



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY SECRETARY

July 20, 2011

The Honorable Nathan Deal
Office of the Governor
State of Georgia
203 State Capitol
Atlanta, Georgia 30334

Dear Governor Deal:

I am writing in response to Georgia's request to amend its approved Race to the Top application. On February 21, 2011, the State first submitted requests to amend activities within four areas of its approved Race to Top application. Throughout March, April, and the first half of May, the State provided additional clarification as requested and refined its requests as necessary. In April, the State submitted additional requests to amend activities within a fifth area of its approved Race to the Top application. As with the initial requests, the State provided additional clarification as requested and refined the April requests as necessary. As you are aware, the U.S. Department of Education (Department) has the authority to approve amendments to your plan and budget, provided that such changes do not alter the scope or objectives of the approved proposal. On January 6, 2011, the Department sent a letter and "Grant Amendment Submission Process" document to Governors of grantee States describing the process by which the Department would review and approve or deny amendment requests. To determine whether approval of your amendments could be granted, the Department applied the conditions noted in this document and compared it with the Race to the Top program *Principles*, which this document also includes.

Most of Georgia's amendment requests involve revising timeframes and stem from the same rationale. In particular, when Georgia applied for Phase 2 of the Race to the Top competition, it did not completely update the timeframes for grant activities from when it applied for Phase 1 of the Race to the Top competition. Thus, the State requests to revise incorrect timeframes for activities across reform areas. Further, interdependencies of some activities within and across reform area sub-criteria also resulted in Georgia requesting to revise timeframes. Additionally, the transition of a new governor and state superintendent of education shortly after the Department awarded Georgia a Race to the Top grant resulted in the need for the State to revise its timeframes as the new leadership assimilated the plan for reform articulated in the State's approved application.

The attached table describes amendment requests related to timeframe revisions, interdependencies of

www.ed.gov

400 MARYLAND AVE., SW, WASHINGTON, DC 20202

The Department of Education's mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

activities, budget shifts, or other clarifications. I am approving these requests at this time.

At this time, I am also approving the following amendment requests that relate to revisions in scope or performance measures for a particular activity or project. It is important to note that, while both the amendments in the attached table and those described below have short term consequences, Georgia will still accomplish within the grant period all of the activities and deliverables articulated in its approved application. Further, it is our understanding that these amendments will neither result in a change in Georgia's Race to the Top student outcome goals nor substantially change the scope of work from its approved application.

- For reform area (B)(3) Supporting the Transition to Enhanced Standards and High-Quality Assessments, under the goal *Developing professional learning unit (PLU) courses targeting the Common Core Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS) and meaningful use of assessment data* (including development, delivery, and refinement of these PLU courses), Georgia will shift timeframes as a result of: 1) the timeline delays noted above and 2) delays in hiring personnel in-house to deliver the PLU courses rather than contracting out for this purpose. The PLU courses would have been available in June 2011 under Georgia's approved application and will be available in August 2012 under the requested amendments. In addition, Georgia will reduce the number of elementary school teachers trained statewide due to a reduction in the teaching force (reduction of 44,600 in the original application to 40,000 under the requested amendments).

With respect to funds allocated to carry out the activities to achieve this goal, Georgia will shift funds within *Project 2: Develop training on new standards and train the field* from contractual to personnel and fringe benefits as a result of hiring in-house personnel rather than a contractor. In addition, the State will reduce Year 1 funds across line items and increase Year 2-4 funds accordingly as a result of the timeframe shifts. As this project funds activities in more than one goal, see table below (B. Standards and Assessments; *Organize, evaluate, and improve existing resources in preparation for CCGPS implementation*) for detail regarding the amount of funds shifted.

- For reform area (D)(2) Improving Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Based on Performance, under the goal *Establishing a clear approach for measuring student growth by developing a value-added/growth model*, Georgia will shift timeframes for the reasons noted above. This amendment request results in a one-year delay of the State piloting its new evaluation system. Georgia originally intended to pilot the system in 2010-2011 and will now do so in 2011-2012.

The requested amendments impact Georgia's performance measures for sub-criterion (D)(2)(i)– *Establishing clear approaches to measuring student growth and measure it for each individual student*. In particular, based on the performance measures in Georgia's approved proposal, 50 percent of participating LEAs would use student growth measures in their teacher evaluation systems in 2010-2011 school year and 100 percent of participating LEAs would will use student growth measures in their teacher evaluation systems in each of the remaining three years of the grant. Under the proposed amendments, no participating LEAs will use student growth measures in their teacher evaluation systems in the 2010-2011 school year. However, Georgia will maintain the measure of 100 percent of participating LEAs using student growth measures in their teacher evaluation systems in 2011-2012 and for each of the remaining two years of the grant.

- For reform area (D)(2) Improving Teacher and Principal Effectiveness Based on Performance, in the goal *Using annual evaluations to inform talent development and talent management decisions*, Georgia will shift timeframes as a result the timeline delays noted above as well as the delay in piloting the new evaluation system one year (as noted above, from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012).

The requested amendments impact Georgia's performance measures for sub-criterion (D)(2)(iv)– *Using evaluation systems to inform decisions regarding developing teachers and principals and retaining effective teachers and principals*. In particular, based on the performance measures in

Georgia's approved proposal, 100 percent of participating LEAs would implement qualifying evaluation systems to inform decisions regarding 1) developing teachers and principals and 2) retaining effective teachers and principals in the 2011-2012 school year and in each of the remaining two years of the grant. Under the proposed amendments, because Georgia will not generate data from the pilot of its evaluation system until the 2011-2012 school year, no participating LEAs will meet these performance measures. However, Georgia will maintain the measure of 100 percent of participating LEAs implementing qualifying evaluation systems to inform these decisions for each of the remaining two years of the grant (2012-2013 and 2013-2014).

- For reform area (D)(4) Improving the Effectiveness of Teacher and Principal Preparation Programs, under the goal *Expanding preparation programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals*, Georgia will change the strategy to achieve this goal. In its approved application, Georgia proposed to tie state funding for teacher and principal preparation programs to scores generated from the new evaluation system. However, only the Georgia Board of Regents (BOR) is authorized to allocate funds to those public universities that offer traditional teacher and principal preparation programs. The Georgia BOR indicated in writing its support of this activity and that it will work with Governor of Georgia and the General Assembly to adjust its internal policies to achieve the intended effect. Further, the State has agreed to provide the Department with bi-yearly updates as to the status of these policy adjustments (each July and February beginning in 2011).
- For grant area (E)(2) Turning Around the Lowest Achieving Schools, in the goal *Supporting participating LEAs through structural initiatives*, Georgia will shift timeframes as a result of 1) the timeline delays noted above, 2) the delay in hiring a Deputy Superintendent for School Turnaround, and 3) the need to align the work in this reform area with the School Improvement Grant. Timeframe shifts resulted in the delay of one year in supporting LEAs through the activities that the State will implement to achieve this goal. With respect to funds allocated to carry out the activities to achieve this goal, Georgia will shift contractual in *Project 26: Turnaround services* from Years 1 and 2 to Years 2 and 3. The total funds allocated for this project did not change.

The requested amendments impact Georgia's performance measures for sub-criterion (E)(2)—*Turning around the lowest achieving schools*. In particular, based on the performance measures in Georgia's approved application, the State would implement one of the school reform models in 34 schools in each of the four years of the grant. However, Georgia intended to indicate that, during each of the four years of the grant, it would work with a total of 34 lowest achieving schools that were implementing one of the four required intervention models. Half of the schools would be implementing in the 2010-2011 school year and the other half would be implementing in the 2011-2012 school year. In addition, Georgia originally calculated the total number of schools to be 34 based on 2009 adequate yearly progress (AYP) determinations. Subsequently, Georgia updated this calculation based on 2010 AYP determinations and increased the total number of schools to 40. Accordingly, Georgia will implement one of the four required intervention models in a total of 40 schools—20 in 2010-2011 school year (which Georgia did) and 20 in the 2011-2012 school year.

- For its project in the invitational priority grant area *Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes*, Georgia will not implement one of three initiatives originally planned due to a decline in state lottery funds. Specifically, Georgia removed the initiative in this project that would have provided resource coordination related to the transition of children from Pre-K to kindergarten and elementary school to families of children in all Pre-K programs that feed into the State's lowest achieving schools. Since state funds would have supported this initiative, the change will not impact Georgia's Race to the Top budget.

Further, the State determined that a different approach for one of the two remaining initiatives could more broadly impact the effectiveness of teachers in Pre-K programs statewide and, thus, changed the approach accordingly. The State originally proposed to provide and evaluate targeted technical assistance to Pre-K programs based on CLASS findings. Under the proposed amendments, Georgia

will offer two alternatives to the current 12-15 hour professional development model offered to Pre-K teachers (either face-to-face or online): 1) a 20-hour course (divided into two hour sessions) and 2) a year-long, online coaching model. Georgia will evaluate the effectiveness of these models and make plans to scale-up the one found to be most effective. In addition, the state shifted the timeframes for all activities from Year 1 to Year 2 as a result of the timeline delays noted above

With respect to the funds allocated for this project, Georgia will revise the budget for *Project 30: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes*. Specifically, the State will: 1) reduce personnel and fringe by \$613,403, 2) reduce supplies by \$411,750, and 3) increase contractual by \$1,063,500 to reflect a change in strategy from hiring staff in-house to complete some activities to contract out for them. In addition, Georgia shifted the funds across all items from Years 1-3 to Years 2-4. The total funds allocated for this project did not change.

I am confident that Georgia will continue its bold, comprehensive reform efforts. If you need any assistance or have any questions regarding Race to the Top, please do not hesitate to contact your Race to the Top Program Officer, Victoria Hammer, at 202-260-1438 or Victoria.Hammer@ed.gov.

Sincerely,

//s//

Ann Whalen
Director, Policy and Program Implementation
Implementation and Support Unit

cc: John D. Barge
Teresa MacCartney
Erin Hames

Reform area affected	Goal within reform area	Description of change
A. State Success Factors	Project management and evaluation	1) Revise budget for <i>Project 29: Project management and evaluation</i> as a result of delayed hiring of project management team members. Specifically, reduce personnel and fringe benefits by \$886,721 as a result of late hiring in Year 1 and replacement of one FTE position with another that required less responsibilities and less salary accordingly. 2) Shift \$116,000 of savings incurred to travel to support monitoring and out-of-state travel over the grant period. 3) Move the remainder of savings incurred to support <i>Project 25: The New Teacher Project (TNTP)</i> .
A. State Success Factors	Base funding amount to Race to the Top participating LEAs	Increase base funding for participating LEAs by \$119,462 to reflect the replacement of one LEA that withdrew with another LEA that receives a smaller Title I allocation (funds reallocated from savings incurred in <i>Project 17: Performance-based pay for teachers</i> —funds originally intended to supplement the LEA that withdrew).
B. Standards and Assessments	Use current assessment system to test the CCGPS	Shift timeframes for two of three activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shift: 11 months for determining measures necessary to use current assessments to test the Common Core standards [from August 2010 to July 2011]) as a result of the timeline delays noted above as well as interdependencies of the activities necessary to achieve this goal (precision review of the Georgia Performance Standards [GPS] needs to be completed prior to the gap analysis between the GPS and the CCGPS, the gap analysis between the GPS and the CCGPS needs to be completed prior to determining measures necessary to use the current assessments to test the CCGPS).
B. Standards and Assessments	Organize, evaluate, and improve existing resources in preparation for CCGPS implementation	1) Shift timeframes for six of 12 activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shift: eight months for updating existing curriculum framework to align with the CCGPS [from September 2010 to May 2011]) as a result of the timeline delays noted above and subsequent delays in hiring staff in this reform area. 2) To ensure successful CCGPS implementation, hire additional in-house personnel to complete work throughout the grant period and fund throughout the grant period those personnel that the State originally intended to hire for only part of the grant period. 3) To accommodate these personnel revisions, revise the budgets for <i>Project 1: Preparation for CCGPS rollout</i> and <i>Project 2: Professional learning units and training on CCGPS</i> . Specifically, a) for <i>Project 1</i> , increase personnel and fringe benefits by \$503,818 and reduce contractual by \$149,504 (additional necessary funds reallocated from <i>Project 8: Decision Support Systems</i>) and b) for <i>Project 2</i> , increase personnel and fringe benefits by \$1,522,475, increase travel by \$143,792, reduce equipment by \$651,294, reduce supplies by \$541,000, and reduce contractual by \$369,154. In addition, Georgia reduced Year 1 funds and increased Years 2-4 funds allocated within both of these projects as a result of the timeframe shifts.
B. Standards and Assessments	Raise awareness of existing resources and CCGPS	1) Shift timeframes for two of the six activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shift: two months for promoting CCGPS resources to teachers in CCGPS orientation sessions [from July 2011 to September 2011]) as a result of the timeline delays noted above. 2) Extend timeframes for four of the six activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal to reflect their ongoing nature (e.g., updating principals on CCGPS training opportunities was initially to occur in May 2011 and will now extend throughout the grant period).

Reform area affected	Goal within reform area	Description of change
B. Standards and Assessments	Ensure fidelity of standards implementation by supporting LEAs in delivering appropriate professional learning to teachers	1) Shift timeframes for six of the ten activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shift: eight months for delivering online and face-to-face training on the CCGPS and use of assessment data [from May 2011 to January 2012]) as a result of the timeline delays noted above and subsequent delays in hiring staff. 2) Reduce the duration of a train-the-trainer professional development workshop from three days to two and reduce the number of participants per school from four to two due to the extent that Georgia's current standards align with the Common Core (based on an analysis Achieve conducted) and the strategy of blending face-to-face and online professional development on the CCGPS. 3) Reduce training stipends for <i>Project 2: Professional learning units and training on CCGPS</i> by \$1,086,000 (funds allocated in Year 2) due to reduction of days and participants. 4) Move savings incurred in this project to support <i>Project 14: Development, testing, and validation of other quantitative measures</i> and <i>Project 25: TNTP</i> , respectively.
B. Standards and Assessments	Create formative assessment toolbox for use by educators	1) Shift timeframes for 11 of the 16 activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shifts: 12 months for hiring staff [from May 2010 to May 2011]; 12 months for availability of toolbox [from September 2011 to September 2012]) as a result of the timeline delays noted above. 2) Revise the budget for <i>Project 3: Create formative assessments</i> . Specifically, a) reduce Year 1 personnel and fringe benefits by \$242,008 to account for later start dates, b) shift contractual from Year 1 to Year 2 as a result of timeframe shifts, and c) reallocate savings incurred to support work on <i>Project 4: Create benchmark assessments</i> .
B. Standards and Assessments	Create benchmark assessments where some degree of curriculum sequencing can help compensate for student mobility	1) Shift timeframes for the activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shift: 12 months for availability of the benchmark assessments [from June 2012 to June 2013]) as a result of the timeline delays noted above. 2) Revise the budget for <i>Project 4: Create benchmark assessments</i> . Specifically, a) decrease contractual in Year 1 and increase contractual in Year 2 accordingly as a result of timeframe shifts, b) decrease fringe and personnel in Year 1 as a result of late hiring, and c) increase personnel and fringe in Years 2-4 by \$182,044 to hire a project manager to oversee development of the formative and benchmark assessments.
B. Standards and Assessments	Ensure student success, in college and beyond, by aligning high school exit criteria and college entrance requirements with the new standards and assessments	Revise the budget for <i>Project 5: PSAT examinations and virtual coursework</i> . Specifically, a) shift \$398,584 from contractual to personnel for one element of this project to fund in-house development of virtual course content as part of its plan to offer a rigorous course of study in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) rather than contract out for this work as originally planned and b) increase contractual for another element of this project by \$599,255 due to underestimating the cost of administering the PSAT to all 11 th graders in the State (funds reallocated from savings incurred in <i>Project 8: Decision support systems</i> in reform area C. Data Systems [see below]).
C. Data Systems	Perform the initial tasks to plan out,	Shift timeframes for the activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shift: 16 months for planning activities required to design, develop, test, and launch the SLDS [from January 2010 to May 2011]) as a result of

Reform area affected	Goal within reform area	Description of change
	staff, and govern the data system	the timeline delays noted above.
C. Data Systems	Develop the core functionality of the P-20 Data System to be able to track student transitions between agencies	1) Shift timeframes for five of the five activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shift of 19 months for developing the capacity to link disparate agency systems into a data hub [from December 2010 to July 2012]) as a result of a) the timeline delays noted above, b) delays in hiring both the SLDS director and staff from participating agencies, and c) interdependencies of activities necessary to achieve this goal (data audit needs to be conducted prior to data normalization, data normalization needs to be conducted prior to migration of data from existing environments and making changes to the data being collected, SLDS needs to be developed and populated prior to developing processes to make data available). 2) Revise the budget for <i>Project 6: Design, develop, and implement P-20 enterprise data hub</i> . Specifically, a) increase contractual by \$1,227,944 to provide for equipment and supplies necessary to complete the work in Years 2 through Year 4 but not necessary long-term to support the data hub and b) decrease equipment and supplies by \$613,604 and \$675,621, respectively, due to including such expenditures in contractual. (No substantive overall change in funds allocated for this project.)
C. Data Systems	Develop a data matching algorithm to properly identify students across schools, districts, and agencies	1) Shift timeframes for the activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (shift of 18 months for developing and implementing, respectively, a data matching algorithm to incorporate new data elements [from January 2011 to July 2012]) as a result of the timeline delays noted above. 2) Revise the budget for <i>Project 7: Student matching system</i> to accommodate change in strategy from completing certain work on the project in-house to contracting out. Specifically, a) reduce personnel and fringe benefits by \$455,470, equipment by \$408,171, and supplies by \$201,621 and b) increase contractual by \$1,049,600. (No substantive overall change in funds allocated for this project.)
C. Data Systems	Developing a decision support system for all stakeholders	1) Shift timeframes for the activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shifts of 17 months to create initial dashboards/reports using existing data [from June 2010 to November 2011] and 23 months to conduct user feedback to determine new reporting needs [from September 2010 to August 2012]) as a result of a) the timeline delays noted above, b) dependency of activities in this goal being dependent on an activity in the goal above (development of a data scheme to normalize old and new data in the SLDS needs to be completed prior to user feedback being solicited and tools necessary to mine and perform analytics can be reviewed) , and c) dependency of one activity on another activity within this goal (Business Intelligence tool needs to be selected before SLDS access can be developed and tested). 2) Revise budget for <i>Project 8: Decision support systems</i> . Specifically, a) reduce funding for personnel and fringe benefits by \$3,222,778 across Year 1 and 2 due to overestimating personnel necessary to complete the activities to achieve this goal, b) increase contractual by \$2,240,000 in Years 2-4 to reflect a change in strategy from completing certain activities in-house to contracting out for them, c) reduce equipment and supplies by \$104,736 and \$2,136,754, respectively, and d) reallocate savings incurred to <i>Project 1: Preparation for CCGPS rollout, Project 5: PSAT examinations and virtual courses, and Project 16: Evaluation training and evaluation process feedback</i> , respectively.

Reform area affected	Goal within reform area	Description of change
C. Data Systems	Set expectations and facilitate LEA use and implementation of instructional improvement systems (IIS)	Shift timeframes for five of the nine activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shifts: 12 months for supporting LEAs with lowest achieving schools to invest in an IIS [from June 2010 to June 2011]; 11 months to either enter into a contact with a vendor to create an IIS on behalf of certain LEAs without an IIS or with an IIS that does not meet minimum standards or to develop a list of state-approved vendors [from July 2010 to June 2011]) as a result of the timeline delays noted above and the need to establish an IIS advisory committee to, among other activities, inventory participating LEAs to determine the current status of their IIS.
C. Data Systems	Develop Instructional Improvement Reports (IIR) for districts, schools, and teachers	1) Shift timeframes for two of the four activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shift: four months for revising the data collection process [from October 2011 to February 2012]) as a result of the timeline delays noted above and interdependencies of activities necessary to achieve this goal (the needs of users [teachers, principals, superintendents] must be determined to prior to revising the data collection process and developing IIR; user feedback needs to be solicited prior to modifying the IIR). 2) Extend the duration of this activity by eight months to account for the work taking longer than anticipated (originally scheduled to last from October 2011 to February 2012 and will now last from February 2012 to February 2013).
C. Data Systems	Support participating LEAs and schools in using the IIS by providing effective professional development to teachers, principals, and administrators	Shift timeframes for four of the seven activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shift: nine months for developing detailed plans with LEAs regarding professional development for teachers on use of assessment data [from August 2010 to May 2011]) as a result of a) the timeline delays noted above, b) dependency of activities related to another goal in this reform area (setting expectations for and facilitating use of IIS and developing IIR), and c) the need to align activities in this goal with professional development activities in reform area B. Standards and Assessments.
C. Data Systems	Develop the capability to track teacher and program performance and link that performance to students	Shift timeframes for four of the five activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shifts: 15 months for developing capacity to capture and disseminate teacher and leader effectiveness measures [from June 2010 to September 2011]; 11 months for linking teacher and leader effectiveness measures to student performance outcomes [from October 2010 to September 2011]; 13 months for linking teacher effectiveness to prior teacher education/coursework [from August 2010 to September 2011]) as a result the timeline delays noted above and the one year delay of Georgia piloting its new evaluation system (from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012).
C. Data Systems	Make data, at the appropriate “unit” level, available to researchers	Shift timeframes for the activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shift of 15 months to make available to researchers data housed in the SLDS [from October 2012 to January 2014]) as a result the timeline delays noted above and dependency of the activities in this goal on development of Georgia’s SLDS (the SLDS needs to be populated with P-20 data before those data can be provided to researchers).

Reform area affected	Goal within reform area	Description of change
C. Data Systems	Enhance data systems to support all reform areas within GA's Race to the Top program	Revise budget for <i>Project 9: Department of Education IT Related Race to the Top Projects</i> as a result the timeline delays noted above and a change in strategy to complete some of the work in this project. Specifically, Georgia will a) increase personnel and fringe benefits by \$1,122,000 to reflect three additional full time employees (FTE) required to complete the activities in this goal (across all four years but greater increases in Years 3 and 4), b) reduce contractual by \$784,000 due to overestimating costs related to collecting, analyzing, and reporting Turnaround School projects, c) reduce training by \$421,001 due to overestimating costs necessary for this purpose; and d) reduce funds in Year 1 and increase funds in Years 2-4 across line items to account for shift in timeframes. (No substantive overall change in funds allocated for this project.)
C. Data Systems	Enhance data systems to support all reform areas within GA's Race to the Top program	Georgia will shift funding within <i>Project 10: Professional Standards Commission (PSC) Projects</i> to account for a change in strategy to complete some of the work in this project. Specifically, Georgia will increase personnel and fringe benefits in Year 2-4 by \$376,286 to complete some of the work on this project in-house and reduce contractual by \$377,746 in those years to account for this change in strategy. (No substantive overall change in funds allocated for this project.)
C. Data Systems	Enhance data systems to support all reform areas within GA's Race to the Top program	Reduce funding in Year 1 and increase funding in Years 2-3 in all budget categories in <i>Project 12: Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG) IT Related Race to the Top Projects</i> due to turnover within the TCSG and the subsequent delay in the development of the alternative certification program. (No substantive overall change in funds allocated for this project.)
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	Establish a clear approach for measuring student growth by developing other quantitative measures of student learning that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms	1) Shift timeframes for five of the nine activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shift: 10 and 13 months to develop and field test, respectively, other quantitative measures [from August 2010 to June 2011 and from January 2011 to February 2012]) as a result the timeline delays noted above and interdependencies of activities necessary to achieve this goal (field test of measures needs to be completed prior to both results being validated against student achievement data and measures being revised). 2) Revise the budget for <i>Project 14. Development, testing, and validation of other quantitative measures</i> . Specifically, a) increase contractual by \$575,000 due to underestimating funds necessary to complete the activities in this goal (funds reallocated from savings incurred in <i>Project 2: Professional learning units and training on CCGPS</i>), and b) shift contractual from Year 1 to Year 2 to account for timeframe shifts.
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	Develop Rigorous, Transparent, and Fair Evaluation System for Districts, Principals and	1) Shift timeframes for twelve of the twenty two activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shifts: 12 months to evaluate and modify as necessary qualitative component of the new evaluation system [from July 2010 to July 2011]; 22 months to formalize, validate, and communicate the new evaluation system [from July 2010 to May 2012]) as a result the timeline delays noted above and interdependencies of activities necessary to achieve this goal (qualitative component needs to be modified based on teacher and administrator surveys prior to

Reform area affected	Goal within reform area	Description of change
	Teachers in collaboration with LEAs, principals and teachers	training materials developed; validation study of qualitative component needs to be conducted before system components can be formalized). 2) Shift contractual from Year 1 to Year 2 for <i>Project 15: Evaluation instrument validation</i> due to the timeframe shifts. 3) Revise the budget for <i>Project 16: Evaluation training and evaluation process feedback</i> . Specifically, a) increase personnel and fringe benefits by \$2,132,806 to hire personnel in-house rather than contract out for evaluation system training and to ensure enough trainers, b) reduce contractual by \$830,000, c) increase supplies and equipment by \$769,138 and \$58,261, respectively, d) reduce training stipends by \$193,264 due to overestimating this expenditure in the original budget, and e) reduce funding in Year 1 and increase funding in Years 2-4 accordingly as a result of the timeframe shifts. The additional in-house staff will ensure successful implementation of new evaluation system. Savings from <i>Project 8: Decision support systems</i> were reallocated to increase funding for this project. (<i>Project 16</i> funds also support the goal below <i>Conducting annual evaluations of teachers and leaders that include timely and constructive feedback and provide data on student growth with.</i>)
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and leaders that include timely and constructive feedback and provide data on student growth	1) Shift timeframes for six of the 16 activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shift: 12 months for training school and LEA staff on the new evaluation system [from July 2011 to July 2012]) as a result the timeline delays noted above and the delay of one year in piloting the new evaluation system (from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012). 2) Revise budget for <i>Project 16: Evaluation training and evaluation process feedback</i> (see goal above).
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	Ensure equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals; Increase number and percentage of effective educators teaching hard-to-staff subjects and in hard-to-staff places. <i>Retention and Signing Bonuses</i>	Shift timeframe for one of the four activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (shift of two years for using results of the new evaluation systems to pay retention bonuses to teachers and principals in high-needs schools who demonstrate a reduction in the achievement gap [from 2011-2012 to 2013-2014]) as a result of a) the timeline delays noted above, b) the delay of one year in piloting the new evaluation system (from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012), and c) the need for two years of data.

Reform area affected	Goal within reform area	Description of change
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	Ensure equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals; Increase number and percentage of effective educators teaching hard-to-staff subjects and in hard-to-staff places. <i>Improve Existing Capacity</i>	Shift timeframes for three of the four activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shifts: 12 months for expanding the Summer Leadership Academies [from Summer 2010 to Summer 2011]; 13 months for providing targeted training to teachers on the CCGPS and use of assessment data to guide instruction via online PLU courses [from May 2011 to June 2012]) as a result the timeline delays noted above and the one-year delay in development of the online PLU course described in reform area B. Standards and Assessments.
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	Ensure equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals; Increase number and percentage of effective educators teaching hard-to-staff subjects and hard-to-staff places. <i>Increase Pipeline of Effective Educators</i>	Shift timeframes for two of the five activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (shift of 12 months for programs funded via the Innovation Fund, such as the Grow Your Own Teacher program [from September 2010 to September 2011]; shift of 16 months for creating alternative certification pathways for principals [from June 2010 to October 2011]) as a result the timeline delays noted above and the delay in hiring staff.
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	Link teachers' and principals' student achievement/student growth data to preparation programs	Shift timeframes for the activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (shift of nine months for creating teacher and leader preparation program effectiveness measures [from August 2010 to May 2011]; shift of three years for publishing "report cards" on teacher and leader preparation programs for both traditional and alternative routes [from September 2010 to September 2013]) as a result of for a) the timeline delays noted above, b) the delay of one year in piloting the new evaluation system (from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012), and c) the need for two years of data.
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	Partner with Georgia Tech's Center for Education Integrating Science,	1) Shift timeframes for six of the seven activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (delay of approximately five months in development of the resources that will be developed to achieve this goal [from October 2010 to March 2011]) as a result the timeline delays noted above and the subsequent delay in the CEISMC contract. 2) Indicate that the Instructional Technology Toolkit (consisting of resources for teachers and

Reform area affected	Goal within reform area	Description of change
	Mathematics and Computing (CEISMC) to provide 21st Century teacher professional development in STEM	principals) will not be translated into Spanish (text in the original application indicated that it would; however, given that this is a toolkit for staff, Georgia determined that translating it was not necessary). 3) Clarify that the robotics/ engineering instructional model for middle school will be implemented in three rather than ten schools due to updating the budget for this project from the Phase 1 to Phase 2 applications but not updating the appendix which indicated that this course would be implemented in ten schools.
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	Ensure that beginning teachers get the support they need to maximize their effectiveness	Shift timeframes for four of the nine activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shifts: 12 months for evaluating the effectiveness of teacher induction programs to inform which ones to expand/improve the quality of existing programs [from September 2012 to September of 2013]; two years to develop induction certification requirements to provide for beginning teachers to work as “Induction Teachers” during their first three years in the classroom [from August 2010 to September 2012]) as a result the timeline delays noted above and the delay of one year in piloting the new evaluation system (from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012).
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	Provide time, training, resources, and induction support to build capacity for school turnaround at the LEA and school levels	Shift timeframes for four of the seven activities Georgia will implement to achieve this goal (key shifts: 12 months for evaluating the effectiveness of principal induction programs to inform which ones to expand/ improve the quality of existing programs [from September 2012 to September of 2013]; 12 months to expand Summer Leadership Academies [from Summer 2010 to Summer 2011]) as a result the timeline delays noted above and the delay of one year in piloting the new evaluation system (from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012).
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	Build relationships, maintain effective communications, and provide forums for educators to ensure active support for reforms and opportunities to share and build upon lessons learned:	1) Shift the timeframe 13 months for expanding Georgia’s Math + Science = Success public awareness campaign due to the need to reach out to private funders to expand the campaign (from August 2010 to September 2011). 2) Extend the activity related to Georgia’s comprehensive Race to the Top communication plan from two months as originally planned to last throughout the grant period.

Reform area affected	Goal within reform area	Description of change
Competitive Preference Priority	Offer a rigorous course of study in mathematics, the sciences, technology, and engineering	Shift the timeframe 12 months for evaluating the effectiveness of various STEM teacher preparation programs due to the delay of one year in piloting the new evaluation system (from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012) and the need for two years of data from the system to carry out this activity (from September 2012 to September 2013).
Competitive Preference Priority	Promote STEM teaching	Shift the timeframe 13 months for using the Georgia Public Broadcasting system to promote STEM fields as a result the timeline delays noted above and change in staff working on this activity at the state department of education (from September 2010 to September 2011).
Competitive Preference Priority	Prepare more students for advanced study and careers in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including addressing the needs of underrepresented groups in STEM areas	Shift the timeframe 20 months for bringing more diverse STEM teachers via Uteach as a result the timeline delays noted above (from January 2010 to September 2011).
E. Turning Around the Lowest Achieving Schools	Support participating LEAs through programmatic initiatives	Shift the timeframes for six of the nine activities Georgia will implement to achieve this as a result the timeline delays noted above and subsequent delays in the activities for other goals (e.g., delays in development of professional development materials, formative and benchmark assessments, and the new evaluation system). Key shifts include nine months for providing support to teachers in the lowest achieving schools (LAS) on use of data to inform instruction (from September 2010 to June 2011) and 11 months for providing technical expertise to LAS on teacher and leader effectiveness reforms (from October 2010 to September 2011).
E. Turning Around the Lowest Achieving Schools	Enter into state-level partnerships to significantly bolster turnaround efforts	1) Shift the timeframes six months for resources to be developed through the CEISMC contract (as noted above). 2) Add \$1,600,000 for supplemental in participating LEAs in <i>Project 25: TNTP</i> to pay for summer stipends for Georgia Fellows in participating LEAs. Funds were reallocated from <i>Project 29: Project management and evaluation</i> and <i>Project 2: Professional learning units and training on the CCGPS</i> .