



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0084GA-1 for Haralson County School System

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>

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

For A1a, the applicant only partially meets this criterion. While they do list the four core educational assurance areas, very little information is provided on how they would be adapting standards and assessment to prepare students for both college and career readiness (other than students will have access to college- and career-ready curriculum standards via blended learning and online instruction, and access to state of the art labs in a wide variety of career pathways), and nothing was mentioned at all as to how they would provide highly effective teachers and principals for all students, and turning around their lowest-achieving schools while improving instruction at all schools. While this section is intended to be an overview of the vision for their entire proposal, with details to follow in future sections, stating nothing at all about several of these assurance areas in this overview means they failed to meet this criteria. It is noted that the applicant did provide some information within A2 on the state's teacher keys effectiveness system and the leader keys effectiveness system which will be implemented for the 2014 school year, and will provide data that will allow for all students to have effective administrators and teachers.

For A1b, the applicant only partially meets this criterion. They offer some good ideas of how to improve the education for students (via blended learning and online instruction as supported by one-to-one wireless technology, a Lifetime Learning Academy, and an individual learning plan for each student). They also note some good ideas on how to improve conditions for all in the broader community (via ubiquitous wireless internet access in every school, for every students, and available to the community as a whole through free, family-friendly internet service), but overall they do not articulate a clear and credible approach for 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.

For A1c, the applicant barely meets this criterion. They note that each student will have an individual learning plan that includes an electronic portfolio of the school history starting with preK, it notes that these would only be analyzed and updated each year by the teachers in collaboration with the parent and student. They note that this portfolio will serve as an individualized graduation plan once the students enter 6th grade, and that it might be used to allow students to earn course credit based on mastery of content as demonstrated through products placed within their portfolio. However, these activities overall did not describe what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments.

Overall the applicant does not offer enough detail to clearly articulate a comprehensive and coherent reform vision, and scores in the lower middle range.

<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

For A2a, the applicant fully meets this criterion by noting that all six schools within the district will participate, and all grade levels within those schools. They offered the rationale that this would best allow effective change throughout the community by implementing a highly rigorous curriculum at all grade levels, and offering an individualized learning plan that would start in preK and follow them throughout their school career and provide them with the tools and information to be successful in their post-secondary endeavors. Since no information at all was provided as to who was engaged in making the decision to involve all students and educators in the district, it is more difficult to determine whether this approach to implementing its reform proposal will indeed support high-quality, LEA-level and school-level implementation of the proposal.

For A2b and, the applicant almost fully meets these criteria by including a table that lists the six participating schools, and their total number of educators, and students (including the students as broken down by high-needs and low-income). Absent in the table (and in the narrative) is a grand total number of educators and students, but upon adding these up, the

applicant does meet the minimum of serving at least 2,000 students or which at least 40% are from low-income families.

The applicant scores in the high middle range.

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

**10**

**4**

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

For A3, the applicant meets only minimal aspects of this criterion. The applicant's logic model or theory of change on how its plan will improve student learning outcomes for all students in their district is not overall convincing. It appears to be primarily a collection of some good reforms to implement (e.g., 1:1 devices; internet for the entire community; a lifetime learning academy, and individual learning plans), but these reforms do not hang together well enough to convince the reader that every student will end up with more rigorous standards and become career- and college-ready, and that each will indeed receive personalized and targeted instruction via these efforts. There is no evidence that each element is an integral aspect of their overall proposed reforms. For example, within this section, professional learning communities are mentioned for the first time as a important part of their reform efforts, as are Career Pathway Advisors. They also note that their performance measures are only tracked on a quarter, semester, and annual basis, thus making it more difficult to implement personalized and targeted instruction. Thus this is limited evidence as to how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change within and beyond the participating schools, and will help the applicant reach its outcome goals

The applicant scores in the lower end of the middle range.

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

**10**

**4**

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

For A4a, the applicant partially meets the criterion by identifying annual ambitious goals that are equal to or exceed their state ESEA targets for the LEA, overall and by student subgroup regarding performance on summative assessments. They offer baseline data for 18 different student achievement areas (including ELA, reading, math, science, and social studies) as tested by their state for each of three grade band levels (elementary, including grades 3-5; middle, including grades 6-8; and high school). The goals are written as the percent meeting a certain proficiency status, and they indicate that their growth measures are simply the change in percent of student meeting and exceeding those proficiency levels. There is no narrative describing how they established their annual goal targets, and some appear to be more modest than others. For example, they propose to increase the overall percent of students in grades 3-5 scoring at meets or exceed on their ELA assessment from the baseline of 88% (in 2012-13) to 96.2% (in 2017-18) - an increase of 8.2%, while they propose to increase the overall percent of these same students in math from the baseline of 79% (in 2012-13) to 93.4% (in 2017-18) - an increase of 14.4%. While this greater increase in math might be possible, there is nothing in the narrative or described in their overall plan thus far which reveals a greater focus on math. Thus it is difficult to ascertain based on the information provided whether these goals are actually achievable.

For A4b, the applicant partially meets the criterion by identifying annual ambitious goals which take 8 of the previous 18 student achievement goals and establish a goal of decreasing the achievement gap between individual subgroup achievements and the overall group achievement. They do this for all students and for all required subgroups. Again there is no narrative describing how they established their annual goal targets, and therefore, it is difficult to ascertain whether these goals are actually achievable or not, based on the information provided. For example, they offer nothing to explain how they anticipate making such large gains with their students with disability group (for example, going from a gap of -27 to -8.5 in grade 3-5 math, and going from -20 to -7.3 in grade 3-5 reading).

For A4c, the applicant partially meets this criterion by identifying baseline and ambitious goals for improved high school graduation rates, for students overall and for the various required subgroups. In this case, the applicant does offer good information as to how the grant will be helping them specifically with this goal, whereby more hybrid and on-line courses, and the Lifetime Learning Academy, will be supporting students who had to drop out to support their families. However, they again offer no detail as to how the grant would be taking them from a baseline graduation rate of 23.2% to 87.2% for students with disabilities, thus it is difficult to ascertain whether such goals are actually achievable or not.

For A4c, the applicant does not meet this criterion. They do identify baseline data and ambitious goals for college enrollment of their students overall, but do not offer any goals for subgroups. They noted that the state only collect data on students overall, but then offered no plans as to how they would be gathering such data for their own subgroup via the grant.

Overall, the applicant scores in the lower part of the middle range for this section.

**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>10</b>
<p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>For B1a, the applicant only partially meets the criterion. They do offer student performance data for math and reading/ELA (as aggregated at the school level) from 2008 to 2011, for students overall, and as broken down by students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged). They also offered the total change over time for each school and subject area, and these results are generally positive (with 24 of the 28 areas showing some positive gain, and 4 showing a loss). They do not offer any data as broken down by racial/ethnic subgroups, nor do they offer any data on the closing of achievement gaps for various subgroups.</p> <p>For B1b, the applicant partially meets the criterion. They describe how they had 4 schools on the state's needs improvement list for AYP in the past, but recently have 5 of their 6 schools make AYP (their high school was the exception). They then describe some significant efforts (e.g., replacing all 4 administrators) they have been putting into place within their high school, and repeated the goals that they have for the future for this school (via support of this grant). They do not describe any of their reforms efforts in the other schools which did make AYP (after having been on the needs improvement list).</p> <p>For B1c, the applicant meets this criterion by describing the data systems that they have and how both formative and summative data is now available to educators via their Performance Matters system, as well as the state longitudinal data system. They indicate that teachers use this data to monitor the performance of all students in all subject areas and all grade levels on their progress toward meeting targets on their individual learning plans. They note that teachers meet as grade and content level teams to discuss individual and group student performance at least monthly, and more often for students who are struggling. Parents and students are kept informed and engaged through student and parents portals in their data management system, and students in grades 6-12 run their own student-led conferences with their parents and teachers to discuss and demonstrate how they have shown mastery of the content standards through work samples and test data.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant scores in the middle range for this section.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
<p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>For B2a-d, the applicant fails to meet these criteria. They do note that all personnel salaries are made public via a state-operated website. They also note that the district prepares a report that contains information on all public school expenditures, revenue, and vendors for public viewing on the state website, and that their state department of education also houses their annual financial budget and expenditures for the school system for public viewing. Also noted is that they provide monthly budget updates to their board at open public meetings, and that their financial reports are posted on their local eBoard for public viewing.</p> <p>However, while it appears that significant budgetary information is available for public viewing, nothing was stated about this information being available as "school-level" data for easy use by the consumers of such data. Therefore, there is no evidence offered that the applicant actually makes available the minimum required data for these criteria (i.e., actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff).</p> <p>The applicant receives a score in the low range.</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>For B3, the applicant almost fully meets this criteria by describing how their entire school system has now been approved by the state to be a charter school system. Within the appendix provided about this charter agreement with the state, their charter system has been granted the authority to implement flexibility in requirements and delivery of remedial and accelerated programs, flexibility with graduate requirements and providing students alternative ways to earn credit, and flexibility with seat time and scheduling designed to support a four-day school week, with an emphasis on blended learning and bring your own technology initiatives.</p> <p>They also profile how the current school councils in each school are being transitioned to a local school governance team through the system's charter agreement with the state. These teams are to be empowered to be responsible for reviewing,</p>		

providing input, and making decisions regarding the school improvement plan, new policies, school budget, extra-curricular activities, parent involvement, academic progress, and personnel decisions. This school-level authority helps provide conditions to help implement a personalized learning environment as described in their proposal.

Overall the district is in the process of implementing various reforms that will allow for successful conditions and sufficient autonomy (although this is all just being implemented and there is no solid record with these efforts). They receive a score in the high range.

<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>
--	-----------	-----------

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

For B4a (i-ii), the applicant almost fully meets these criterion by describing the many meetings with school leadership, teachers, parents, board members, and community members to discuss and analyze the strengths and needs of the school system. Reoccurring themes included the need for increased technology access for all, the need for students to be fully prepared for post-secondary education and the workplace, and increased student achievement for all students. All students in grades 8-12 were also surveyed about their programmatic needs. Building upon this, as part of planning for this specific grant, they met with community leaders, faculty and administrators in post-secondary education, and parent and student groups. They surveyed their teachers, and noted that 85% (306 individuals) responded to the survey and voice support for the grant proposal. Earlier data revealed there were 360 educators in the district, so these 306 respondents do represent 85% (thereby meeting the B4aii requirement of at least 70% support).

The applicant notes how the proposed grant activities were developed based on input from these various groups, but it does not mention anything about it being reviewed and revised based upon their engagement and feedback. Nor does it detail how the teachers were actually engaged in the development of this specific grant .

For B4b, the applicant meets this criterion by including 14 letters of support, coming from local business leaders (3 letters), county board of commissioners and county development authority (2 letters), public library (1 letter), family connection coalition (1 letter); higher education (1 letter); and school councils at the elementary, middle and high school level (6 letters).

Overall the application scores in the high range.

**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>

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

For C1ai, the applicant meets this criterion by noting that as part of creating an individual learning plan for each student, and reviewing their progress on a regular basis, student will have a better understand that learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals.

For C1aii, the applicant partially meets this criterion by noting that within the individual learning plan, and the data management system to be created to house such plans and associated data, advisors will help student identify and target the specific learning outcomes that they need to realize their goals based on the state's college and career read performance index targets set forth by the state. What is not stated explicitly is how all students will learn how to structure their learning to achieve their goals and to measure progress toward those goals.

For C1aiii, the applicant partially meets this criterion, by noting that the grant will be used for teacher training (and technology) to help support enhanced blended, on-line and flipped learning. It also mentioned the various types of learning that might occur within the Lifetime Learning Academy. However, the narrative is not clear as to how "all" students will be participating in that Academy, and there is inadequate detail as to how all teachers will be adequately trained (and with adequate incentives) to change to this type of teaching and learning.

For C1aiv, the application partially meets this criterion by noting that greater access to technology will allow learning situations where students in learning teams connect with experts and students from around the world in a variety of disciplines, which will exposure them to diverse cultures, context, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning. While this is all a great idea, the document lacks the details necessary to ascertain how they will ensure that all of their students participate in learning teams and have these experiences.

For C1av, the applicant partially meets this criterion by noting that students will be engaged in real-world projects as part

of the Lifetime Learning Academy, and the new forms of teaching to come. They note that students will be participating in learning teams (including the student, other teachers, fellow students, and business partners), with participation in such teams intended to help them master the curriculum content, but also the soft skills they need to develop to be successful in the classroom, college, and career environments. While this is all a great idea, the document lacks the details necessary to ascertain how they will ensure that all of their students participate in learning teams and have these experiences.

For C1bi, the applicant partially meets this criterion by noting that each student will have an individual learning plan created for them, which at some point will evolve into an individual graduation plan. They also note that these plans will be developed as part of one-on-one advising, and that teachers, students, and parents will be able to track the accomplishment of the required college- and career-ready standards. While this is good, details are missing as to how this will really result in a personalized "sequence" of instructional content and skill development for all students.

For C1bii and iii, the applicant partially meets these criteria by noting that the new technology infrastructure, and the 1:1 devices that are mentioned, will support enhanced offerings of blended and other on-line learning opportunities, thus offering a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments. However, adequate detail is not provided to ascertain how all students in the district will indeed be receiving high-quality content, including digital learning content as appropriate, aligned with college and career-ready standards.

For C1biv (A and B), the applicant partially meets these criteria by noting that all data related to a student's individual learning plan and the required standards being mastered along the way will be maintained within a new database, and reviewed on a regular basis. They note that this new data base will be pulling data from multiple state and other databases, and that as part of their academy experience they will be connected to a personal "advisor" to help them complete their individual graduation plan and establish career goals.

For C1bv, the applicant partially meets this criterion by noting that if the advisor assigned as part of their academy experience is working with a high needs student, the advisor will also work closely with the appropriate support personnel to help meet the student's unique educational needs (including response to intervention coordinators, special education teachers, case managers, transition specialists, career technical instructors, or job coaches. Nothing, however, is noted regarding the additional support they might received prior to becoming involved in the academy experience.

For C1c, the applicant does not meet this criterion. There is nothing directly noted within the narrative regarding the mechanisms being put into place to provide training and support to students to ensure they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to tack and manage their learning. They note that they will be able to check out computing devices for use at home, and that students and parents will be engaged in creating and monitoring their individual learning plan on-line, but nothing is noted about training and support for students to use these tools. In the next section's narrative on Teaching and Leading, they do note that students will be trained in using technology devices as part of their curriculum as they use these tools.

Overall, nearly all of the criteria are addressed to some detail, but nearly all require additional detail to really ascertain is doable or not. They did conclude the section with a summary table that includes the elements of a high quality plan (goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties). Within that they summarize 4 goals: individual learning plans; blended, flipped and online instruction; free, family-friendly wireless internet; and the lifetime learning academy. The applicant scores in the middle range.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

For C2a (i, ii, and iii), the applicant does not clearly meet these criteria. They note that all of their teachers will be trained on a number of things (e.g., how to utilize the data management system, how to analyze data, how to teacher students how to understand their own data, how to guide students in setting targets; how to create flipped classrooms, how to implement the wide variety of instructional methods available to them). They note multiple approaches for the provision of such training (e.g., targeted, needs-based professional development; utilizing mentors from the state department focused on developing strategic plans for 8 content areas; a just in time (JIT) professional development system; and via a professional learning community model). While all of these are good ideas, the plan does not include the elements of a high quality plan which clearly identifies the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. Therefore the narrative contains lots of ideas, but not enough clarity or details to ascertain whether all participating educators will indeed be trained adequately 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; (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; and (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.

For C2a (iv), the applicant partially meets this criteria by noting that they are participating in the state's new leader keys effectiveness system (LKES) and the teacher keys effectiveness system (TKES) and will be using that data to ensure that all student are taught by highly effective teachers. They note that district walkthroughs and the teacher efficacy protocol will also be used, which is an individual growth plan for teachers which outlines a teacher steps to obtaining their goals. They note that administrators will use data from these systems to guide teachers in how to design and deliver targeted, needs-based professional development. These activities appear to be good approaches, but without the elements of a high quality plan to identify specifically who is to do what by when, it is difficult to ascertain the feasibility of these things actually being accomplished.

For C2b (i, ii, and iii), the applicant partially meets these criteria. Via their new proposed integrated data management systems, educators should have access to actionable information to would help them respond to individual student academic needs and interests (criterion i). Via the internet and digital devices for students, they should have access to more high-quality learning resources (criterion ii), although there is nothing specifically identified to help them easily find good materials for students as connected to the college- and career-ready standards, and besides some training and the internet, they really are not being given tools to create and share new resources easily. For criterion iii, there will have an individual learning plan and a database management system which will help them identify students needs. but nothing was noted regarding specific resources as matched to student needs, nor a process for continuously improving feedback about the effectiveness of various resources in meeting student needs.

For C2c (i and ii), the applicant partially meets these criteria by having noted the new data they will be receiving and using from the teacher and administrator evaluation system (criterion i), and the multiple types of training that is to occur to help improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps (criterion ii). But as noted, without additional details as to who is doing what by when in reference to the massive amount of needed teaching training and support, it is difficult to ascertain if it is all doable or not.

For C2d, the applicant does not meet this criterion of having a high quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction for effective and highly effective teachers and principals. They discuss elements and activities, but not as part of a high quality plan. They do note that they do not have any hard-to-staff schools in their district, and that they are already working closely with a higher education institution to grow the number of teachers for harder to staff subjects like special education.

Overall, given the lack of detail for most of the criteria, the applicant scores in the lower end of the middle range.

#### 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>8</b>

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

For D1a, the applicant meets this criterion by describing the recent transition to be a charter system, which provides enhanced flexibility from state policy as needed to support an enhanced learning environment for students. They also describe in detail each of their central office support areas and the role they play in supporting the needs of schools.

For D1b, the applicant partially meets this criterion by describing the new local school governance teams that are being developed as part of the charter system, and the specific authority that such teams will have. From the information provided, however, it appears that these school governance teams are advisory only and provide input for decisions to be made by the principal and the school leadership team. It is also unclear the real distinction between these two entities, but even then the school leadership team is only able to make recommendations to the superintendent after they interview applicants for personnel decisions (although it appears that the leadership team can create and implement the school budget). Thus it is not clear if the school leadership teams have sufficient autonomy over factors like school personnel decisions and staffing models.

For D1 (c and d), the applicant does not really meet these criteria. While the applicant notes a number of things that "might" or "could" occur as part of having an individualized learning plan and flexibility from the state, there is nothing noted that the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on mastery, and that they can demonstrate mastery at multiple times and in multiple comparable way, are things that "will" indeed be available for all students (criteria c and d).

For D1e, the applicant partially meets this criterion, by noting that performance-based learning opportunities will provide students with disabilities and English learners with a variety of ways to demonstrate mastery of the curriculum. They also note that their assigned advisor will act as case managers and be involved in all aspects of their instructional planning through the individual learning plan, and that the online and blended technology options can be used to better meet their needs, and technology can also assist teachers to work with students with other languages.

Overall, given that several of the criteria are only partially met, or not at all, the applicant receives a score in the middle range.

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
---	-----------	----------

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

For D2a, the applicant meets this criterion by offering details on how all students, parents and educators, regardless of income, will have access to the necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school. They detail a plan for making ubiquitous wireless access available to every home in the community, and devices available to all students who cannot afford them (loaned to them by the school), and to all such parents (via check outs at the local library). This will be done in part by replicating a current bring your own device being used in the high school and taking it to the middle and elementary schools.

For D2b, the applicant partially meets this criterion by noting that appropriate training will be provided to teachers, and that they will be using students within the lifetime learning academy to be preparing and conducting workshops for teachers and others on various technology tools. They note that this is also a good way to help such student develop soft skills like information seeking and problem solving. What is missing is any detail on how the districts plans to provide for the hardware and software support for the learning devices being used by students, teachers, and parents.

For D2c, the applicant partially meets this criterion by noting that much of their future electronic content within their lifetime learning academy will incorporate sharable content object reference model (SCORM) which will ensure that a variety of systems, including open source learning management systems such a Moodle, can be used within the academy. This will allow students to export their data and electronic products in open data format using tools such as Google Apps and Drive. Nothing is noted, however, about how such data might be used in other electronic learning systems.

For D2e, the applicant meets this criterion by noting that their data management system(s) use a School Interoperability Framework (SIF) to facilitate the effective flow of information between systems. The district also uses a Zone Integration Server (ZIS) to integrate data between PowerSchool and a variety of systems. It appears that they have the appropriate systems and/or plans to ensure that the schools can use interoperable data systems for all aspects of data.

Overall, this applicant meets two of the criteria and partially meets the other two, and thus scores in the higher middle range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>

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

For E1, the applicant partially meets the criterion by offering the elements of a high quality plan which includes some of the major goals of the project, the activities associated with its implementation, the timeline, the responsible parties, and the deliverables. For example, the goal of creating their lifetime learning academy will be started via a needs assessment to determine school and community needs for educational programing offered via the academy, during the time period of January 2014-June 2014, under the responsible party of the academy project manager, and with deliverables being plans which outline the development and implementation of the academy which includes industry certification of pathways. They also note that they will be using the quality practices of "plan, do, check, and act" cycle to monitor progress and provide for continuous improvement.

However, there are some key aspects of their plan missing from these key goals, including the implementation of a data

management system to house all the individual learning plans and associated data, and the actual creation of these plans. Also missing are some of the aspects of their goals, such as having individual advisors as part of the learning academy work with students to create individual graduation plans. In addition, it is not clear that the review processes proposed and all overseen by internal personnel will be able to adequately "measure the quality of its investments," such as investments in professional development, technology, and staff.

Given the partial meeting of this criterion, the applicant scores in the middle range.

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

**5**

**3**

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

For E2, the applicant partially meets this criterion by noting the numerous ways that they plan to communicate with internal and external audiences, and to get their input on how things are going. For both internal and external, they plan to use the school-level websites to both inform, and gather feedback (via surveys). Print material is also planned for both the internal and external, supplemented by email for the internal groups (and increasing for external as the broader community gains access to the internet).

While all of these communication efforts are good, there is still little detail as to how they would be continuously "engaging" the external stakeholders in their process of school reform (not just informing them and getting their input, but serious on-going dialogues about what is working and not working and how best to adjust as needed). The detailed elements of a high quality plan for such ongoing communication and engagement are also not offered.

Overall, however, because the criterion was primarily met, the applicant scores in the middle range.

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

**5**

**3**

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

For the indicator requirement for all students, the applicant partially meets this requirement by offering baseline data and projected targets (for all students and as broken down by the subgroups of white, economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities) for the % of students having an effective teacher and principal, and then also for the % of student having a highly effective teacher and principal. The data will be coming from a newly implemented state teacher and administrator evaluation system, which was piloted with 10% of their educators and 100% of the principals during 2012-13 (and used for all during 2013-14). The goals they have established for these two areas do appear to be ambitious, but achievable (e.g., moving from a baseline of 80% of students having an effective teachers and 67% having an effective principal to 100% of both by 2017-18; and a baseline of 40% of students with a highly effective teacher and 22% with a highly effective principal to 90% with a highly effective teacher by 2017-18 and 100% with a highly effective principal). The applicant nicely offers a rationale for the use of these indicators, but does not offer any explanation as to why they do not offer any baseline or targets for all of the racial/ethnic subgroup categories.

For the indicators required for PreK-3, the application partially meets this requirement by offering baseline data and projected targets (for all students and as broken down by the subgroups of economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities) for the % of students in 2nd grade passing the reading benchmark and the math benchmark. The targets for these appear both ambitious, but achievable (e.g., for reading, going from 96% to 98% by 2017-18 for all students, and going from 76% for students with disabilities to 88%). They also propose to track the average attendance rate for all students preK-3rd, and again offer baseline and targets for the subgroups of economically disadvantages and students with disabilities which appear ambitious, but achievable (e.g., going from 94.98% for all students to 97.5%). Lastly they offer a non-cognitive indicator of tracking the number of office referrals for discipline issues, for all students and for economically disadvantaged students (going from 4.59% for all students to 2%, which is ambitious, but achievable. The applicant nicely offers a rationale for the use of these indicators, but does not offer any explanation as to why they do not offer any baseline or targets for all of the racial/ethnic subgroup categories.

For the indicators required for 4-8, the application partially meets this requirement by offering baseline data and projected targets (for all students and as broken down by the subgroups of economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities) for 3 cognitively-focused indicators: the number and % of students in grades 6-8 meeting or exceeding on the state math assessment, the percent of 5th grade students passing the reading benchmark, and the number of 5th graders passing the reading benchmark . The targets for these appear both ambitious, but achievable (e.g., for the state math assessment, going from 80% for all students to 93.4%; for the economically disadvantaged group on the reading benchmark, going from 81% to 91%). They also propose to track the average attendance rate for all students grades 6-8, and again offer baseline and targets for the subgroups of economically disadvantages and students with disabilities, which appear ambitious, but achievable (e.g., going from 94.09% for all students to 96.5%). Lastly they offer a non-cognitive indicator of tracking the number of students assigned to out of school or in-school suspensions, for all students

and for economically disadvantaged students and and students with disabilities (going from 22.79% for economically disadvantaged to 13%, which is ambitious, but perhaps achievable). The applicant nicely offers a rationale for the use of these indicators, but does not offer any explanation as to why they do not offer any baseline or targets for all of the racial/ethnic subgroup categories.

For the indicators required for 9-12, the application partially meets this requirement by offering baseline data and projected targets for the # of students completing the FAFSA (only for students as a whole, not for any subgroup breakdowns since they noted they had to rely on national data not broken down by subgroups), going from 43% to 77%, a very ambitious goal, but perhaps achievable given the increased access to internet that will occur. They then offered baseline and targets (for all students and as broken down by the subgroups of economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities) for 4 cognitively-focused indicators: the number of students in grades 9-12 meeting or exceeding the Math I ECOT; the number of students in grades 9-12 meeting or exceeding the 9th grade Literature; the % of students in 8th grade passing the reading benchmark; and the number of 8th graders passing the math benchmark. The targets for these appear both ambitious, but perhaps achievable (e.g., for the 9th grade literature, going from 73% for all students to 92.6%). They also propose to track the average attendance rate for all students grades 9-12, and again offer baseline and targets for the subgroups of economic disadvantages and students with disabilities, which appear ambitious, but achievable (e.g., going from 92.2% for all students to 95.0%). They offer baseline and target data for the number of CTAE pathway completers, going from 43% for all students to 53%. Lastly they offer a non-cognitive indicator of tracking the number of students assigned to out of school or in-school suspensions, for all students and for economically disadvantaged students and and students with disabilities (going from 18.03% for economically disadvantaged to 8%, which is ambitious, but perhaps achievable). The applicant nicely offers a rationale for the use of these indicators, but with the exception of the FAFSA data, does not offer any explanation as to why they do not offer any baseline or targets for all of the racial/ethnic subgroup categories.

For all performance measures, the applicant notes that these will be reviewed at the time the data is gathered in order to determine if the measure is accurately gauging implementation progress and/or if the data for the performance measures is still available. And if not, then the project managers, along with appropriate personnel, will review the performance measures and revise as needed.

Overall, for E3, the applicant partially meet the criterion, with the major exception of no explanation for some missing subgroup categories. The applicant scores in the middle range.

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

**5**

**3**

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

For E4, the applicant partially meets the criterion. They offer a very nice explanation of how they will be monitoring some of the specific goals and indicators as tied back to the core aspects of the overall RttT grant (e.g., designing and implementing rigorous standards and high quality assessment; attracting and keeping great teachers and leaders; supporting data systems that inform decisions and improve instruction; using innovation and effective approaches to turn-around struggling schools; and demonstrating and sustaining education reform by promoting collaborations between business leaders, educators and other stakeholders). They also list the specific indicators of most importance to evaluating the effectiveness of investments and the purpose for selecting that assessment. But they do not clearly identify all required elements of a high quality plan, including the core goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible players.

The applicant scores in the middle range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>

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

For F1 a, b, c(i-ii), the applicant almost fully meets the criteria by offering budget narrative and tables that identify all funds needed to support the three main clusters of activities for their grant, and a thoughtful rationale for each: the wireless internet infrastructure; the lifetime learning academy; and the individual learning plan and blended learning technology. The budget as a whole aligns with all reform activities previously described in the grant proposal. Funds which are one time versus on-going are identified, and all proposed items seem reasonable to support their proposed efforts. Some

confusion exists in that within the initial narrative, only 2 of these major clusters of activities are detailed (the wireless internet infrastructure, and the lifetime learning academy), but all 3 are detailed in the required tables and narratives.

The applicant scores in the high range.

<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>
---	-----------	----------

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

For F2, the applicant partially meets this criterion by detailing a public/private partnership to sustain the wireless connections for the community, and that for the lifetime learning academy, much of the grant funding is being used as one-time funding to support the creation of various career-focused labs. For the technology devices they indicate that this can be sustained via the schools's IT department, and leveraged textbook monies since they will be switching to e-books. Project managers will be absorbed into the district as teachers, professional learning staff, or technology staff. The applicant notes funds to be coming from local, state, and federal sources, and mentions regular meetings occurring between district administrators and project managers to facilitate collaboration among the leaders of the district so the work will continue beyond the grant period.

They then summarized the implementation activities in great detail for the county wireless and lifetime learning academy. There was no overall summary that details all elements of a high quality plan for their sustainability plans, nor was there any note of how they will evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes to inform a post-grant budget.

The applicant scores in the lower middle range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

For item 1, the applicant does not identify any specific new partnership per se (beyond what had been in the full proposal), but reiterates many of the community and business partnerships they have been developing and who will be assisting with the community-wide internet access, and with the lifetime learning academy (as well as the goals within the Absolute Priority). The applicant describes what is, and what might be, indicating that all of these partnerships are a work in progress (although the various partners are committed, as evidenced by many letters of support). The current and potential future partners include many county agencies, the Chamber of Commerce, the Rotary Club, Honda LOCK, West Georgia Community College, University of West Georgia, and Jacksonville State University.

For item 2, the applicant proposed 3 population-level desired results as a result of these partnerships (in addition to the indicators and targets already noted earlier in the grant): increased percentage of community members who utilize the lifetime learning academy for training and education; the number of faculty/staff/parents/community members who are trained in technology and technology integration, personalized leaning advising, and use of data for instruction; and the percent of graduated students receiving a passing score on "soft skill" assessment designed by business/community members. In addition

For item 3, the applicant does indicate how they would track their selected indicators, and how they would use such data to target resources. They noted that they have emphasized the subgroups of students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students in their key performance measures. They also note the importance of continuous improvement via these partnerships as driving their efforts.

For item 4, the applicant indicates how these partnerships will help students become college- and career-ready, by helping students acquire the soft skills desired by employers. There was also mention of partnerships with some community agencies to address social-emotional needs, but this was not the core focus of the partnerships described in this section.

For item 5, since the partnerships described in this section are the same as described earlier in the grant, no additional information was offered about how the partnership would build the capacity of the staff by providing them with tools to better assess the needs of students; identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community; create a decision-making process to select, implement, and evaluate supports, engage parents and families; and routinely assess the applicants' progress.

For item 6, the targets established for the additional performance measures appear to be ambitious, yet achievable (e.g., the % of parents using the lifetime learning center gong from 20% the first year to 40% by 2017-18; number of parents

trained in technology, going from 20% to 40%, and faculty from 50% to 100%).

Overall, for this competitive preference priority, the applicant only partially meets this priority, and scores in the middle range.

### Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

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

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

Although there are some weakness due the lack of details in some areas, this applicant did indeed coherently and comprehensively address how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice); accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student; increase the effectiveness of educators; expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. They would be accomplishing these via three major projects: implementing a wireless internet infrastructure for all their schools and the broader community, establishing a lifetime learning academy, and implementing an individual learning plan and blended learning technology.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>114</b>
--------------	------------	------------



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0084GA-2 for Haralson County School System

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

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

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

The 4 core assurance areas are discussed in detail looking toward the future. Much of the narrative talks about the future for the district and what they hope to accomplish with the support of the RTTT-D grant. Woven throughout the narrative are phrases "will provide", "would consist of", "would help us to fulfill", "our hope is to provide".

1. Standards and assessment

The applicant shared a comprehensive list of assessment tools used K-12 to assess student progress. A narrative outlining the local and state educational standards was shared too. Details of how this information would be used by staff and shared with parents, students were outlined in another section of the application.

2. Building data systems to measure student growth and success-

The district states it has devoted significant resources to examining student progress beyond state standardized test scores. They note areas of strength and weakness in their program. The district states it utilizes an array of indicators to measure student growth including attendance rates, discipline records, formative assessments, yet little detail is shared

such as trend data on specific indicators.

3. Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals-

The applicant states their intention to recruit, develop, reward and retain effective teachers and principals in many sections of the document. "All students should have access to effective teachers and principals in all schools". They will be utilizing the new state accountability system(TKES and LKES) to meet this goal. No other strategies are shared.

4. Turning around lowest achieving schools

The district high school was identified as the lowest achieving school. District has implemented key strategies such as setting up instructional teams, employing graduation coaches to improve student success, yet the HCHS graduation rate for 2011 was 66.6%. They discuss closing achievement gaps by initiating Professional Learning Communities at the building level and providing wireless internet access at school, home, and the community for educational purposes. This goal is not supported by data that pinpoints the areas of deficit or identifies specific subgroups in need of critical resources. The applicant fails to be specific in their approach.

Considering these examples and others found in the document the applicant has partially met the requirements of A1a.

The grant proposal states that -We propose providing every school and every student in Haralson County with highly effective and personalized instruction to achieve the goal of an 83.7% graduation rate for all students. It goes onto to explain in detail how this will be accomplished, how it will be monitored and evaluated and how the new initiative will continue beyond the grant period. What is missing is any data or narrative defining the current areas of deficit or success.

The creation of Lifetime Learning Academy is a very creative approach to address the problems of unemployment and low graduation levels. It is inclusive as it provides opportunity for high school students and community members. The addition of Career Path Advisors will be a great support for students. The data supporting the choice of identified deficits to be addressed is missing. An array of courses based on student interest are proposed and more detail is given in other sections of the proposal.

The applicant proposes that a number of improvements will be attained in student learning through individual personal learning plans. Success of the plan will be measured by many performance measures. The applicant failed to outline the detail of each performance measure- audience, timeline, people responsible for administering, analyzing, reporting etc..

The applicant hopes that the educational innovations described will increase student achievement, deepen student learning and increase equity by providing timely and effective interventions for all students through personalized and targeted instruction. They also may increase graduation rates through individualized graduation plans and advisors for each student, and increase college enrollment by better preparing students to compete locally and globally in academics. These are inspiring goals. Unfortunately there is little detail offered to insure that they can be attained. For example the applicant states "Students may be able to earn course credit based on mastery of content as demonstrated through e-portfolio". This is an interesting idea but the applicant fails to back it up with detail of who will authorize credit and what state regulations allow this to occur.

The applicant provided a weak description of what the classroom experience would be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments. These were shared in very broad and general statements that did not provide the information required.

The applicant has shared a vision that does not provide the critical detail and data needed to make it comprehensive.

<b>(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

The applicant shared the process that was used to determine that all schools in the district would participate. The rationale shared is that to affect change through out the community all schools will participate. The goal is to increase access to high quality instruction and services on a personalized level. The proposal does list resources that address various issues identified in the narrative. "Project Be There" is proposed to deter poor attendance, for example. They also go onto state that beginning in Pre-K students will be provided with an Individualized Learning Plan that will be used throughout their school career. They propose to provide highly effective, personalized instruction for every student based on the belief that this will increase graduation rates. They draw the conclusion that a higher graduation rate will have a dramatic impact on their community by providing a competitive workforce. No data or research is cited to support this conclusion. Upon further examination the proposal states: " A second critical predictor of student achievement is attendance rates", yet no attendance data is shared to illustrate the current rates.

Data such as federal free and reduced lunch program statistics are used to meet grant criteria regarding poverty rates. The list of

schools participating is included as well as the number of participating educators and students by school as required.

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

**10**

**6**

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

Applicant restates districts mission to propose innovations that will make equity and access for all students a priority and prepare students for mastery in content and skills required for career and college readiness. Details provide the concepts and strategies the proposal would initiate. Since 2008 the middle school has had a fully functioning data team whose primary focus has been on examining student work to see where teacher/student engagement can be enhanced. This would be very helpful data to review as implementation plans are created. None was reported in this grant application.

The applicant reiterates the benefits of the Lifetime Learning Academy and mentions it will provide "a model full-service school system able to both set and achieve high expectations for students". This may or may not prove true. It is hard to assess as limited information regarding current student performance, beyond summative assessments, community demographics, etc. is shared. The applicant did provide a chart noting key goals, activities to be undertaken, deliverables, timeline and responsible parties. Some of the information may not be achievable as for example, the deliverables don't support the goal: Goal: Increase performance on summative assessments; Activities: Develop Individual Learning Plan software; Deliverables: Individual Learning Plan software that collects data from all our available programs and aligns each students needs and talents to instruction. A concern is that this software is auxiliary to the process of teaching and learning and will not have a direct impact on student success as it will only provide an assessment of how the student is doing or his interests, not remediate his deficit areas of learning.

There are no logic models or theory for change shared in this section, only the applicant's belief's are stated.

The applicant partially meets the criteria of this section.

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

**10**

**6**

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

The applicant states they intend to consider all data when making decisions to insure they are informed decisions, particularly when considering individual student learning plans, yet they do not share a process, or plan to accomplish this.

The applicant proposes to employ interventions based program to increase achievement for all students, which in turn will decrease achievement gaps between subgroups. They plan to provide personalized instruction options and individual advisors for each student. Details of how this would be staffed is not shared. Online and blended learning technologies will be available at school and home for the students and will allow students to participate in real-world learning experiences, internships, and gain access to a variety of educational opportunities without the boundaries of time or place. These are all innovative concepts that have merit. But they are not tied to any field data or information that indicates there is a capacity to implement them successfully. The applicant does share the specific goals for decreasing achievement gaps. The goals are ambitious and respond to ESEA state targets. This will be measured by success on the state benchmark tests in math and ELA. The applicant met the requirement to report. Their goals are detailed by subgroup, by grade bands with predictions for the duration of the grant. Significant gaps are identified in some sub groups.

Graduation rates shared on A4c indicate some trends that may need further examination. For example, In 2012-13 90% of the black students graduated according to the chart, yet when looking ahead the predication for 2014 is a reduction to 75.9%. More compelling is that all other categories increased that year, with the most significant increase being in the students with disabilities who go from 27.45% in 2012-13 to 47.4% in 2013-14. No explanation of how this will be achieved or extenuating circumstances that may be skewing the data is given.

The applicant states that due to the low graduation rate they will "reexamine our current instructional practices and look for new strategies to engage and retain students through graduation" This is concerning as this competition is seeking exemplar programs that can be replicated. This would be a much stronger proposal if the applicant had already developed the framework to conduct this reexamination, or better yet, had accomplished the task and could report the results here.

College graduation enrollment rates are shared in chart A4d.

The proposal describes how Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) will be implemented to decrease achievement gaps. They propose to develop teams of teachers and administrators and district staff to assess and address individual student needs; seek out

best classroom practices to be shared across the district. The applicant does not share the process that would be used to communicate the recommendations of the PLC in an organized way to the teacher/student/parent level. This lack of communication could create unnecessary confusion and possibly impede progress in implementing the changes recommended.

The applicant predicts that through the use of Individual Learning Plans, Individual Graduation Plans, one-to-one technology initiative, wireless Internet access, and the Lifetime Learning Academy, students will have full and continuous access to highly effective instruction and rigorous curriculum which will more fully prepare them to meet the College and Career Ready Performance Index (CCRPI) indicators. They state that by fully preparing students for the CCRPI their graduation rates and college enrollment will increase. Other factors such as social and emotional issues of students, absenteeism are not mentioned, but should be as they are critical factors when considering academic success. The applicant did not set benchmarks or methods to measure progress beyond the ESEA and CCRPI targets but did meet the basic requirements of this section of the application.

## 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>10</b>
<p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant discusses their record of success in the narrative. It is stated in global terms and does not pin point issues at the grade or subgroup level. In addition the charts shared are not broken down by grade level. Also the applicant does not develop trends or identify "trouble spots" based on this data. This may be because there are two different testing initiatives on the same chart which creates confusion and a limited point of reference. This does not provide the level of detail required to assess the appropriateness of goals and measurements of student success proposed.</p> <p>Applicant included high school and college graduation information in the previous section of this grant. Reviewing the performance on summative assessments charts A4a and A4b some of the goals appear unrealistic and not achievable. For example, % of students with disabilities scoring at meets or exceeds on the ninth grade literature EOCT: from 29% to 78.9% in five years; % of overall students at meets or exceeds on the math I EOCT from 32% to 84 in five years; on the same test students with disabilities from 0% to 78.7% in five years.</p> <p>Proposal narrative discusses various strategies used to turn around the high school which is the lowest performing school. The district took the dramatic step of replacing all administrators and hiring a new ELA coach and providing targeted training for the teachers. Absent from the narrative was any indication of soliciting feedback from key stakeholder groups. This would be a critical component when implementing ambitious and significant reforms.</p> <p>There is discussion of using a parent portal at the high school to make student data available. The applicant also proposes doing this system wide. Parents and students will have access to this information 24/7. Student led conferences on individual academic performance and goal attainment are proposed for grade 6-12 students. This is an effective way to analyze student progress and goal attainment. This will have a positive impact on improving participation, instruction and services provided.</p> <p>The applicant partially meets the criteria of this section.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The district has put into place a number of procedures and reporting functions to address transparency. For example: - Annually, Haralson County School System submits the Transparency in Government Act (TIGA) report to the auditors which is part of the Georgia Senate Bill 300 (2008). The TIGA report contains information on all public school expenditures, revenue, and vendors for public viewing on the Open Georgia website.</p> <p>District also makes financial reports available on the website and at BOE meetings. Public access to financial information regarding personnel salaries and non-personnel expenditures are posted on the "Open Georgia" website. Applicant states that all salaries are posted at the school and district level for all instructional and support staff on the Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts website "Open Georgia".</p> <p>Applicant has demonstrated they met the requirements of B2 a-d.</p>		

<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Haralson County School system has shown they are capable of creating the condition and sufficient autonomy to implement the personalized learning environments described in this proposal. This statement: "Haralson County School System currently operates within the legal and procedural limits of all state and local law and policy. The local board of education examines, discusses, and revises local policies on a two-year cycle with revisions made as needed to comply with any new or amended state or local laws/policies." supports the necessary autonomy.</p> <p>The district shares it was named a Charter School by Georgia State which provides much needed flexibility for implementation, such as waiving instructional seat time. Upon review of the charter document in the appendices it should be noted that the document is not executed as it is unsigned.</p> <p>They have declared their desire to implement the personalized learning environment and propose two innovations that could prove successful-Individualized Learning Plan and Lifetime Learning Academy. Both of these options will need some flexibility to be successful. It is unclear if they have received waivers to allow exceptions to requirements such as course seat time.</p>		
<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Applicant states they continually strive to include all stakeholders in all decision-making processes. All stakeholder groups have been involved in meetings and roundtable discussions, surveys, over a period of time. The applicant shared common topic/concerns from the meetings. They note "a priority discussed in many meetings is the need for increased opportunities for community involvement so that the schools, parents, and community can come together to build a better economy and community for Haralson County."</p> <p>A survey was also conducted with these key stakeholder groups and four priorities emerged. This information will be passed onto the School Governance teams to establish their focus when developing and improving instructional processes.</p> <p>The applicant proposes to establish School Governance teams at each building that will include all stakeholders- parents, teachers, staff, administrators, community members. The applicant does not explain how these groups will work in concert with the school leadership teams.</p> <p>The proposal outlines the process of soliciting responses from their teachers who are not part of a collective bargaining unit. Of the 360 educators included in the selected schools for the grant 85% (306 responses) of the faculty and staff responded favorably and in support of the grant proposal when asked to complete a survey regarding the initiatives in the proposal.</p> <p>Letters of support were received from key stakeholders and are supportive of this initiative. The applicant also held meetings and forums to discuss the plan and solicit feedback from the business community and community and government officials. It appears there was little or no communication with college or higher education institutions in this process.</p>		

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>
<p><b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The proposal outlines a variety of high quality instructional approaches including flipped instruction, differentiated instruction and project-based learning. Strategies to support high needs students are also proposed such as individualized graduation plans and intervention coordinators. Specifics regarding implementation of these resources is not offered in the proposal, with the exception of the detail shared about services to be offered through the Lifetime Learning Academy. Also absent is detailed information regarding how the deep learning experiences, exposure to diverse cultures and perspectives, and mastery of critical academic content and skill development for students not enrolled in the Learning Academy will occur and be measured.</p> <p>The district has already invested resources in training and staff development. Also Instructional teams within buildings and within</p>		

district clusters have expanded the Professional Learning Community concept to provide instructional support. It is not clear how the support will be coordinated at the building level.

The Lifetime Learning Academy appears to be a program plan that will support individualized learning, college and career readiness, and impact graduation rates. It becomes a major community resource when offered to parents and community members so they can further their education. The spin off effect will have a positive impact on the local area as it is designed to provide training for the unemployed too.

The applicant notes that technology will play a major role in these learning experiences. Applicant does not share a strategy or process that will be used to address the day to day maintenance required of personal devices. Mechanisms are in place to provide training for students and staff on use of tools and resources. This will be done through orientation programs etc.

The applicant has proposed a creative way to address the lack of internet access. "through a one-to-one technology initiative using tablets and Netbooks, and providing free wireless Internet access in the schools, homes, and the community. The district is proposing a partnership with local businesses, the county commission, and other private and public entities that will not only help the district implement such a large scale project, but also allow the project to be self-sustaining. This will be accomplished by allowing business members to enter into a contract lease agreement to offer low-cost fiber to the home Internet access in addition to the free wireless option.". They also are providing access to individual electronic devices through the local library system. The applicant is commended on this very exciting and resourceful approach to a major problem. Applicant does not explain how they will address the practical issues of how they will predict the number of units requested and then provide them through library loan and how these units will be maintained. Orientation for "new" users will be at school. It is not noted how library recipients will be trained.

The applicant does share that the Individual Learning Plan will be the document used to track student progress and share student data with parents and students. A chart noting the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties is shared to support this proposal.

Major components of the criteria of this segment are lacking detail, for example- accommodations for high need students to understand how they will structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward their goals are not noted.

Overall the applicant partially met the requirements of C1. The elements of a high quality plan are present but limited description and depth regarding the elements is shared.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>14</b>
--	-----------	-----------

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

The applicant provides rationale and real life examples of implementation which builds strong support for the Lifetime Learning Academy program. The applicant fails to provide the same level of detail for other programs or schools included in this proposal.

The district is proposing a model in which each student receives their own career and college advisor. Teachers will be assigned to advise students and their parents regarding the information found in the ILP. This may prove unattainable for many reasons such as teachers are not trained to be guidance counselors typically and may not have the depth of knowledge needed in this area. Beginning in elementary school each student will develop an individualized learning plan that will include a portfolio with the help of their parents and the counselor. This could be an effective method to focus student engagement if a quality implementation plan was developed. Also lacking is the specifics regarding how the student transitions from one level to the next, building to building, seamlessly. The district does not state if they are going to implement this initiative independent of the proposal.

This proposal outlines that teachers will receive all their professional development through the Professional Learning Community and specifically they will be trained in career pathways. This is a resourceful way to provide support for the Individualized Learning Plan process. Parents can access this information through the parent portal. Another idea mentioned is establishing student learning communities to meet and work on educational and community projects, collaborate on performance assessments and capstone projects. This is an innovative way to engage students in authentic learning and build 21st century skills. What is not mentioned is what grade levels will be participating, how often they will meet, project timelines, quality measures.

The applicant reviews a number of business partnerships that are forming to offer authentic learning experiences for students. This is essential to make the high school experience successful. They share detail about one existing partnership but do not share information about other established partnerships or data citing student progress, employment following graduation, high education of students involved etc.

Detailed information regarding the construct of the teacher and principal evaluation is shared but no data is included to provide a baseline or predict success levels. Applicant mentions this is the first year of implementation, therefore baseline data is not available. Including previous years data, despite that it is the "old" system would have offered a more complete analysis, especially when reviewing goal setting. Noting specific goals for professional development including areas of focus is also lacking.

The applicant states they have no hard-to-staff schools as all these schools are similar. They do make efforts to recruit and retain high quality teachers thorough hosting student teachers and allowing district staff to serve as adjunct professors at local colleges.

In this section all the elements of a high quality plan are not noted for all students. As previously stated the Lifetime Learning Academy provides detailed information yet little is shared regarding how these initiatives would be developed for other cohorts of students. The applicant also did not share other features of a high quality plan such as deliverables, responsible parties, timeline.

#### 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 LEA has demonstrated they are an organization that is responsive to supporting student progress, they are resourceful and open to change. An example of their efforts is that they have been approved as a state charter school system. Some examples of innovation would be the Lifetime Learning Academy program and the Individual Learning Plans that span Kg-22.

The applicant has demonstrated they have a basic infrastructure to support personalized learning and will expand it through grant activities.

The applicant states that Haralson County School System and the community would like to provide alternative ways for students to earn credit to support career and college readiness. They fail to outline how this will be accomplished. Applicant does not mention if permission from the state is required and if they have already attained this on a course by course basis.

Students will be able to show mastery in a variety of ways through the use of their Individual Learning Plans which are designed based on their current level of performance each quarter. Demonstration of student mastery is noted and can be achieved in multiple ways including work based experiences, Carnegie Units, community service project, electronic portfolio.

These program shifts will require extensive local effort and training. Staff will have to be engaged and invested in the changes occurring. The district has an continuous conversation with staff thought the PLC and solicits perspective through surveying etc. The proposal does not provide detail regarding how these groups will communicate amongst themselves and with district level management.

The district plans to establish a teacher training center to encourage collaboration and cross training. Little detail is shared regarding how these initiatives would be accomplished, for example no information is shared about how the teacher training academy will function or where it will be located.

The applicant met the requirement to demonstrate school leadership teams and central office organization that is in tune and responsive to building needs. The district has established a system of building level autonomy through the School Governance Teams. These teams are responsible to provide input for setting academic achievement targets, school budget, instructional technology, improvement plans etc. Parents and community members are invited to provide input at all school improvement planning meetings as part of the school improvement process. The district also has established two way communication with schools through a set of committees including monthly cross team meetings, building level and central office staff meetings for various groups including teachers, administration, and support services.

The applicant notes that they will meet the needs of all students including students with disabilities and English learners by providing blended learning and online learning opportunities. They mention they could adapt curricula to meet the student needs by using a wide variety of software etc. What is missing is the procedures/process that will be used to initiate this plan.

Overall the applicant has met most of the criteria of this section. They do provide the elements of a high quality plan by stating the key goals, rationale and activities, timeline, deliverables and responsible parties. Much of this information is found in section E-1 of the proposal.

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The proposal supports personalized learning through two major initiatives- Lifetime Learning Academy and creation of an internet system to provide virtual instruction and resources. The internet is currently not available to many in the district. The applicant contends that providing blended learning and online learning opportunities to students, curriculum could be easily adapted to meet the needs of all students, including students with disabilities and English learners. The District also proposes to open the LLA to community members for training in a wide array of areas. Though much information is provided for rationale for these initiatives, a more comprehensive method to measure progress would have demonstrated success of their efforts.</p> <p>They also propose to have students serve as "teacher" for these stakeholder groups after hours. This is an interesting concept but no detail is shared regarding how this would be accomplished or how success would be measured.</p> <p>Proposal mentions that for those students who cannot afford their own computing devices the district will provide devices so that each student has unlimited access to digital resources within the school.</p> <p>The applicant states they will develop a professional training center to develop and sustain these initiatives as described. The grant will provide the resources to establish both the physical and virtual LLA. Some detail is provided outlining how the district will accomplish this.</p> <p>The applicant talks about providing both supports to implement and maintain the countywide wireless internet service proposed. They describe both community internet partners from both the public and private sector. The applicant shares the district resources that would be used to maintain the integrity and security of the electronic data systems that will be required by the state in the near future. The applicant shares that internet services in particular requires a tremendous amount of support to implement and maintain, yet only general narrative of how this may work is shared.</p> <p>Key components of a high quality plan are missing including, in some instances, the rationale, timeline and clear definition of deliverables. Yet the ideas shared and respond to identified needs.</p>		

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>A number of strategies and programs have been proposed to carry out the vision of this project. Applicant plans to seek input from stakeholders through surveys, questionnaires, and/or face-to-face meetings and will continually monitor the process of developing and opening the LLA. This information will be used to make adjustments to the plan and implementation of the LLA.</p> <p>The applicant states-To assess the effectiveness and reliability of the wireless project usage, data and customer support records will be kept and analyzed for coverage, usage, and reliability. Additionally, student data will be collected and used to determine how well the wireless network supports the educational initiatives by the school district. A commercial installation of this size would probably require a commercial vendor to design, build and install. The issues of confidentiality and security of information are minimally discussed.</p> <p>It is noted that each school will address student achievement goals through the school improvement plan. Again the applicant does not state who will determine the components of this plan and how it will be reported.</p> <p>Applicant states that throughout the project communication using an array of methods with all internal and external stakeholder groups will occur on an ongoing basis. They will use a tool the "Balanced Score Card" to analyze progress in key goal areas. They will also maximize the use of student information systems such as PowerSchool. These are good beginnings, but applicant failed to note who would receive these reports and how conversation between the students and teachers will occur.</p> <p>Applicant states they will have continuous conversations with employers to assess student progress and program success. Applicant did not share implementation plans for communicating with employers, parents, students regarding student success. The applicant shares plans to continuously review progress and evaluate quality of initiatives being implemented. They also will report progress to all stakeholders including media on an on-going basis. They have included all the elements of a high-quality plan.</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>The proposal outlines key strategies and procedures that will enhance communication throughout the system.</p>		

The system will communicate with all stakeholders through the school system website, face-to-face meetings, and email. Print materials are widely used in the school system to inform external stakeholders. It appears they have a working relationship with local media outlets although sample articles etc. would provide evidence of this.

"If awarded the grant, the grant's goals and performance measures would also be incorporated into the strategic plan and progress would be tracked through the Balanced Score Card (BSC) thus ensuring transparency with the internal and external stakeholders". The applicant fails to outline how stakeholder responses will be considered and incorporated in long range decision making. The applicant shares that the stakeholders will access the BSC through the district website.

Most of the elements of a high quality plan are included in this proposal resulting in a near perfect score.

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

**5**

**4**

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

The applicant states they have employed strategies that provide layers of data to develop comprehensive analysis of programs and student achievement.

The applicant did outline approx. 12 performance measures as required. The rationale used to select performance measures: select those that are aligned with to the state CCRPI indicators and designed to measure and predict college and career level mastery. In addition the applicant has provided detailed charts predicting performance progress over the life of the grant, by grade level, benchmark and subgroup. Each performance measure is designed to provide formative information so that the data can be used to make instructional decisions in a timely manner. How this information will be reported and shared is not mentioned in the proposal.

Benchmark assessments are given in grades 1-8 and are used at all grade levels to inform student placement, instructional priorities, and mastery of standards. They also indicate learning and preparedness for college and career ready knowledge and skills.

Similar performance measures for students in grades 4-8 and 9-12 use the data from locally developed benchmarks that are aligned to the CRCT and the EOCTs. The applicant states- We will examine these areas not only to monitor student progress over time, but also to see if the achievement gap between subgroups is decreasing over time. Applicant shares other measures used to determine career/college preparedness.

Appropriate workplace behavior skills are stressed through a Positive Behavior Support model based on teaching and reinforcing appropriate classroom and school expectations organized around these skills. The applicant did not note how these skills are evaluated.

The applicant did provide detail of how each measure will provide rigorous, timely and formative information.

Applicant met most of the criteria of this section.

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

**5**

**5**

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

The applicant shares their intent to implement a 5 part evaluation plan to measure the success of the grantee in achieving the major objectives of this grant. Information contained in this portion is very comprehensive and includes clear rationale as well as anticipated responses/outcomes. It is evident that the applicant has spent considerable time building evaluation plans to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed activities.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>

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

The narrative components of the budget outline the intent of the district both short and long term. The charts provided give information related to each component. They are lacking detail and are confusing when trying to evaluate them. It is difficult to determine the specifics on various categories as they only use basic labels and are not formatted in a concise budget layout that includes grant year expenditures outlined in a clear way. This proposal outlines the intent to maximize

funds by using them for one-time investments that have a long term impact on the district. When reviewing budget documents the year in which these one time investments will occur is missing. Plans to use local resources and funds to continue the project components is outlined. It is also noted that some components are needed on a temporary basis and will be phased out when no longer needed. These strategies help insure the financial success of this proposal.

Overall the applicant was successful in meeting the criteria of this section.

<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
---	-----------	----------

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

Applicant details the various components of this proposal. They explain how they will purchase, lease and transition personal devices after the grant concludes.

Post grant plans are shared and layout how the work will continue and be evaluated. Applicant shares financial information to support the local share of this project. They do not share how student learning data will be used to build continued support. They also do not discuss long range plans for hardware repair and replacement when considering the internet system that will be in existence at the conclusion of the grant.

The applicant did make clear the staffing pattern required to implement grant initiatives and then shared the plan once initiatives are established.

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

In this section of the proposal the applicant does not provide a comprehensive description that outlines a coherent and sustainable partnership to support the four core educational assurance areas. Examples of community access and partnership with local industry is shared. Both are used as examples of initiatives that will directly reduce unemployment in the county. There is no evidence provided to substantiate this claim. The applicant does provide local statistics that indicate the need for addressing this problem. They do build a case for the need for strong, local career and college ready graduates in their district and suggest that programs outlined in the grant would provide this workforce. Key initiatives of the proposal are innovative and do respond to local identified needs, but lack detail. Parents and families of participating students are minimally engaged in both decision-making about solutions and assessing progress toward implementing plans and resolving problems. The applicant did provide annual performance measures that are reasonable overall. Some sub group targets appear unrealistic.

The applicant does use data to target resources to improve results for participating students. The plan to scale the model beyond the participating students over time is not shared. The competitive preference priority criteria was not met due to the number of components lacking in this section.

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

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

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

This proposal was focused on three innovations that would have long lasting effect on the school system: Individualized

Learning Plans, Lifetime Learning Academy and creation of a wireless internet service. These components are very innovative and would be a welcome addition to any school. The challenge is that the applicant provided little data and artifacts that supported the program design, criteria, and continuation beyond the grant years. There was also limited discussions with higher education shared in this document, a key partner in this endeavor. Elements that were of great interest include the LLA and Internet infrastructure. Overall the applicant does meet the criteria of Absolute Priority 1. They were unable to show how these ideas coherently and comprehensively built on the core educational assurance areas. Lacking in many sections was the detail and data to reinforce the concept or program component proposed. Also lacking was proof of deep learning and rigorous curricular experience for students, especially high needs students, within all student populations participating in the grant program. It is unclear how this project would be scaled up and replicated.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>150</b>
--------------	------------	------------



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

#### Application #0084GA-3 for Haralson County School System

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

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

#### (A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The district has a vision that it will be recognized as a leader in improving student achievement for all students, will display an on-going commitment to student achievement and academic excellence for all students through a continuous improvement process of collaboration with internal and external stakeholders who share accountability for a high-quality education for all. The Haralson County School System also has a vision of improved student learning through individual personalized instruction.

The applicant indicates that its belief statements are the foundation for our proposed innovative practices in four core educational areas: 1) adapting standards and assessments to prepare students for both college and career readiness in a global economy 2) building and using data systems that measure student growth and success and inform and improve instruction; 3) providing highly effective teachers and principals for all students; and 4) turning around our lowest-achieving schools while improving instruction at all schools.

However, the applicant does not clearly set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that builds on its work in the for core educational assurance areas. It is unclear and ambiguous as to whether the applicant will concentrate its efforts on its broader vision of being recognized as a leader in improving student achievement for all students or improving student learning through individual personalized instruction.

The applicant 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 applicant proposes to increase performance on summative assessments; decrease achievement gaps.

The applicant also proposes to increase the graduation rate and college enrollment; provide educational and training opportunities for secondary students, parents, and community members.

The applicant clearly evidences goals, activities, a timelines, deliverables and responsible parties to accelerate student performance and achievement and prepare them to be college and career ready.

However, the approach to increasing college enrollment and providing training opportunities are ambiguous. The applicant proposed to utilize the Life and Learning Academy to engage students in college and career readiness standards and

assessments. Yet, the applicant also indicates that it will plan and develop the Life Learning Academy to provide educational and training opportunities for secondary students, parents, and community members.

The applicant does not sufficiently describe what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments. Teachers will seamlessly integrate in class lessons and digital learning platforms which will allow students access to many more teachers and instructional opportunities, and rigorous performance assessments both at school and at home. Digital learning platforms are not clearly defined. It is also unclear as to how students being exposed to more teachers coincide with experience in a personalized learning environment.

The applicant scored in the medium range in this section.

<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

The applicant evidences a general approach to reform that will focus that will include all of the schools within the school district.

The applicant describes a general process for how schools will be selected to participate. The applicant proposes to provide every school and every student in Haralson County with highly effective and personalized instruction to achieve the goal of an 83.7% graduation rate for all students.

Collectively, all of the schools are school-wide Title I schools and meet the eligibility requirements of this grant with free and reduced lunch rates ranging from 57% to 100%, with an overall district rate of 79%.

The applicant provides a list of all of the school that will participate in the grant.

The applicant proposes to serve approximately 3,600 students. No data is provided relative to the total number of participating students from low-income families or the total number of participating educators. Although all of the participating schools are eligible school-wide Title I schools, no high-need students have been clearly identified.

This section was assigned a score in the medium range because its approach to implementing its reform proposal was of adequate quality and some data elements were not provided.

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant does not evidence 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 school. The applicant indicates that the district is in close proximity to Alabama, North and West Georgia and Atlanta, and Tennessee which will provide the opportunity for other school and state leaders to visit its proposed Lifetime Learning Academy and replicate or adapt the concept in other communities.

In addition, the applicant proposes a Lifetime Learning Academy and free wireless access for the community will provide alternative avenues for students and community members to access educational and training opportunities. There is much ambiguity regarding whether the applicant is indicating that because it is in close proximity to other states, the Lifetime Learning Academy could be replicated, represents its scale-up plan. In addition, the applicant does not clearly communicate whether the implantation of the Lifetime Learning Academy is a part of its reform efforts for improving student achievement and preparing them for college and career readiness or whether the implementation of the Academy represents its scale-up plan.

The applicant indicates that local and statewide data systems and on-going assessments will be populated into each student's Individual Learning Plan. However, the applicant does not articulate when or how the assessments would be populated into the learning plans nor does the applicant evidence persons responsible for the process.

The applicant indicates that data teams have been established to continually examine a variety of data including benchmarks, standards-based grades, performance assessments, and progress monitoring. The applicant, however, does not evidence how the data would be continually examined. The applicant does not identify who would make up the data teams. In addition the applicant does not provide a timeline for how often data would be examined, as continually is general in nature.

The applicant proposes to provide an Individual Learning Plan (ILP) for every student for grades PK-12. Through individualized and personalized instruction, each student will have the opportunity to pursue a rigorous course of study which will in turn accelerate and deepen students' learning through attention to their individual needs and talents.

The applicant does not adequately demonstrate how the proposed logic model or theory of change of how its plan will improve student learning outcomes for all students who would be served based on its proposed activities and deliverables. In addition, no specific strategies, clearly identified timelines for implementation of its plan and persons responsible for its implementation is clearly communicated.

Overall, the application does not evidence all of the elements necessary for 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 applicant reach its outcome goals. The plan does not evidence elements relative to clear timelines, concrete activities, deliverable and persons responsible for carrying out the identified activities and deliverables..

This section was assigned a score in the medium range.

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

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

The district provides tables that clearly describe projected, performance goals based on achievement gap performance between subgroups within the LEA and the LEA's highest achieving subgroup in reading or Language Arts and math based on the following summative assessments: the Georgia Criterion-Referenced Competency Test (CRCT) for grades 3-8 and the Georgia End-Of-Course Tests (EOCT) for grades 9-12.

Relative to decreasing the achievement gaps, increasing the graduation rates and increasing college enrollment rates, the applicant's goals are ambitious. However, it cannot be determined if the goals are attainable as State ESEA targets overall and by subgroups are not evidenced for comparison. The applicant's goals are ambitious to move the students at the elementary and middle level achievement on summative assessment to an average of 7 point gains by the end of the grant period based on its proposed use of individual learning plans.

The goals to move the high school student's achievement on the summative assessment to an average of 15 point gains may not be attainable. Based on the applicant's limited and generalized vision associated with it goals and activities, the proposal is likely to result in minimal improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals that are equal to or exceed State ESEA targets for the LEA(s), overall and by student subgroup.

The applicant does not articulate what the State ESA targets are overall, and by subgroup for base line comparison to determine if its achievement goals are ambitious and achievable.

The applicant's goals are ambitious to move the students at the elementary and middle level achievement on summative assessment to an average of 7 point gains by the end of the grant period based on its proposed use of individual learning plans. Overall, it is difficult to ascertain, based on the proposal's generalized vision, that its reform model would result in improved student learning and increased equity among all of the students anticipated to be served by the proposal.

This section of the proposal was assigned a score in the medium range.

**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>10</b>

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

The applicant provided sufficient documentation that it improved student learning outcomes and closed achievement gaps, including by raising student achievement, high school graduation rates. As indicated by the student performance data for the past four years, all of the elementary (except for one elementary school) and the middle schools experienced achievement gains in ELA on the state's summative assessment. All of the elementary schools experience an average of 6.5% growth over a 4 year period in ELA. Buchanan Elementary experienced an average of 22.9% gains in math on the state's summative assessment over a 4 year period. Relative to closing the achievement gap, students with disabilities at West Haralson Elementary School experienced an average 18.5% growth in math on the state's summative assessment

over a 4 year period. At the middle school students with disabilities experienced an average of 38.4% gains in math on the state's summative assessment over a 4 year period as well. On the state's graduation test, the high school experienced an average of 6.7% gains in math. Relative to graduation rate, the high school experienced an average of .2% gains over a 4 year period. The graduation rate for economically disadvantaged students at the high school achieved a 2.1% gains over a 4 year period.

Although the applicant experienced gains in student achievement in some content areas at varied grade levels, overall, the applicant did not close achievement gaps in student achievement over a four year period. Achievement gap decrease occurred at two elementary schools and the applicant demonstrated increased achievement in the identified subgroups. However, the decrease in achievement gaps at the two identified schools were not significant enough to impact a decrease in the achievement gaps for the applicant overall over a four year period.

The applicant did not provide data relative to its record of success for college enrollment.

It is clearly evident that the applicant has achieved ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools or in its low-performing schools based on the following: At the high school, the district replaced all four administrators in 2012, hired a new ELA academic coach and provided targeted professional learning based on data for teachers in all core content areas using online systems and state and regional educational support staff. Staff have been involved in several professional learning opportunities over the past year including Schlechty Center "Working on the Work" for student and teacher engagement, and Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement (GLISI). Several high school math teachers have been involved in a math/science partnership regional grant over the past year. The applicant partnered with the University of West Georgia on several Teacher Quality Grants in the core content areas. It is evident that the applicant makes student performance data available to students, educators and parents as evidenced by the following: Parents and students fully informed and engaged in their academic achievement through student and parent portals in the data management system. Parents and students are encouraged to log in to the database frequently to check grades, attendance, and test scores.

Teachers also use Performance Matters to build reports of individualized student achievement that show both state standardized and local test scores to send home to parents and use at parent-teacher conferences.

The Statewide Longitudinal Data System is easily accessible for all teachers, administrators, and parents and provides a full educational picture and history for students anywhere in the state of Georgia for easy access to transfer information and data through post-secondary years.

The performance data is made available to teachers in ways that inform and improve instruction.

The applicant does not provide evidence that the student performance data is available to students and parents in ways that improve participation or services. The applicant also does not evidence that the performance data is available to educators in ways that improve services. The applicant also states that the student data is accessible for all parents but it does not indicate how the student data is accessible and to what degree.

Overall, the applicant adequately demonstrated evidence of a clear record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching, including a description, charts or graphs, raw student data, and other evidence. The applicant did not coherently demonstrate academic achievement across the district as a whole. The applicant overall, only experienced sparse records of success relative to student achievement and closing the achievement gap in very few of its schools and the successes varied across content areas and grade levels.

This section was assigned a score in the medium range.

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

**5**

**3**

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

The applicant indicates that all salaries and travel are posted on the Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts (DOAA) website called Open Georgia. This website contains actual personnel salaries and travel expenditures at the school and district level for all instructional and support staff for each person and job code. However, the applicant does not clearly evidence that the report includes actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only.

The applicant indicates that annually, Haralson County School System submits the Transparency in Government Act (TIGA) report to the auditors which is part of the Georgia Senate Bill 300 (2008). The TIGA report contains information on all public school expenditures, revenue, and vendors for public viewing on the Open Georgia website. The Georgia Department of Education also houses our annual financial budgets and expenditures for the school system for public viewing. The applicant does not clearly evidence that the report includes actual non-personnel expenditures at the school

level.

The applicant provides ambiguous evidence relative to increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments. In addition, no evidence is provided indicating that the transparency in LEA practices and processes are posted on each school's website.

This section was assigned a score in the medium range.

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

**10**

**10**

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

It is clearly evident that the applicant has demonstrated successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal as indicated by the following:

Haralson County School System has been approved as a charter school system with the Georgia Department of Education as of July 1, 2013. At present, there are five elected board of education members.

The Board of Education (Georgia Department of Education/BOE) is largely responsible for the approval of policy regarding instruction, teachers, students, and facilities and ensuring that these policies align with federal, state, local, and health/safety requirements.

Each of the six schools in Haralson County School System has a School Council which is in the process of being transitioned to local School Governance Teams through the system's charter agreement with the state BOE. The members of the School Governance Team serve staggered three-year terms, and their role is to serve as an advisory panel to make recommendations to the local school board. Each school is permitted to determine the parameters of their role through the system charter.

In addition, as indicated in its charter, the decision-making authority of the principal of each System Charter School, the School Governing Council of each School and the local Board in resource allocations and establishing and monitoring the achievement of school improvement goals.

This section was assigned a score in the high range.

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

**15**

**13**

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

The applicant provided a clear 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, as evidenced by the following:

The applicant held numerous meetings with school leadership, teachers, staff, parents, school board members, and community members to discuss and analyze the strengths and needs of the school system.

Specific programmatic needs for the high school were addressed through a survey of our 8th-12th grade students.

The applicant met with a variety of community leaders, including county commissioners, mayors, business owners, county agencies like the Haralson Family Coalition and the Chamber of Commerce, and faculty and administrators in post-secondary education to discuss how the Race to the Top grant would not only support innovation and opportunity for students, but how the initiatives outlined in the grant would help to meet community goals as described in some of the community agencies' strategic plans.

The grant planning process allowed all stakeholders to be included in creating a collective vision and focus for all students in Haralson County.

The applicant did not evidence whether the teachers engage in collective bargaining representation. The applicant however did provide survey results indicating that more than 70 percent of the teachers and administrators for the participating schools support the proposal.

The applicant clearly evidences letters of support from key stakeholders such as the business community, institutions of higher education and the mayor, the Georgia Department of Education, all of the participating schools, the local Chamber of Commerce and the County Board of Commissioners.

The applicant did not provide letters of support from parents, parent organizations or student organizations.

This section was assigned a score in the high range.

### 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>

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

The applicant demonstrates a high-quality plan to help the student understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals as evidenced by the following: The applicant indicate that students will be guided in the use of their ILP in how they are progressing toward their goals, and teachers, parents, and students will be able to develop and use individual strategies towards achieving those goals. However, the applicant does not evidence that with the support of parents and educators, students will understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals.

The applicant evidences a high-quality plan whereby students are able to identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements and understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goals.

The first innovation is to develop Individual Learning Plans (ILP) for each student which will provide them with a portfolio of information based on their skills, abilities, needs, and interests and that will then be used to guide instruction starting in prekindergarten through graduation.

Teachers and other staff will be assigned as advisors to students and will continually work with student and parents to develop a full picture of the student’s current performance, their strengths and areas for improvement, their goals, and steps to achieve those goals.

This individualized approach will provide the necessary supports and guidance to provide high need students full access to college- and career-ready standards. The advisors will also help the student identify and target the specific learning outcomes that they need to realize their goals based on the Georgia College and Career Ready Performance Index.

The applicant articulates an adequate plan whereby students in middle school, and advisors will transition their ILP into an Individual Graduation Plan (IGP) which will include the student’s interests, strengths, areas for improvement and long-term plans for college and/or career after high school.

The applicant does not evidence a plan relative to high school students being able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest.

The applicant evidences an adequate plan whereby students will have access and exposure to several of the areas of study based on the following: A student learning community will be comprised of students from several of the areas of study called Career Pathways in the learning academy. These areas of study include, but are not limited to, business, digital communications, automotive technologies, manufacturing, agriculture, and programming.

The applicant does not provide evidence that exposure to several areas of study motivates and deepens individual student learning.

The applicant adequately evidences 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. The learning team will not only consist of their advisor but other teachers, fellow students, and business partners. In these teams students will not only master the curriculum content, but will also develop the “soft skills” that they need to develop to be successful in the classroom, college, and career environments. In the learning team each student will be presented with a number of challenges that the team will have to meet.

The applicant does not, however, demonstrate a sequence of instructional content relative to ensuring that students would graduate on time and college and career-ready.

The applicant clearly evidences a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments based on the following: The infrastructure and technology to achieve the goal of personalized instruction includes providing access to current technology to each student and teacher both inside and outside of the classroom through a one-to-one technology initiative using tablets and Netbooks, and providing free wireless Internet access in the schools, homes, and the community. This 24/7 technology access will provide students and teachers with access to the most current research and technologies and will allow teachers to personalize instruction by using a variety of blended learning approaches such as online and flipped

instruction.

The applicant demonstrates an adequately quality content, including digital learning content as appropriate based on the following: Early in the student’s educational career they will be expected to use a variety of technologies for learning including tablets, Netbooks, multimedia, and web-based programs. A key component to students’ learning about technology will be their use and application of technology in their everyday educational experiences.

It cannot be determined if the content and digital learning content is aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

The applicant adequately demonstrates a method for feedback in an effort to update individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery. The e-portfolio will be analyzed and updated each year by the teacher in collaboration with the parent and student (when age appropriate). In conjunction with other data collection systems, an identified data system will be used as a formative assessment system which will provide markers as to the progress towards the system’s goals of high achievement for all students. The applicant does not indicate what aspects of the portfolio would be updated as it relates to progress toward mastery of college and career ready standards or college and career ready graduation standards.

The applicant documents an adequate system for 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 indicated by the following: Both the leadership team and the SGTs will be able to view and analyze data related to student achievement and success on other performance targets such as the College and Career Ready Performance Index indicators. The SGT members will receive reports from the school leadership teams on how the students are progressing on these different performance indicators and will provide input and recommendations for improvement when necessary.

The applicant adequately evidence accommodations and adequate 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. For high needs students, the advisor will also work closely with the appropriate support personnel to establish an Individualized Graduation Plan to meet the student’s unique educational needs. These support personnel may include Response to Intervention Coordinators, special education teachers, case managers, transition specialists, career technical instructors, or job coaches.

The applicant proposes to provide instruction to students on how they will use their ILP as well as provide one-to-one computing devices to every student in the school system and training for the students. However, the applicant does not evidence resources provided to the students in order to track and manage their learning.

Overall, the applicant demonstrates a plan of adequate quality 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 approach to the plan would be strengthened if parental support was evidenced.

This section was assigned a score in the medium range.

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

**20**

**18**

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

It is clearly evident that the applicant engage in practices that 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 indicated by the following: Teachers will be provided professional development through a Professional Learning Community (PLC) model which will provide an equitable and collaborative environment for all teachers and administrators to learn how to implement and guide students through their ILPs. Training will be provided for teachers on how to utilize the data management system, how to analyze data, how to teach students how to understand their own data, and how to guide students in setting targets. Teachers will be trained on how to help parents understand the ILP/IGP process.

The applicant clearly demonstrates that the applicant engages in practices that 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 as indicated by the following: students will engage in a curriculum that infuses the “soft skills” that they will need to be successful. These soft skills include information and communication technologies, presentation skills, and thinking and reasoning skills. Life skills, which include leadership, ethics accountability, adaptability, personal productivity and responsibility, self-direction, and social responsibility, will also be incorporated throughout the curriculum. Students will engage in performance-based educational opportunities by running a graphic arts shop, or working as technology assistants and website designers. Students would be able to earn credit for this coursework if

mastery of the standards is demonstrated in their performance and in their e-portfolios which would be part of their ILP.

The applicant clearly demonstrates that it 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 Benchmark assessments are given in grades 1-8 and are used at all grade levels both as grade level information to facilitate vertical planning for both the sending and receiving grade level teachers to inform where they need to remediate or accelerate their instruction to maximize mastery of the standards. Grades 9-12 use the data from locally developed benchmarks that are aligned to the EOCTs. The benchmark data also are analyzed at the individual student level to inform instruction as to acceleration, remediation, and grouping for targeted instruction. These results can be tied directly to improving student achievement and the ILPS system will be used to help the district, teachers, parents, and students analyze this data.

However, the applicant does not evidence how often benchmarks are administered.

It is clearly evident that the applicant engages in practices to 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 based on the following: The TKES evaluation system, an Individualized Professional Growth Plan (IPGP) for the teacher can be developed. This system can also function as a clearinghouse of resources that can then be recommended to the teacher to help them improve their professional practice.

Individual feedback will be provided to teachers on their progress on implementation of the ILPs. The professional development plan will be continually monitored and revised to address ongoing needs of teachers and students.

Georgia's new accountability system will provide with the tools to ensure we meet this goal. This new accountability system for teachers and leaders is called the Teacher Keys Effectiveness System (TKES) and the Leader Keys Effectiveness System (LKES) and is fully implemented in the Haralson County School System for the 2013-14 school year. This new evaluation system for the 2014 school year will allow principals to identify effective and highly effective teachers based on student growth and provide them with valuable data on each teacher to implement goals and plans for improvement and growth. The Leader Keys Effectiveness System which will allow the superintendent to identify effective and highly effective principals and assistant principals based on student growth and make decisions based on data that will allow for every student to have an effective administrator and teacher.

The proposal provides clear evidence that it has access to actionable information that helps educators identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests as indicated by the following: circulation data will be collected to identify how the devices are being used. Data will be collected through the system content filter that can collect data on educational resources that are accessed by students. These data can then be correlated with specific areas of student achieve to determine the usefulness of the electronic resources provided by the district and access to those resources.

The 24/7 technology access will provide students and teachers with access to the most current research and technologies and will allow teachers to personalize instruction by using a variety of blended learning approaches such as online and flipped instruction.

The ILPs will contain information from a variety of online sources which will show progress towards academic, performance, and "soft" skills. Once these areas are identified a number of instructional strategies including remediation, differentiated learning, and problem based learning situations will be employed to ensure that each student is having his/her unique educational needs met.

The Lifelong Learning Academy will be physically housed at the district high school. With the guidance of an advisor, students at the high school will work collaboratively in a problem based learning environment. Each member of the learning team will have the opportunity to take classes uniquely suited to their career interests, then will work in real-world contexts such as technology support for the district, community health clinic, and web development.

The applicant clearly evidence that students will have access to high-quality learning resources, including digital resources, as appropriate, that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements the tools to create and share new resources. The infrastructure and technology to achieve the goal of personalized instruction includes providing access to current technology to each student and teacher both inside and outside of the classroom through a one-to-one technology initiative using tablets and Netbooks, and providing free wireless Internet access in the schools, homes, and the community.

The proposal clearly demonstrates that it has 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 based on the following: The Teacher Efficacy Protocol is an individual growth plan for teachers which outlines a teacher's steps and training

involved in reaching the goal. Individual goals are set between the teacher and the principal using formative and summative student assessment data, classroom observations, and other student outcomes such as grades and office referrals.

Training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing the achievement gap is clearly evidence based on the following: As a part of the grant, teachers at all of the schools will receive professional development to help them learn how to integrate these technologies into the curriculum. Initially these professional development opportunities will involve traditional training. Over the course of the grant a professional development center will be formed.

The applicant clearly demonstrates a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals, including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects and specialty areas. The applicant proposes to provide every school and every student in Haralson County with highly effective and personalized instruction to achieve the goal of an 83.7% graduation rate for all students.

Through the use of Individual Learning Plans, Individual Graduation Plans, one-to-one technology initiatives and ubiquitous wireless Internet access, and the Lifetime Learning Academy, students will have full and continuous access to highly effective instruction and rigorous and relevant curriculum which will more fully prepare them to meet the College and Career Ready Performance Index indicators.

However, the applicant does not specify in which subjects it will concentrate its efforts to ensure that all students receive instruction from highly-effective teachers.

Overall, the applicant evidences coherent elements of 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.

This section was assigned a score in the high range.

#### 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>15</b>

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

The applicant clearly evidences practices and policies relative to Organizing the LEA central office, or the consortium governance structure, to provide support and services to all participating schools. The superintendent acts as the CEO of the school system and collaborates closely with the school board to advise and make decisions regarding all areas of the school system. There are three Chief Officers who serve as department heads of Academics, Technology, and Finance. The Chief Academic Officer has responsibility for all programs related to teaching and learning, these include: curriculum, assessment, data collection, professional learning, special education, ESOL, Response to Intervention, gifted, student services, nursing, school psychologists, counselors, family and community engagement, attendance, prekindergarten, homebound, grant writing, instructional policy, and all Federal Programs (except school nutrition). The Haralson County School central office staff works closely with the schools, regional training centers, and the state department in providing targeted, needs-based instruction for the leadership team and all faculty and staff for any new initiatives. Local School Governance Teams are local school teams that provide input into setting academic achievement targets as the schools and the teams become more familiar with the new accountability measures.

The applicant clearly demonstrates that it has policies relative to 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 evidenced by the following examples. The School Governance Teams participates in the educational process of the school in the following areas: meeting etiquette, sunshine laws, the development of School Improvement Plans, progress monitoring, school budgeting, Common Core implementation, instructional technology, personnel, strategic planning, Federal and State programs, and Special Education law. These local school governance teams will have input and decision-making authority 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.

It is clearly evident that the applicant gives students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery and not on the amount of time spent on a topic based on the following documentation within the proposal. The

Georgia DOE provides for minimum competencies that are required for students to graduate Haralson County School System provide alternative ways for students to earn credit. Some possibilities include Carnegie Units high school coursework offered at the middle school level, application of skills through community-project and work-based experiences that would count as credits, credit by exam for those students who have already mastered the curriculum, and a variety of dual enrollment and move on when ready opportunities to best prepare students for whatever path they choose after graduation.

The proposal well documents that students are given opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways. For example, the Students will be able to show mastery in a variety of ways through the use of their Individual Learning Plans which are designed based on their current level of performance each quarter. By allowing students opportunities to access blended learning technology and multi-media they will be able to demonstrate mastery through tradition paper-pencil tasks, on-line learning formats, performance and experiential tasks, and through individualized learning modules in a platform such as Moodle.

The applicant clearly demonstrates that students are provided learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners. As indicated in the proposal, students will be able to show mastery of standards by collaborating on a team project and presenting their performance tasks to other students and the community. These performance based learning opportunities will provide students with disabilities, and English learners with a variety of ways to demonstrate mastery of the curriculum.

Overall, the applicant clearly demonstrates coherent elements of 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.

This section was assigned a score in the high range.

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

**10**

**10**

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

The applicant evidences a plan for ensuring that all participating students, parents, educators and other stakeholders 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. The students in the district, the residents of the county will also have access to the academy for training. Parents and community members will be able to use the Lifetime Learning Academy after school hours to access instruction in basic literacy, post-secondary institutions through online content, and training in career-ready and 21st Century skills. The applicant noted that 2009 data revealed that 22% of all live births in the county were to mothers without a high school diploma or GED. Through the Lifetime Learning Academy, these mothers would have the opportunity to increase their education or training and therefore better provide for their children. In addition, the district will provide training opportunities to parents and students on how to complete the FAFSA so that all students will have access to a variety of educational opportunities regardless of income.

The proposal clearly evidences a plan for ensuring that students, parents, and other stakeholders have appropriate levels of technical support, which may be provided through a range of strategies based on the following: In the learning team, each student will be presented with a number of challenges that the team will have to meet. Depending on the specific career and college goal for the student, these challenges might involve starting a business in which the team contracts with the district for technical support services.

District and grant personnel will collaborate with parents and community members to develop a decision-making structure that will allow the applicant to select, implement, and evaluate supports to address the individual needs of the students.

The grant proposes tools and supports that will allow faculty and staff members to continually improve instruction through professional development opportunities.

The development and implementation of the ILP will require professional development and supports and services for teachers to learn how to use the e-portfolio platform to personalize instruction for every student through the use of this comprehensive data system.

The applicant evidences an adequate plan for 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. The helps to ensure that work developed by students in the course work can be transferred to other systems. Students will be able to export their data and electronic products in open data format using tools such as Google Apps, and Google Drive.

The Statewide Longitudinal Data System is easily accessible for all teachers, administrators, and parents and provides a full educational picture and history for students anywhere in the state of Georgia for easy access to transfer information and data through post-secondary years.

A plan to for ensuring that LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems is clearly demonstrated. The state of Georgia is in the process of fully implementing a Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS), which the district uses to help it with data analysis. The ILPS will also be used to collect and aggregate data about students, groups of students, and the entire district. The ILPS will also have a component that can help teachers evaluate their own performance based on aggregate student data.

The project manager at the Lifetime Learning Academy will be responsible for developing, coordinating, and implementing the professional development necessary to carry out the initiatives; managing purchases, budgets, and inventory; ensuring compliance; collecting, analyzing, and disseminating data about the grant initiatives; and coordinating activities between all of the relevant parties.

Additionally, these data systems will be used at the district level to assess areas of need and possibly help prescribe solutions to a wide variety of instructional, managerial, and leadership issues that may be present.

Overall, the applicant clearly demonstrates 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.

This section was assigned a score in the high range.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>

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

The applicant proposes to provide students with access to rigorous and relevant curriculum through data-driven instruction using the Individual Learning Plan (ILP), one-to-one technology initiatives using digital learning platforms, ubiquitous wireless access in school, home, and the community, and access to high-quality college- and career-pathway programs available at the Lifetime Learning Academy (LLA).

The proposal consists of goals, activities, a timeline and responsible parties and deliverables.

Develop Professional Learning Communities (PLC) to provide professional development for teachers on personalized instruction with Individual Learning Plans (ILP) technology into instruction.

Additionally, the LLA personnel will develop materials, activities, and processes that will ensure sustainability after funding for the grant ends.

The Technology Project Manager will work with internal and external stakeholders to develop the plan for constructing the wireless infrastructure in Haralson County, as well as the agreements with contracted suppliers and the policy/procedure for public access to the wireless internet in order to go live in August 2014.

The proposed Individualized Learning Plan System (ILPS) will be used to aggregate data about educational resources assigned to students and whether those resources would have been accessed primarily at home, and whether those resources had a positive impact on student learning. The Individual Learning Plan Project Manager will collaborate with the technology department staff, system and school administrators, and teachers to evaluate the teachers' needs in the areas of using ILPs to provide personalized instruction and integrating technology into instruction. A professional development plan will be developed based on the needs assessment and the ILPS will be used to house this data.

The applicant will monitor the effect of the grant initiatives on student achievement. Each school will address student achievement goals through the school improvement plan. The system and school administrators will monitor student achievement through the school improvement plans. The ILPS will gather student achievement data from multiple sources (i.e. classroom assessments, common assessments, benchmark assessments, standardized tests) and analyze the data in order to personalize instruction to meet individual student needs. The school leadership team will monitor school-level achievement data to evaluate instructional program effectiveness and investigate ways to improve.

The applicant proposes to monitor the impact of the grant initiatives on students' success in the work force.

The applicant's professional development plan will be continually monitored and revised to address ongoing needs of

teachers and students. Administrators will also publicly recognize and celebrate teacher accomplishments and share examples of successful implementation.

The applicant indicates that one of its evaluation systems that will be developed is a system that will measure student's progress towards a career. Critical to these data collection systems will be connections to local employers who will provide valuable feedback about the students' progress. Along with data about career paths for the students, data from many stakeholder groups will be collected.

The plan clearly addresses how it will publicly share information on the quality of its investments via the following: Throughout the process, the project managers and other appropriate personnel will regularly report progress to internal and external stakeholders via Board of Education meetings, school faculty meetings, school leadership team meetings, Haralson County School System website, school websites, school councils, Parent/Teacher Organizations, e-mail, and news media. The plan does not, however, indicate how it will monitor and measure the quality of its investment funded by the Race to the Top grant funds.

The applicant indicated that administrators will publicly recognize and celebrate teacher accomplishments the applicant does not address how and when the accomplishments would be shared. In addition, the applicant does not clearly evidence how will monitor the effect of the grant initiatives.

Although the applicant indicates that local property will be leased to install wireless towers and access points to support the wireless network infrastructure, the applicant does not clearly evidence where and how it will construct wireless network infrastructure.

A high-quality plan for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant opportunities are clearly evidenced.

Although the applicants plan is inclusive of a timeline, the timeline is very general. It cannot be determined exactly when the feedback or deliverables would take place. The timeline makes a general reference that activities would take place between January and June, between August and June or that the activities are ongoing resulting in a vague timeline.

In addition, the proposal does not evidence opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. Nor does the proposal address how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top – District, such as investments in professional development, technology, and staff.

The applicant scored in the medium range in this section.

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

5

5

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

The applicant clearly evidences a plan for ongoing communication as indicated by the following:

Haralson County School System will utilize various strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders throughout the grant period and beyond. One way that the system will communicate with all stakeholders is through the school system website

During the planning phase, the project managers will utilize the websites to seek input from stakeholders regarding the initiatives using tools such as surveys, comment forms, or questionnaires. Each school also has a website that can be accessed through the system website. These websites provide information on current news and projects, programs, co-curricular and extra-curricular activities, achievements, and calendars of events to keep stakeholders informed. Internal stakeholders e-mail will be utilized. Face-to-face meetings will be another way to communicate and engage internal and external stakeholders. Print materials are widely used in the school system to inform external stakeholders, and they will continue to be utilized to inform parents and community members regarding the grant initiatives.

Although he proposal does not indicate how often communication will take place, overall, the applicant evidences a concrete elements of a high-quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.

This section was assigned a score in the high range.

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

5

5

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

The applicant provides a clear rationale for selecting the following performance measures and indicators. The first performance measure is the number and percentage of students whose teacher of record will be effective or highly effective and the number and percentage of students that are in a school with an effective or highly effective principal. Two of the schools were more than one point below the state average. The applicant will continue to adjust these percentages and collect data in the new evaluation system. To determine if teachers and administrators are “highly effective” the final results will be determined by the state’s Teacher Effectiveness Measure tool. The percent of students in 2nd grade passing the reading and math benchmark assessments are used to inform the Individual Learning Plan and are a leading indicator used to inform instruction for teachers in 3rd grade. A second performance measure, the Survey of Instructional Practice is based on another part of the new evaluation system, Teacher Keys Effectiveness System and is administered to students in grades 3-12. The number and percent of students in grades 6-8 who are meeting standards on the Georgia Criterion-Referenced Competency Tests (CRCT) were used to demonstrate the ability of our students to show readiness in college and career ready standards. The first performance measure for students in grades 9-12 is FAFSA completion data. Because of the high poverty rate in the county, financial support and access to higher education is a barrier that needs to be overcome. The next performance measures are the number and percent of students in grades 9-12 who are meeting standards on the Georgia End of Course Tests (EOCT) in Ninth Grade Literature and ninth grade math were used to demonstrate the ability of our students to show readiness in college and career ready standards. Additionally, students must take eight courses in their high school career that are assessed with an EOCT and successfully pass all eight courses in order to graduate.

The applicant clearly describes 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 based on the following: Through the Lifetime Learning Academy we hope to provide rigorous and relevant, embedded performance tasks in all CTAE areas that utilize math skills. This will provide students the opportunity to practice math across classes and see the relevance of math in other areas, including career skills. These assessments will provide a strong measure if we the three proposed projects are increasing both access and practice with Common Core/Georgia Performance Standards as evidenced by students passing these assessments.

How the applicant will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress is clearly described as indicated by the following: Each of the performance measures is designed to provide formative leading information so that the data can be used to make instructional decisions in a timely manner. The performance measures will be reviewed at the time that the data is gathered in order to determine if the measure is accurately gauging implementation progress.

It is clearly evident that the applicant evidences ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures.

This section was assigned a score in the high range.

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

**5**

**4**

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

The applicant demonstrates a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve its plans as indicated by the following:

The district employs locally developed benchmark tests as a predictor of success on standardized test. Teachers utilize Performance Matters to analyze the benchmark data along with the standardized test data that is loaded into the program. Each school develops common assessments that are used as summative assessments for students as well as a means to evaluate teacher and program effectiveness. The analysis of the assessment data is used to modify instruction for each child. The assessment process will be combined with the proposed Individualized Learning Plan (ILP), and anticipates serving as a clinical model for education.

Professional Learning Communities (PLC) will be a way for the teachers and leaders of the district to collaborate about instructional issues, provide effective support, and feedback on the entire instructional process, and develop a highly effective mentoring program that would support new teachers as they enter the PLC.

The project will also develop an Individualized Learning Plan System (ILPS) in which each student has individualized goals which best meet their educational needs. All teachers will be required to approach teaching more as a clinical practice that focuses on the needs of each student and directs specific educational resources to each student based specific, documented needs.

The ILPS will also be used to collect and aggregate data about students, groups of students, and the entire district. The

ILPS will also have a component that can help teachers evaluate their own performance based on aggregate student data.

The system will also allow for reports that can show the impact specific educational resources provided by the district are having on student learning by associating specific educational resources prescribed in a student's ILP with the impact that those resources had on the student's learning.

The Lifetime Learning Academy will be associated with student success through specific educational resources available in this innovative program. The proposal does not indicate how the Lifetime Learning Academy would be associated with student success through educational resources. In addition, the applicant does not define the resources.

Along with data about career paths for the students, data from many stakeholder groups will be collected. The applicant does not indicate who would be responsible for collecting the data and how often the data would be collected.

Overall, the applicant clearly demonstrates a high-quality plan with necessary elements to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities, such as professional development and activities that employ technology.

This section was assigned a score in the high range.

## 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 applicants budget clearly identifies all funds that will support the project based on the following: Funds for innovations and improvements will come from RTTT (this grant) funds, local sales tax (ESPLOST), state and local education funds, Title I, Title II, and Title VI-B (Rural and Low Income) for developing and implementing performance assessments.</p> <p>The project will concentrate its efforts on grades in all of the target schools in the county, the duration of the project. Educators directly involved with the implementation of the project will receive intensive professional learning and related supports that will help implement blended learning strategies into the district. The project will also serve approximately 3600 students in grades PreK-12 to cover the cost of implementing strategies that will improve their academic achievement via Individual Learning plans and increase their college- and career-readiness. With a total four-year project cost request of \$9,991,362, this amounts to approximately \$2,775.00 in annual program costs, per student participant. The total cost is also inclusive of the following defined line items: personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contractals, training stipends and indirect costs.</p> <p>The applicant provides a rationale for the investments and priorities, including a description of all of the funds that the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant's budget, is feasible ensure the long-term sustainability of Individualized Learning Plans for the development of the students' e-portfolio and for the ubiquitous wireless system via the Lifetime Learning Academy.</p> <p>This section was assigned a score in the high range.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The applicant has a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant, as evidenced by the following:</p> <p>The Lifetime Learning Academy will also be open to members of the community who need or desire training in a wide variety of areas including basic computer skills, automotive certificate upgrades, and literacy skills. During the course of the grant, materials will be developed which can then be delivered to these stakeholder groups after hours by the students themselves. This concept of the student as teacher/trainer not only helps the student achieve mastery of the content but also ensures the sustainability of the project after grant funding has ended.</p>		

The contractual lease agreement will allow Haralson County School System to build, install and own the wireless Internet infrastructure, while the partners in this lease agreement will provide maintenance and upgrades to the system beyond the term of the grant in order to provide sustainability for the school system. The students enrolled in the technology programs in the Lifetime Learning Academy will support the technology infrastructure within the academy. Their teachers who will work closely with the district information technology department to coordinate the support of the system will supervise these students.

The infrastructure and technology will be self-sustaining through the contract lease agreements with private Internet providers and through the school system's Instructional Technology department (IT).

The LLA personnel will develop materials, activities, and processes that will ensure sustainability after funding for the grant ends.

The plan does not include how the applicant will evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes to inform a post-grant budget, and include an estimated budget for the three years after the term of the grant that includes budget assumptions, potential sources, and uses of funds.

Overall, the applicant evidences a general sustainability plan that is of moderate quality.

This section was assigned a score in the medium range.

### Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>

#### Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant is currently looking to expand student opportunities for internships and its partnership with Honda Lock for students to study robotics and engineering. The applicant is exploring ways to have business associates from Honda Lock teach courses at the high school and the Lifetime Learning Academy, and then to have students earn course credit for internships in the Honda Lock plant.

By providing new and innovative ways for students to show mastery and earn credit, the applicant proposes to be able to personalize instruction for those students who prefer internships or may need a paid internship in order to stay in school.

The Internet 2 capability that it proposes to add to its Internet system would allow health science students access to health agencies and professionals around the world in a virtual clinic setting. This would build on the current dual enrollment system with West Georgia Technical College where students can graduate with their Certified Nurse Assistant certificate and move right into coursework for higher professional degrees in health care.

The applicant adequately identified 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. By providing new and innovative ways for students to show mastery and earn credit, we will be able to personalize instruction for those students who prefer internships or may need a paid internship in order to stay in school.

The applicant proposes to use data systems that will be linked to the district's website so that students, teachers, parents, and community members can be securely authenticated to the appropriate learning resources offered by the Lifetime Learning Academy.

The applicant proposes to increase engagement, college and career readiness, and graduation rates for all high school students assessed through EOCT test scores, CTAE Pathway completers, and graduation rate percentage.

The applicant will be tracking progress over time for the performance measures related to student achievement, content mastery, and career readiness listed in the tables below. The applicant anticipates being able to use the data to target resources to improve student achievement with special attention to the subgroups of students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged.

The applicant proposes to 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, family instability, or other child welfare issues. The partnerships would allow all students, including students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students, the opportunity to engage in real-world career training opportunities. To help build capacity in the participating schools, qualified school personnel from the district would engage in a variety of educational activities with the partner colleges or universities. These activities will range from team teaching with faculty at the partnering schools to developing online content for the schools, to teaching selected courses.

The grant will be used to acquire and/or develop data management systems that will track all of our performance measures and allow us to examine data at least quarterly to make adjustments towards meeting our goals. By having more formative evaluation data, teachers and administrators can better help students identify the resources that they need to be more successful learners and adjust programs to quickly meet the needs of the community. To better target the district's resources, the ILP data gathered on the community's adult learners will help the district to see what resources have had the greatest impact on the adult learner's educational level. The ILP will also be used to see how the district's adult learners have benefited from the greater educational opportunities along with the students graduating from the district's schools. By gathering more specific data on the types of jobs the adult and student learners are receiving and how well they are doing on these jobs, the district can then tailor resources such as content, counseling, internships, and instructional programs to increase the employability of the adults and students participating in the program.

The applicant does not provide clear evidence relative to developing 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.

The applicant adequately evidences a plan to 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 indicated by the following: district and grant personnel will collaborate with parents and community members to develop a decision-making structure that will allow us to select, implement, and evaluate supports to address the individual needs of the students.

The applicant does not sufficiently provide a high-quality 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. The applicant only indicates that they are currently looking to expand student opportunities for internships and its partnership with and is exploring ways to have business associates from Honda Lock teach courses at the high school. The applicant's approach of looking to expand and exploring ways do not align with elements of a high-quality plan.

This section was assigned a score in the lower end medium range of this section.

## Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

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

### Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not clearly set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that builds on its work in the for core educational assurance areas. The applicant 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 applicant proposes to increase performance on summative assessments; decrease achievement gaps.

The applicant adequately demonstrated evidence of a clear record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching, including a description, charts or graphs, raw student data, and other evidence. The applicant did not coherently demonstrate academic achievement across the district as a whole. The applicant overall, only experienced sparse records of success relative to student achievement and closing the achievement gap in very few of its schools and the successes varied across content areas and grade levels.

The applicant clearly evidences goals, activities, a timelines, deliverables and responsible parties to accelerate student performance and achievement and prepare them to be college and career ready. The applicant proposes to provide an Individual Learning Plan (ILP) for every student for grades PK-12. Through individualized and personalized instruction,

each student will have the opportunity to pursue a rigorous course of study which will in turn accelerate and deepen students' learning through attention to their individual needs and talents.

It is clearly evident that the applicant engages in practices to 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 that will effect student achievement.

Total	210	157
-------	-----	-----