of this facet of the application. This gives the applicant a score of 8.</p>		
<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant sets forth in this section of the application a list of goals which will support and accelerate personalized learning; and inserts a logic model of their PULSE reforms. This model summary illustrates strategies, actions, outputs, outcomes, and the long term impact of this program . They also list a table which gives management structures that will be in place to support their district wide reform, by listing the positions, and the function for each position. They go on to also give a table that outlines their high quality plan, with deadlines, leaders, and how it correlates to their reform goals.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant gives a clear and detailed outline in this section of how their proposal will be implemented and turned into district wide change. They did not indicate in this section how the proposal would be scaled up if funded, which would have been important to see in this section. All their tables and logic model summaries address the descriptors in this section, giving them a score of 8.</p>		
<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant states in this section of the proposal that they are setting ambitious but achievable goals to improve student learning. They mention that the state of Georgia will change their standardized testing instruments in 2014-15, due to the implementation of Common Core State Standards. Due to this fact, baseline data will change and goals will be re-projected.</p> <p>The applicant's task in this section is to show that they are setting goals that will be equal to or exceed State targets. In performance on summative assessments, they set growth targets that range from .2-.7 %percent, depending on the subgroup. Although these targets may be reasonable, they do not seem ambitious in terms of what is required in this criteria. In growth, they are just trying to get into plosive growth, as most subgroups are in the negative range at the baseline of this grant.</p>		

In decreasing achievement gaps, once again the applicant is looking at targets that decrease the gap by .01 or .02 a year. The gap decrease is not consistent across the board; for example some years they project a decrease of .01, and then the next year it is .04. The gaps seems miniscule in nature; achievable, but certainly not ambitious.

In graduation rates, the applicant is setting a target growth from 76.32% in the first year of implementation, to 81.00% post grant. This target seems more in line with the ambitious but achievable goal that is the criteria in this grant.

For college enrollment rates, they are setting a growth target from .69%, to a post grant target of .80%. Once again, the target is small in terms of the reform that they are proposing.

Overall, the applicant shows goals for every category that is required in this section, and sets an ambitious but achievable goal in the area of graduation rates. Where this section seems lacking is in the goals that are set that are attainable, but very small in terms of growth. With such a reform proposal, the applicant seems to lack certainty in what it will be able to do in areas of assessments, achievement gaps, and college enrollment. This lack of ambition in these areas gives the candidate a score of 5.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant demonstrates through the use of data how they have improved student learning, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment in this section of the application. Both content areas (such as math, science, and English/Language Arts) show subgroups gains in grades 3-8 anywhere from 1% in a five year period(white and black subgroups in English) to 10 points in students with disabilities in both math and English.</p> <p>The applicant mentions that two of their district schools were named "Reward Schools" by the state of Georgia, which is given to schools exhibiting greatest performance or largest academic gain within a three year period. However, they do not indicate whether or not these two schools were low-performing schools before the award, so it is hard to tell if this criteria was met or not. They show plans that they have in place for continuous improvement, and for the RTI process. They were awarded nearly \$4 million in federal funding for Smaller Learning Communities in the district, which developed Career academies. Project STARR focuses on Technology, math ,and science, targeting their mobile military-connected students. Although all these plans and initiatives show growth, the applicant does not demonstrate clearly how they impact their lowest-achieving schools in this section of their proposal.</p> <p>CCS makes their student performance data available to all stakeholders through various means; through Power School, which is a data management system.They can contact families through Parent Link; and their website has access to many reports .</p> <p>Overall, the applicant demonstrates that they have a clear track record of improving student achievement, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment, as indicated by the data they present in this section. They also make student performance data available to all stakeholders in the process as well. Although they give a lot of evidence of the programs and reforms that they have in place for improvement, they do not specify the persistently lowest-performing schools that it impacts, as required in this section. Due to this lack of information in this area, the applicants receives a score of 11.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>In this section of the application, the applicant clearly states their level of transparency in making public expenditures for instruction, support, and administration. The actual personnel salaries are not listed in this section. The applicant does make reference to a link that can take you to this information, however, this can not be considered when reviewing the application.</p> <p>They have an annual report that outlines their processes, practices, and investments. Their district website gives the community access to policies, documents, calendars, and individual school websites. They plan fiscally at the school level, followed by full budget development at the district level. This financial information is made public through their district website. They also link the personnel salaries and expenditures on their website as well.</p> <p>The applicant demonstrates most of the needed information needed in each part of this application. Actual personnel salaries for instructional staff and teachers are not listed, giving the applicant a score of 3.</p>		

<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant demonstrates in this section of the proposal that the State of Georgia has in place policies that will allow for the implementation of their PULSE system, and then goes on to address within the section the criteria that support the successful conditions and sufficient autonomy through the state that will allow this proposal to occur.</p> <p>Georgia itself is a Race To The Top recipient, receiving over \$400 million dollars in RT3 funds, of which the CCS district has benefited. The state also received a waiver that releases the state from the requirements set forth in No Child Left Behind , and gives the state greater flexibility to use fund, and to give districts the power to implement Flexible Learning Plans to meet needs of specific student populations. They also list Georgia's Move On When Ready act, which gives students in grades 11 and 12 the chance to earn credit for high school graduation through equivalent postsecondary work. The state (as a part of the RT3 funds) also instituted a new teacher evaluation system, in which CCS volunteered to be a part of a pilot program. CCS also has begun the transition, along with the state to Common Core State Standards.</p> <p>The applicant gives many clear examples of how they have successful conditions under the state's requirements to implement their personalized learning environment; such as how they benefited from the reorganization with new performance categories from state assessments to meet the needs of students; having some schools designated as "Reward Schools" which is based on a criteria of progress and and high levels of performance; being part of Georgia's "Move On When Ready Act" which deals with personalized learning. This is further backed by the fact that the State that they reside in as well is a Race To the Top recipient. The above facts give the applicant a score of 8.</p>		
<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>13</b>
<p><b>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The CCS district does not have a collective bargaining unit; therefore, they had to provide evidence in this section that at least 70% of their teachers supported the RTT-D proposal. A committee was formed by their superintendent, with district and school leaders, district data specialist, technology coordinator, and key staff from current federal grant programs. This Council developed the PULSE model; and then it was presented to all educators during staff meetings. Evidence of support for this proposal is documented in Appendix G of the proposal, with each staff member listed, along with their approval answer, date, and time of approval.</p> <p>Letters of support from key stakeholders are documented in Appendix H of the proposal; with support from key businesses in the district, as well as colleges, civic groups, and health groups.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant gives clear and visible documentation of this section of the proposal, demonstrating through the appendixes that both staff and community members support the implementation of their grant. They also give a clear description detailing how the key members were engaged in the designing of this proposal, giving the applicant an overall score of 13.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• demonstrates that they have methods and systems in place to achieve goals, however, they do not state how they are involving the student in this process.</li> <li>• When they mention deep experiences , they align this more to a traditional method of how a gifted seminar is taught.No mention of how the technology based system would tie into setting higher level goals is mentioned in this subpart.</li> <li>• Although the applicant lists many methods that they will use to accelerate student learning, the issue of addressing diverse cultures is not a part of this section.</li> <li>• The applicant does outline how the SEM system with it's technology base will enable students to be ready for</li> </ul>		

college and career.

- The applicant does talk about feedback, but it is more directed at the teachers, and not the learner.
- They do mention the use of an e-portfolio, that will accompany the student throughout their educational career, with advisors being available to work with HS students.
- RTI seems to be the answer for the high need students, but high quality strategies are not mentioned in this section, except to talk about the framework of the RTI, which existed before the proposal of the grant.

Overall, the applicant seems to list good framework and strategies, but they do not seem to align to the needs of the students mentioned in this section of the proposal. There are pieces missing in the selection criterion (such strategies for high-needs students). They address areas of the criteria, but they do not go into detail to address the criterion that is being asked for in this section. This mis-alignment of their resources to the student gives them a score of 10.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>13</b>
--	-----------	-----------

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant contents that the work of supporting teachers in the effective implementation of personalized learning environments will be done through Professional Learning Communities, or PLCs. District PLCs will meet as well to share effective strategies. The new Georgia Teacher evaluation system will give support to teachers as well. They allude to the fact that their flexibility in giving leadership teams autonomy is due to their Board of Education receiving an award from the state, but this does not seem to correlate with how an award gives their leadership teams autonomy.

Professional development will also play a key in supporting teachers , and the applicant gives examples of some topics that might be covered with cadres of teachers. However, the applicant does not indicate exactly how they plan to provide professional development, nor do they mention how the PLCs work will align with the tenets of their proposal. Since this is one of the major parts of their proposal, and they intend to implement this Professional Development model at each school, a detailed plan for how they are going to provide Professional development is crucial to successful implementation.

They show how they plan to integrate their existing central office infrastructure with new supports and services made possible by the RTT-D grant. They state that the systems operations are guided by their Outcome-Based Continuous Improvement process, but they do not do into detail about what this process is.

They do plan to have coaches and internationalists at each school to assist and plan professional development, and to provide targeted support with students on their personalized learning path. Technology support will be crucial as they implement their new systems, and to give training to teachers.

The School wide Enrichment Model is the basis of their grant proposal, with a model that will assess student strengths, and allow teachers to have blended learning options to adapt content and instruction, using technology. They will monitor this growth by state and district data systems, give assessments that measure student growth, and to measure college and career readiness.

The applicant demonstrates through this section of the application their High-Quality Plan for Teaching and Leading. They insert a plan that shows the specific goals, timelines, and responsible parties. This table gives clear details and steps of how they plan to improve the teaching level of their teachers to ensure that the students will receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers, using an explicit evaluation system to support and evaluate the instructional staff.

The applicant gives a lot of broad outlines and examples of what is going to happen in the teaching and leading section of their proposal, but do not seem to have a targeted vision of exactly what will happen to make this a high quality plan. Specific targets and goals do not have a specific roadmap for implementation, giving the applicant a score of 13.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant demonstrates through a table the district organizational plan, which outlines the schools, principals, and board members in their district. They state that they operate systems that support their vision through the Balanced Scorecard System, which captures teacher retention rates, student behavioral indicators, free/reduced lunch participation, annual pupil expenditures, and national/state assessments to measure school and student performance. The findings from this scorecard guide the development of improvement activities for the next school year.

As a part of the continuous improvement, PULSE implementation support and services will be led by a management team. The applicant lists in the appendixes resumes and letters of support for these members. This team is responsible for all aspects of this implementation, with support from personalized learning/technology coaches. This plan seems well thought out, with personnel in place to ensure that the implementation has support, plus the services they need for fidelity in the grant programs.

They do address how students can earn credits on mastery and progress through PULSE and programs within the district. (such as online recovery credit, and virtual learning). They list programs that give their students opportunities to demonstrate mastery of standards. The applicant does an excellent job in this section of giving details of programs, such as PULSE, standard assessments, student learning portfolios, and ways their high school students can work towards college credits while still completing the requirements of high school. They feel that the RTI , early childhood interventions, flexible instructional grouping, extended learning time, and on site credit recovery give students equal access to instruction, and give a detailed description of these strategies in C(1). They do not address how they they are going to make these programs accessible to English language learners, and Students with disabilities.

Overall, the applicant addresses the criteria of the plan, with details of how the district will support and implement this plan with sufficient support and services. They give excellent details of how students have both opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards, and give great detail of programs available in this area. They did not give examples of how programs are accessible to English language learners and students with disabilities, giving them a score of 12.

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

**10**

**8**

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant demonstrates in part A of this section the ways that students, parents, and educators will have access to learning resources. For students, it is the technological device, with student learning portfolios that travel with students throughout their school career. For parents, they receive current information about their child's performance in person, through student data portals, through school websites, access to their child's electronic portfolios, and access to technology based resources before and after school. Educators have access to portable technology as well, with access to electronic learning and resources, and the Georgia State Electronic platform that gives multiple resources for assessment and professional development. All seem well aligned to each other; although parents having more access to resources at home would strengthen this program even further.

In part B, the district gives examples of how the stakeholders have levels of technical support. They give examples of what leaders will have, such as the PULSE management team, technicians for technology integration, and Personalized Learning Committees at each school. For teachers, examples of support include personalized learning coaches and professional development options. Specialists even support teachers by skill and grade level. This is a very specific and targeted way to provide needed support. Students have advisors, their learning portfolios, with their devices allowing them to develop their own goals as they advance through the grade levels.

In part C, the applicant inserts a table that shows the parent and student technology system options, such as Data Director and the Learning Portfolios. They state that they describe these resources in further detail in section B. It would be useful to have more pertinent information about these programs alluded to in this section.

In part D, they indicate the use of Data Director as their data system that houses their assessments; with the Balanced Scorecard giving outcomes and annual targets. They believe that their PULSE system will expand these programs through their student learning portfolios. This additional measure does seem like a way to extend the information that goes through the district and the schools, bringing to a more personal level for students and their families.

Overall, the applicant addresses each part of this section, giving strong examples of how they will support the district, school, parent, student, and educator infrastructure to give the appropriate support that will implement and sustain this new initiative. Giving parents more access to technology at home is an area that would make a stronger connection. This information above garners the applicant a score of 8.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant is planning as a part of this initiative to partner with an independent evaluator, who will give the PULSE team unbiased, completely analyzed feedback throughout the course of the program so that they are able to make adjustments, and other decisions. This evaluator will involve all stakeholders in an on-going dialogue to assess progress towards goals and objectives, although they do not state the time and frequency of when this feedback will occur. They will monitor through needs assessments by all stakeholders, with triangulation of this survey data to allow for identification of program strengths, and look at needs and strengths across the time of the grant.</p> <p>A logic model will be utilized to guide the continuous improvement model, using this format as a road map to make connections between the theory of this initiative, and it's implementation. They also will monitor for fidelity of of this grant, with the outside evaluator computing the average of fidelity scores, ensuring that the mandates of this grant stay true, safeguarding against "program drift". The applicant also inserts a table, demonstrating their High-Quality plan for Continuous Improvement. this plan has specific goals, deliverables, deadlines, and responsible persons for these areas.</p> <p>An external evaluator seems to be a very effective way to maintain objectively, and ensure that biased perspectives from district members that are submerged in this initiative are realistic. The models that are in place for safeguarding that the initiative stays on track and is done with fidelity are monitored regularly and systematically, with classroom observations done four to six times a year to further ensure this plan is being done with fidelity. The High Quality Plan further gives systematic details of how this plan will be implemented. This thoughtful and detailed plan gives the applicant a score of 12.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Meaningful structures are in place to ensure that the applicant has ongoing communication with all stakeholders. They plan to conduct monthly and quarterly meetings with management teams, personalized learning committees, professional development, and evaluation. Just as before, they tie their communication plan to their continuous improvement process, demonstrating the details with a table that they insert in this section. This table gives the goals, targets, deadlines, and leaders responsible for these goals of communication and engagement.</p> <p>The applicant demonstrates through the regular and systematic ways they plan to involve all stakeholders (both educators and families) that they have a high quality plan in place that will keep all stakeholders up to date in how they plan to implement and improve the initiatives they will receive from the grant. They provide a variety of examples of how they will communicate on a consistent basis, such as school-based Personalized learning committees that will oversee PULSE implementation at each school and communicate with staff; and to host technology family nights to demonstrate the use of new devices; how to trouble shoot common problems,a And how they will integrate this into the students learning goals. This detailed engagement and communication piece gives the applicant a score of 4.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>For the effective teacher and principal measurements for subgroups, the applicant made an estimation from taking a sample of four math and reading Student Learning Objectives responses from the Georgia Pilot of it's Teacher Keys and Leader Keys evaluation systems. These objectives link student gains to teacher and leader effectiveness. It is interesting to note that the number for effective teachers and principals are the same in percentages and in numbers. This seems unusual, since typically there are more teachers than principals in a district. It is not clear if the numbers and percentages are averages of teachers. and principals. The applicant provides a breakdown of numbers and percentages in all required subgroups of this section.</p> <p>The applicant provided performance measures for grades PreK-3 in the area of percentages of children (third grade) that scored as proficient on the Georgia Criterion Referenced Competency tests in ELA and Math. Over the period of the grant, the applicant set a goal of a 5% gain in all subgroup areas. They also list the number of disciplinary referrals as a data point with the the goals to decrease these referrals. However, the goals do not seem ambitious. The Hispanic and Multi-Racial subgroups are only expected to go down in five years from 10 to 9 students; there is no data at all for Economically Disadvantaged, English Learners, or Students with Disabilities.</p>		

In performance measures for grades 4-8, they are measuring the percentage of students in grade 8 passing at least four courses in four content areas. In five years, the targeted number for all students goes from a baseline of 545 to 594 students. They do not have baseline data for ED, ELL, or SWD. They do have targets for these areas over the life of the grant.

They also target eighth graders in the area of students who will score as proficient in ELA and Math on the Georgia Competency Tests. The goals seem to be between 3 and 5 % in these areas. They also target the number of discipline referrals for grades 4-8; once again, there seems to be a slight decrease for all subgroups during the five year period; the white subpopulation has a more ambitious goal: from 446 to 403.

The applicant targets the 9-12 grades in the number and percentage of students who complete the free and reduced lunch forms; aiming for a goal of 74.8%, up from 64% at the baseline point. They also are tracking the number of students who do not need remedial courses or support; the percentage of graduates who complete what they describe as a "pathway" within their unit of study; those students who meet or exceed the Georgia end of course test in Math; and the rate of discipline referrals each year. It is interesting to note that in the area of 9-12 grade students, the applicant has ambitious goals in the discipline area, looking for a 2-3% increase. The applicant has very ambitious goals in the areas of SWD, with an almost 30% goal in terms of those students who will meet or exceed the EOC tests for the state.

The applicant also goes on to explain the rationale of how these measures were selected, and how they will review these goals during the life of the grant. Although the rationales are general in nature (Annual course performance on the Georgia EOC tests will indicate student growth and proficiency) they are able to give the rationale and review process in the format of a table.

Overall, the applicant does a through job of addressing the criteria in this section. The goals are sometimes inconsistent in what one would think would be improvement, or closing the achievement gaps, but they have a detailed plan in place to monitor and adjust their targets as well. This gives the applicant a score of 4.

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

**5**

**5**

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has in place in this section a very complex and technical way to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of their RTT-D activities. They are using a Regression Point Displacement trajectory, along with using the outside evaluator, who will continue to use their district logic model to examine and adjust the initiatives they are striving to implement through this grant. The RPD is interesting, for they will use their data in comparison to 24 other outside school districts.

The applicant will also use quantitative measures, such as EOC scores, the teacher evaluation system, and competency results. Qualitative measures include interviews, reflective practice session transcripts, and surveys.

They present in this section a table, in which they list their "High Quality" Plan for Evaluating Effectiveness of Investments, with goals, and activities broken down with the responsible parties, and time lines.

The use of an outside evaluator to be the facilitator of this measurement seems a very objective way to look through data points at how the investments they are making are effecting student growth; the applicant has addressed the methods being used, with a variety of ways ensuring that the true picture of how effective this grant is being in terms of effectiveness is addressed. This gives the applicant a score of 5.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>

**(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

It seems as if in this section of the application that the information needed for section F(1) is listed at the end of this application, in the appendix section. The applicant is requesting a total of \$19,999,136 for this RTT-D grant. They also identify the outside funds that will support this grant, such as monies from the LEA, Title 1, the Georgia State RRTP grant, local sales taxes, and Department of Defense monies.

They believe that this amount is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of their proposal, supporting all 791 educators and their 9, 158 students in their district, with a breakdown cost of approximately 500 dollars for each teacher and student.

They give a description of the funds that they will use to support the implementation of the program, listing the key employees that will supervise this grant, with their costs listed as well. Costs are also identified that are one time investments versus those that are used for on-going costs, such as technology coaches, a project director, and Transition Coaches. The breakdown by year , with a total cost for these employees, is listed. The applicant gives an example of an independent program evaluation as a one-time cost.

The applicant does a very thorough job in explaining and identifying the funds that will be used for the implementation of the RTT-D grant. All funds are tied into their proposals. The only one that seems a little off center is a conference for gifted and talented students. Although this trip would be useful overall, it does not seem to directly tie in to the mandates of the proposals. The above information gives the applicant a score of 9.

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

**10**

**7**

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant demonstrates in this section that they will be able to sustain the project goal's after the term of the grant is over. Their project director will lead this piece of the initiative as well. The applicant lists the facets of a high-quality sustainability plan, such as a clear direction and vision of what needs to be improved or changed, funding alternative sources, and a data base that will include current and potential financial support options.

The applicant's table that is in this section outlines their goals, activities to meet these goals, and the personnel responsible for ensuring these goals will be completed. The activities are not detailed in this table, they give an overall view of ideas such as cultivating relationships with potential stakeholders, and to secure or renew financial commitments for support of critical components.

They do reference that they currently receive support from community contributions, as well as Title One and other grant programs. They give a prediction of the funds that will be needed to sustain this grant over a three year period, with the personnel and justification for these personnel listed within the table. They also list training and supplies.

Overall, the applicant addresses this section with a broad picture of what could occur post grant. They do give information about how they will continue to evaluate their outcomes, and a budget. Having identified potential support from other sources than federal programs would help the applicant get a head start on continuing a promising initiative to support student growth, giving the applicant a score of 7.

**Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

With this district's proximity to a Naval base, 21% of their student body has a family member that serves in the U. S. military. Due to the mobility of this subpopulation, and some associated risks, the applicant is partnering with the US Department of Defense, and a local Health Service organization. This program, entitled the Military and Family Life Counselor program, will provide socio-economic support at six of their district schools, enhancing their PULSE initiative. This program not only gives emotional and academic support to the targeted students, but assists their educators in meeting their needs as well.

They describe how this partnership would track selected indicators through a variety of tools, aligned with the PULSE proposal, and used the the student electronic learning portfolios. This method not only helps students and their families monitor their goals, but also the educators that are assigned to these students.

They will use the data provided to allow counselors at these six identified school to prioritize students by need, and use intervention strategies described in their PULSE proposal to support students as well.

The strategies needed will be additional counselors at these six schools to support these identified students; the bonus is that all students at these schools will benefit from these services as well. They will be partnering with community organizations to provide mental and health counseling and services, as well as transition coaches, who will create learning plans to assist these students in being college and career ready.

The outside evaluator hired for the overall implementation of the PULSE RTT-D proposal will also oversee this section, assessing the effectiveness of this program as well. Specific ways of how the program will be evaluated were not given for this component.

They give a model of exactly how the applicant will service service students, their families and educators, and will continue to assess needs through their RTI monitoring, PLCS, and tools that are going to be used by all members of this proposal. The targeted schools will conduct needs assessments, using a technology based structure that was not identified.

Their on-going continuous improvement process will ensure that these students have the supports that they need; and families will be engaged and students assessed in the implementation process in the same manner the general population of families are in the overall proposal.

The applicant has means and resources identified for this special subpopulation that needs emotional and academic support, and is integrating this additional support with the overall proposal of their RTT-D grant. This integration of both specific support of this subpopulation, aligning it to the overall proposal is an excellent way to use the resources at hand, and to partner with local organizations as well. This gives the applicant an overall score of 8.

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

Overall, the applicant met the criteria for Absolute Priority 1. They demonstrated how they would use the monies from the RTT-D grant to create student electronic learning portfolios for each student; giving staff and educators the support that they need in implementing this grant; the funding is used wisely, using personnel and resources that will go on after the life of the proposal. The strategies, tools and supports for students to be college and career ready are systematically aligned with strategies that will accelerate student achievement, and expand the effectiveness of educators. They give specific data to support their claims, and in each section, define the rationales, activities, and personnel that will be used for this well thought out plan.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>160</b>
--------------	------------	------------