

# **Communities In Schools of Georgia**

## **Mid-Year Formative Report on Race to the Top Performance Learning Centers**

**FY2013**



**Communities In Schools of Georgia**

Submitted April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2013

**Mid-Year Formative Report  
on Race to the Top  
Performance Learning Centers  
FY2013**

---

**Overview of the Race to the Top Performance Learning Centers**

Communities In Schools of Georgia was awarded a contract by the Georgia Department of Education to develop three Performance Learning Centers as part of the State's Race to the Top grant. Communities In Schools of Georgia has contracted with the following agencies to fulfill the contract: CIS of Carrollton City/Carroll County, Carrollton City Schools, CIS of Augusta/Richmond County, Richmond County School System, Rome/Floyd CIS and Floyd County School System. The Floyd County and Richmond County Performance Learning Centers opened in August of 2011 and the Carrollton City Performance Learning Center opened in August of 2012.

This mid-year report provides information on the support and services CIS of Georgia has provided to these three communities in developing their Performance Learning Centers, detail on their progress in implementing the model during the first half of the 2013 year and the results for the students they served during the first semester of the 2013 school year.

**Overview of CIS of Georgia Support to Communities in PLC Development**

Communities In Schools of Georgia's Race to the Top (RT3) PLC Team provide training and technical support to lead the local school districts and Communities In Schools staff through the process of developing their Performance Learning Center. The RT3 PLC Team is comprised of the CIS of Georgia Director of Field Support, our field support curriculum & training coordinator, two field support coordinators, the director of evaluation and technology, one evaluation specialist and an evaluation administrative assistant. Each RT3 PLC has been assigned a field support coordinator and an evaluator who is their first contacts for ongoing support in the areas of program development and evaluation/data collection respectively. Formal training opportunities are provided throughout the year, in person and via webinar. Technical support and monitoring of program development take place through site visits, conference calls, email and telephone contacts as needed.

Communities In Schools of Georgia requires that PLC personnel receive and maintain adequate training and/or certification. All PLC staff are expected to understand the PLC model and to work in good faith to implement all its components while utilizing each of the guiding principles to maximize PLC success and achievements. Therefore, it is necessary for each PLC staff member to attend the multi-day PLC Summer Institute and participate in PLC Roundtables for Academic Coordinators and Services Coordinators twice each year. These formal trainings are also supplemented with webinars and conference calls conducted throughout the school year.

CIS of Georgia field support coordinators and other RT3 Team staff conduct regular site visits to support successful implementation of all aspects of the PLC model, which includes the following components:

- Project-Based Learning – Used to ensure that students engage in all facets of learning. Students develop skills in research methods, writing, use of technology and other forms of media, and collaborating with peers on presentations.
- Academic Service Learning – Engages students in service to their communities as a means of enriching their academic learning, promoting personal growth, and helping the students to develop the skills needed for productive citizenship.
- Senior Project - The Senior Project is an opportunity for students to demonstrate what they have learned and showcase their achievements. This project must be successfully completed prior to graduation.
- Individual Development Plan - Students, in partnership with staff, develop an Individual Development Plan that includes personal, educational, and career goals.
- Career discovery – All students participate in career interest inventories, career fairs, and field trips. Guest speakers are frequently invited.
- Job shadowing program – 9th and 10th graders may choose two careers to experience.
- Internships – 11th and 12th graders may select an internship to prepare for future job search and employment.
- Dual enrollment/Post-secondary option – Students can integrate an associate's degree or a technical degree into the high school diploma track.
- Morning Motivation – A daily session designed to establish, maintain, and nurture a positive, safe environment for PLC students to learn, grow, and experience success. Students have the opportunity to lead daily discussions and activities that build applicable presentation and life skills.
- Optional Tutorials – Students may voluntarily arrive early or stay after school for tutoring with staff and volunteers.
- Charting for Success Advisory Lessons –Charting for Success curriculum guides students through developing a plan of action to continue their education beyond high school. Charting for Success modules address key steps for college and career success. Facilitators provide one-hour advisory sessions each week with the participation of all students and PLC staff.
- Incentives – Each PLC establishes an incentive program that rewards and promotes improvement in attendance, academics, and behavior.
- College Preparation – Staff prepares and assists students so that they may take college entrance exams, apply for college and for financial aid, and transition successfully to college.
- Mentors – Students are assigned a mentor from the community who works on career development or other areas of interest.
- Employment – Staff members connect students to workplace opportunities (e.g., job shadowing, internships, part time jobs, etc.).

- Parent/Guardian Involvement – PLC staff members work together with parents/guardians to provide information on their child’s progress, ways they can support their child and the school, and opportunities to voice their comments and concerns.

The field support coordinators provide the academic coordinator (AC) and CIS executive director (ED) with feedback on project and staff performance after each site visit. The field support coordinators also provide advice on the implementation of instructional and non-academic program components of the PLC model and serve as a link to the district’s central office, PLC network and CIS evaluation department.

### **Formal Training Opportunities Provided to RT3 PLCs During FY2013**

#### **CIS/PLC Summer Network Training 2012**

The CIS/PLC Summer Network Training was held June 6th through June 8th for Performance Learning Center staff. The theme for this training was “Mission Possible: Reshaping the Way We Teach and Lead.” Attendees included PLC academic coordinators, learning facilitators, administrative assistants, site coordinators and CIS executive directors from PLC sites statewide. Participants included over 100 staff from PLCs and CIS affiliates, as well as CIS staff and partners.

On Wednesday, June 6th there was New PLC Staff Orientation which covered the basics of PLC operations for any new PLC staff. Thursday’s training was geared towards new and veteran PLC staff, going beyond the basics to explore key issues together and share best practices to make an even bigger impact next year. On Friday, June 8th the keynote address took place, which was given by Bill Milliken, CIS Co-Founder. The keynote was followed by a CIS/PLC Multi-Track Training designed as a one-day drive-in for all CIS executive directors and site coordinators, in addition to the PLC tracks. A total of 126 PLC staff members, partners, and CISGA staff were served during this event.

Attendees evaluated the Summer Institute based on if the content was relevant to their job, provided knowledge/skills they could apply at their school site, quality of information presented, presentation skills of the trainer, and an overall rating for the session. Across all sessions offered, 99.1% of attendees agreed that the sessions were relevant to their job, with 85.3% answering Strongly Agree. 99.5% agreed that the knowledge/skills provided by the sessions could be applied at their school site, with 81.6% Strongly Agreeing with the statement. 98.4% of respondents rated the quality of the information presented as Good or Excellent, with 80.9% rating it Excellent. The percentage that rated the presentation skills of the trainer as either Good or Excellent was 98.8%, with 83.6% rating it Excellent. 96.9% rated all of the sessions either Good or Excellent, with 80.1% rating them Excellent. Tables of the results of the training evaluations are attached as Appendix A.

#### **Performance Learning Center New Staff Orientation**

On October 15<sup>th</sup>, CIS of Georgia held Performance Learning Center (PLC) New Staff Orientation. This training was designed for new Learning Facilitators and Academic Coordinators who were not able to attend the PLC Summer Training. Newer staff shared their lessons learned and current challenges, asked questions and gained background on the PLC components and learned about proven practices for increasing student success in our unique learning environment. The orientation included a tour of Cobb

PLC and a questions and answers session with their experienced facilitators. The new Richmond County academic coordinator and new learning facilitators from Richmond and Floyd County PLCs were in attendance.

### **Race to the Top Grant Management Orientations**

New CIS executive directors (EDs) and PLC academic coordinators (ACs) were provided with Race to the Top Orientation sessions, held separately at each site. The purpose of these orientations were to ensure that the EDs and ACs were aware of their roles and responsibilities for implementation of the Race to the Top grant. In these sessions, the MOAs were discussed and staff were introduced to required forms and instructed on budgetary reporting procedures and approved expenditures.

### **Back to School Webinars**

At the start of the new school year, two “Back to School” webinars were held to get the PLCs off to a strong start. The training covered planning for the school year and gave PLC staff an opportunity to provide input on the support services they will need in the new school year. Twenty-two PLC staff members attended the trainings.

### **Fall PLC Roundtables**

PLC Roundtable sessions were held on November 8<sup>th</sup> at the Marietta City PLC. PLC Staff, CIS Executive Directors and Site Coordinators were in attendance. The meeting included the following topics:

- Strengthening the Movement to Increase Student Success in the Local Community presented by Karin Douglas, CIS of Georgia
- Overview of Marietta City Schools PLC presented by Tammie Roach, Marietta City Schools
- Learning Walk/Tour of Marietta City Schools PLC led by Student Ambassadors
- Marietta City Schools PLC Student & Parent Panel facilitated by Shayla Jones, CIS of Marietta-Cobb County
- A Ninth Grade Academy Model to Serve More PLC Students presented by Floyd County PLC and CIS Leaders
- Leveraging the PLC Student Survey and CISDM data to Showcase Your Student Performance presented by Linda Kelley, CIS of Georgia
- Increasing STEM Funding Opportunities through Strategic Funding Partners presented by Dr. Vickie Perdue Scott
- HighPoints Learning Math Tutorial Software to Increase Student Achievement in Math presented by Dr. Vickie Perdue Scott
- Brainstorming Roundtables

Twenty-five PLC staff were in attendance at the Fall Roundtables.

## PLC Program Development

In December 2011, Jerry Randolph of Georgia DOE met with several members of CIS of Georgia to review the form used to monitor the PLC Sites' progress, reviewing and adding an alignment to the Alternative Education Standards.

The RT3 field support and evaluation members worked together to further refine our rubric for PLC program implementation, establishing a developmental timeline for implementation of the components of the model. For each component, expectations were set for the level of proficiency during each semester of the first year, as well as for year 2 and 3 of PLC implementation. This new developmental rubric was first used in site visits from the CIS of Georgia Evaluation team visited in January of 2012. In February and March of 2013, the CIS of Georgia Evaluation Team conducted site visits to each of the RT3 PLCs, with the Carrollton City PLC undergoing its first mid-year developmental assessment and the Richmond County PLC and Floyd County PLC undergoing their second year developmental assessment.

Summary tables of the assessment results for each of the PLCs by each area of program development can be found on the pages that follow. The assessment coding for each element are shown below.

<b>CODING</b>	<b>PL = Planning</b>	No expectations element should be in place; evidence of active planning to implement and development of needed resources should be evident and available
	<b>NE = Not Evident</b>	Element should be in place, but no evidence of implementation or development of needed documents and/or resources
	<b>EM = Emerging</b>	Element is in place, but implementation is incomplete or uneven; May be: (1) lacking required written protocols, policies, procedures, documents needed; (2) implemented but not according to a regular timeline or in compliance with established policies; (3) reaching fewer students than expected
	<b>PR = Proficient</b>	Element is in place, with complete implementation. Required written protocols, policies, procedures, documents are in place and followed; (2) adherence to regular timelines evident; (3) reaching student populations expected
	<b>EX = Exemplary</b>	Proficiency evident with signs of innovation, on-going planning, regular review and revision for improvement; May also be given for elements implemented ahead of expected developmental schedule or with greater frequency than expected

**Enrollment and Recruitment Process.** Table 1a below provides the summary of assessments for the three Race to the Top PLCs in the program area of enrollment and recruitment.

**Table 1a:** Summary of Assessments of PLC Implementation - Enrollment and Recruitment Process

	YEAR 1		YEAR 2		YEAR 3		
	End of 1st Semester		2nd Semester		Expected		
	Expected	Carrollton City 2/25/13 Assessment	Expected	Expected	Richmond County 2/26/13 Assessment	Floyd County 3/5/13 Assessment	Expected
<b>ENROLLMENT/RECRUITMENT PROCESS</b>							
PLC Orientation for all new students	EM	EM	PR	PR/EX	PR	EX	PR/EX
Established Enrollment Plan	EM	EM	PR	PR/EX	PR/EX	EX	PR/EX
Waiting list to fill open seats in PLC		N/A	PL	PR/EX	PR	EX	PR/EX
75-100 students enrolled - If multi-program site - what constitutes PLC student?		PL	PL	PR/EX	PR	EX	PR/EX
Creative scheduling utilized to open more PLC seats		NE	PL	PR/EX	PR/EX	EX	PR/EX

Carrollton City. As a new PLC, Carrollton City is developing its enrollment and recruitment according to schedule, with orientation and enrollment plan in the emerging phase, working to develop unique orientation for the program and establish a better structure for referrals. They have developed a student handbook and have parent orientation, requiring parents and students to sign off on expectations. The site had not reached maximum capacity by the end of the first semester and as such, has not had a waiting list. Initially, the site was not making the best use of the potential for self-paced learning by following a more traditional schedule. They are working on developing a web site to increase awareness of the PLC as an option for students in the district.

Floyd County. The enrollment and recruitment process at Floyd County PLC has been exemplary and innovative. They have an online orientation that helps potential students to determine if they are a good fit for the PLC, being able to handle working with on-line curricula. The PLC has been innovative in its recruitment processes this year, opening the program to home-bound student and increasing capacity by allowing students to “Bring Your Own Computer.” Currently the site does have a waiting list of around 70 students.

Richmond County. With new leadership in place this year, the Richmond County PLC has made tremendous progress in enrollment and recruitment. Last year, the PLC was behind schedule in developing their enrollment process and now they are proficient or better in all areas. The site is being proactive in identifying potential candidates to recruit for enrollment and working with graduation coaches at the home schools who make the referrals. The site now offers a single session per day, as having two sessions was not working well. They now have more minimesters with 2 blocks per day. Students may attend an extra credit recovery period at the end of the day to further accelerate. The site has implemented the full student interview process for all incoming students. The CIS site coordinator provides group orientation to the students including a tour, overview of rules and regulations.

**Attendance.** Table 1b below provides the summary of assessments for the three Race to the Top PLCs in the program area of student attendance.

**Table 1b:** Summary of Assessments of PLC Implementation - Attendance Process

	YEAR 1		YEAR 2			YEAR 3
	End of 1st Semester	2nd Semester	Expected	Richmond County 2/26/13 Assessment	Floyd County 3/5/13 Assessment	Expected
	Expected	Carrollton City 2/25/13 Assessment	Expected			
<b>ATTENDANCE (AC/SC)</b>						
Attendance policy for absences and tardiness	PR	EM/PR	PR	PR/EX	EM	PR
All students made aware of attendance policy and sign form	PR	NE	PR	PR/EX	PR	PR
Review attendance records to offer placement options for students in violation of attendance policy (EOY Intent Form)	EM	EM	EM	PR/EX	PR	PR
Review attendance policy to determine if it has been effective and revise as needed prior to start of school year.		EM	PL	PR/EX	PR	PR

Carrollton City. Carrollton City has not had tremendous problems with attendance in the district overall and the PLC has been following the same trend. Currently, the PLC has a school attendance policy, but has been practicing leniency, being flexible on a case by case basis, given the challenges facing students at the PLC. They currently do not have many placement options in place for students who may need to leave the PLC, but they are looking for potential partners.

Floyd County. The attendance policy at Floyd County PLC is in place and students are made aware of policies during their orientation and as part of the student contract. Currently, they also adopt a policy of leniency based on challenges faced by individual students. If students are non-attending, the PLC now is enforcing its policy of withdrawing students after 10 days.

Richmond County. Attendance has been a challenge at the Richmond County PLC. Transportation options for students are poor, which has made the situation worse. The PLC is hoping to get the district to allow students attending the PLC to utilize transportation that the district has set up for the magnet school a short distance from the PLC to improve attendance. They are allowing students whose life circumstances are a challenge to attendance to complete coursework from home. The new AC has developed an attendance policy for the PLC and they are awaiting approval from the district to fully implement it. Currently they do conduct calls to students who do not attend and some home visitation. The PLC has had to exit many students recruited during the first year who lacked the skills needed for self-paced learning. They have developed a number of placement options for those students including returning to the home school and partnerships with Youth Challenge and JobCorps GED program.

**Documentation.** Table 1c on the page that follows provides the summary of assessments for the three Race to the Top PLCs in the program area of documentation.

**Table 1c:** Summary of Assessments of PLC Implementation - Documentation

	YEAR 1		YEAR 2			YEAR 3	
	End of 1st Semester		2nd Semester				
	Expected	Carrollton City 2/25/13 Assessment	Expected	Expected	Richmond County 2/26/13 Assessment	Floyd County 3/5/13 Assessment	Expected
<b>DOCUMENTATION</b>							
<b>Admin Assistant at Carrollton City; Site Coordinators at Floyd and Richmond Counties</b>							
All student Pre-PLC information entered into CISDM	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	PR	PR	PR/EX
All current student demographics and case record entered in CISDM	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	PR	PR	PR/EX
Classes entered for each student	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	PR	PR	PR/EX
Intake information on all current students	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	PR	PR	PR/EX
<b>Site Coordinator</b>							
Weekly Reports for every week/days school is in session	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	PR	PR	PR/EX
Level 1 and Level 2 services entered for active students	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	PR	PR	PR/EX
Keep current all attendance and grade information for active students	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	PR	PR	PR/EX
Record of all students exiting the program/EOY status entered	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	PR	PR	PR/EX
PLC Student Survey administered to students as they leave or at EOY	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	PR	PR	PR/EX

Carrollton City. Carrollton City has been quick to develop proficiency in data collection. Data entry is shared by the PLC administrative assistant, Wanda Todd, and the CIS site coordinator, Shae Holland. The administrative assistant maintains the student academic data, while the site coordinator maintains all student intake and service data and is responsible for having students complete exit surveys. The two coordinate information using googledocs. Data monitoring shows that the site is functioning well on data collection.

Floyd County. The CIS site coordinator is responsible for all student data entry at the Floyd County PLC. The site has set up mechanisms and procedures for providing class completion data to the site coordinator. Data monitoring shows that the site is functioning well on data collection.

Richmond County. During the first year of operations, data access was a major impediment to data collection at the PLC site. The CIS site coordinator is primarily responsible for data entry and during their first year, the SC did not have access to the school’s data system which resulted in incomplete data collection in the CIS data management system (CISDM) during year 1. This issue has been remedied, but much work had to be done this year to correct past errors and omissions in data entry in CISDM. The site is now functioning well in the area of data collection. The site coordinator has been having students complete exit surveys. The site is also taking part in a study of e2020 curriculum and EOCTs.

**Curriculum.** Table 1d below provides the summary of assessments for the three Race to the Top PLCs in the program area of curriculum.

**Table 1d:** Summary of Assessments of PLC Implementation - Curriculum

	YEAR 1		YEAR 2			YEAR 3	
	End of 1st Semester		2nd Semester				
	Expected	Carrollton City 2/25/13 Assessment	Expected	Expected	Richmond County 2/26/13 Assessment	Floyd County 3/5/13 Assessment	Expected
<b>CURRICULUM</b>							
All courses have basic syllabus with description of grading scale that integrates online curriculum and notebooks	PR	EM	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR
All courses have complete syllabus with pacing guide that integrates on-line curriculum, notebooks, PBL, quizzes and final exams	PL/EM	PL	EM/PR	PR/EX	PR	PR	PR/EX
All learning facilitators exhibit consistency in methods of differentiated instruction that includes various learning styles, scaffolding for lower level students and acceleration	PL	PL	EM	PR	EM	Not Observed	PR/EX
Class time frequently includes on-going small and occasional whole group instruction, as well as techniques such as peer tutoring, mnemonic devices or movement/music to increase student engagement	PL	PL	EM	PR	EM/PR	EM/PR	PR/EX
LFs should continue to use the technology and updated resources to enhance their curriculum			PL	EM/PR	EM/PR	Not Observed	PR/EX

Carrollton City. Carrollton City PLC has been using a hybrid model, utilizing the e2020 online curriculum program and supplementing with moving students back and forth to the traditional school for some courses, with buses provided to move the students back and forth. The learning facilitators are still

learning the e2020 system and could use additional support in management of the system to learn more about sequencing and project-based learning resources. The site is working to develop pacing guides. They have begun planning for more “off-line” time and working in small groups.

Floyd County. Floyd County PLC has operated with 4 full-time learning facilitators and sharing subject area specialists with the alternative school, having them work for one period per day at the PLC. All classes have full syllabi and pacing guides. The teachers who are there full-time have been engaging students in small group instruction.

Richmond County. The new academic coordinator at Richmond County PLC has been working to put many elements that were not implemented the first year into place during this second year. The PLC is using e2020 and the district has aligned e2020 with the Common Core and this is working well for the site, placing them on target in implementation of the Common Core. Learning facilitators are beginning to work on developing syllabi with pacing guides. Small group instruction has commenced with some learning facilitators, particularly within CTAE courses.

**Project-Based Learning.** Table 1e below provides the summary of assessments for the three Race to the Top PLCs in the program area of project-based learning.

**Table 1e:** Summary of Assessments of PLC Implementation - Project Based Learning

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2			YEAR 3
	End of 1st Semester		2nd Semester				
	Expected	Carrollton City 2/25/13 Assessment	Expected	Expected	Richmond County 2/26/13 Assessment	Floyd County 3/5/13 Assessment	Expected
<b>PROJECT-BASED LEARNING (PBL)</b>							
Projects are aligned to standards and assigned by start of 2nd semester	PL	PL	EM				
Projects are documented in a PBL Planning form			PL	EM	PL	EM	PR/EX
Evidence exists that core courses have at least 1 individual project that is relevant to students, addresses one or more GPS standard in each overall core subject and includes rigor that stretches students' critical thinking, research, and technology and presentation skills	PL	PL	EM	EM/PR	EM/PR	PR	PR/EX
Learning facilitators are continuing to develop new projects and are tweaking and adding to existing project based learning plans to meet the academic needs of the students and are aligned with the standards				PR	PR	PR	PR/EX

Carrollton City. Carrollton City PLC is currently planning project based learning. At the time of the assessment, learning facilitators at the site had just received training in the PBL tools available within e2020. However, they have indicated concerns that the hybrid system of on-line learning with students moving back to the home school for some courses makes project-based work more difficult. It is likely that the site will need more support in this area.

Floyd County. Floyd County PLC been involved in project-based learning since their first year. Students engage in project-based learning, often tied into their senior project.

Richmond County. Richmond County PLC has implemented project-based learning during their second year. As the PLC has been working to fully implement senior projects, they are hoping in the future to tie project-based learning in with these projects. The CTAE learning facilitator works with students in this area.

**Academic Service Learning and Senior Projects.** Table 1f below provides the summary of assessments for the three Race to the Top PLCs in the program areas of academic service learning and senior projects.

**Table 1f:** Summary of Assessments of PLC Implementation - Academic Service Learning and Senior Projects

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2			YEAR 3
	End of 1st Semester		2nd Semester				
	Expected	Carrollton City 2/25/13 Assessment	Expected	Expected	Richmond County 2/26/13 Assessment	Floyd County 3/5/13 Assessment	Expected
<b>ACADEMIC SERVICE LEARNING (ASL)</b>							
Staff implements at least one academic service learning project	PL	PL	EM	PR/EX	PR	PR	PR/EX
The PLC offers 2 or more academic service learning opportunities with all students participating in at least one project				EM	PR	PR	PR
The PLC has offers 3 or more academic service learning opportunities with all students participating in at least one project					PR	PR	EM
<b>SENIOR PROJECTS</b>							
The Senior Project should be developed and implemented, whereby complete all four parts of the Senior Projects	PL	PL	EM	PR	EM	PR	PR

Carrollton City. Carrollton City PLC is currently planning academic service learning and senior projects, but has not implemented. They would like to start a recycling program within the PLC and utilize this as a project. They will need further support from the CIS of Georgia field support department in implementing these. Most likely senior projects will not be fully implemented until the second year of operations.

Floyd County. Floyd County PLC been proficient in Academic Service Learning since they started and they have moved from emerging to proficient in senior projects. This year, they have had a series of academic service learning projects that students could participate in and developed a service learning workbook called “MIA: Mission in Action” Service Learning for use by students. Projects have included projects on domestic violence, anti-bullying, a river clean-up project, a book fair and others. They have fully implemented senior projects, with all graduates completing these this year. Wherever possible,

project-based learning, academic service learning and careers and Common Core elements are incorporated into senior projects.

Richmond County. Richmond County PLC has implemented academic service learning this year. The science learning facilitator has taken the lead in developing projects, tying them in with each subject area. So far this year, they have had 3 service learning projects including voter registration, a blood drive and a garden project. Senior projects are in the emerging stage, and the staff intends to tie these in with project-based learning and academic service learning. Pacing has been a challenge with senior projects and they are hoping to have students actually work on these projects commencing in their junior year.

**Morning Motivation.** Table 1g below provides the summary of assessments for the three Race to the Top PLCs in the program area of Morning Motivation.

**Table 1g:** Summary of Assessments of PLC Implementation - Morning Motivation

	YEAR 1		YEAR 2			YEAR 3	
	End of 1st Semester	2nd Semester					
	Expected	Carrollton City 2/25/13 Assessment	Expected	Expected	Richmond County 2/26/13 Assessment	Floyd County 3/5/13 Assessment	Expected
<b>MORNING MOTIVATION</b>							
At least once a week Morning Motivation that is teacher-led, 10-20 minutes, organized, upbeat/positive climate and is organized with good momentum, and interesting. It should include a variety of the following: music, word/thought of the day, P's, creed, current event, student/teacher greeting, life skills, daily announcements, talent showcase, themes, and exercise/nature walks	EM/PR	EM	EM/PR		PR	PR	
Students take more responsibility for leading with teacher approval		EM	EM	PR	EM	PR	PR/EX
Two or more student-led sessions per week				PR/EX	PL	PL	PR/EX

Carrollton City. Carrollton City PLC did not implement Morning Motivation during the first semester. The site lacks a large central space to do this. They began implementation during the beginning of second semester in the homeroom classes over the intercom, including quotes, news and announcements. Each week a teacher will take responsibility with help from students.

Floyd County. Floyd County PLC began incorporating daily Morning Motivation this year within each homeroom. Each learning facilitator uses their SmartBoard with a theme for the day and students provide quotes. Morning Motivation is participatory with students being given reflection time with a focus on future and goal setting. Their reflections are placed into their portfolios.

Richmond County. Richmond County PLC has implemented Morning Motivation within homerooms with a monthly whole-group Morning Motivation. Learning facilitators take the lead, developing the theme for their homeroom. Students do have some input, but it is not yet truly “student-led.” They are

working toward developing more student-led sessions and more large group motivation, but they it has not been developed to the extent they want it to be.

**Advisory/Charting for Success.** Table 1h below provides the summary of assessments for the three Race to the Top PLCs in the program area of Advisory/Charting for Success.

**Table 1h:** Summary of Assessments of PLC Implementation - Advisory/Charting for Success

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2			YEAR 3
	End of 1st Semester		2nd Semester				
	Expected	Carrollton City 2/25/13 Assessment	Expected	Expected	Richmond County 2/26/13 Assessment	Floyd County 3/5/13 Assessment	Expected
<b>ADVISORY/CHARTING FOR SUCCESS (LF)</b>							
Before the beginning of school: a daily schedule which includes advisory once a week is developed, with all students assigned to a teacher-advisor	PR	EM/PR	PR	PR	PR/EX	EX	PR
Students meet with advisors at least an hour each week to update their notebooks, Graduation checklist, Individual Development Plans (IDP) and other advisory materials	EM	PL	PR	PR/EX	PR/EX	EX	PR/EX

Carrollton City. Carrollton City PLC learning facilitators conduct advisement once monthly, with all students assigned to a particular learning facilitator. For 8<sup>th</sup> grade students, the CIS site coordinator conducts advisement. All students are GACollege411 registered. They want to expand these services and will likely need support in this area and training in the Charting for Success curricula.

Floyd County. Floyd County PLC has been very innovative in use of technology within their advisement, employing googledocs to develop online portfolios for each of the students. All learning facilitators at the PLC have been trained in reading transcripts and work with students in learning to read them and understand what they need to do to graduate so that no student can say they were unaware of what they needed to do to graduate. Each student has weekly advisement with Ms. Martin or Mr. Burkhalter. Within their online portfolios the students maintain their own transcripts of courses completed, and set weekly goals. During reflection, students assess their progress toward goals and if they do not meet their goals, must explain why. The online portfolios are shared with and reviewed by all learning facilitators who can make comments and send communications to the students. The intent is to have students take ownership of their education. Ms. Winston, the CIS site coordinator, conducts college and career readiness with the students.

Richmond County. Richmond County PLC has fully implemented advisory this year. The homeroom teachers are the primary advisors for students. The academic coordinator (AC) has put checks and balances into place wherein students go first to their homeroom teacher for support, then to Ms. Reid, the CIS site coordinator, and finally to the AC, Natalie Robinson for help as needed. When students complete a course, Ms. Reid and Ms. Robinson must sign off before a student can enroll in a new class.

The CIS site coordinator is in charge of Charting for Success and has provided opportunities such as college fairs and visits to technical college for students. Most of the students now have GAcollge411 accounts.

**Career Capstone/Job Shadowing.** Table 1i below provides the summary of assessments for the three Race to the Top PLCs in the program area of Career Capstone/Job Shadowing.

**Table 1i:** Summary of Assessments of PLC Implementation - Career Capstone/Job Shadowing

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2			YEAR 3
	End of 1st Semester		2nd Semester	Expected	Richmond County 2/26/13 Assessment	Floyd County 3/5/13 Assessment	Expected
	Expected	Carrollton City 2/25/13 Assessment	Expected				
<b>CAREER CAPSTONE/ JOB SHADOWING</b>							
Site Coordinator coordinates with the technical college to set up Compass testing for graduating seniors	EM	PL	EM	PR	PR	PR	PR
Site Coordinator and Academic Coordinator establish a partnership with the technical college to get students dually enrolled	EM	PL	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR
All students (priority 11-12th grades) discuss and select a pathway course of study with advisor, Site Coordinator and technical college high school coordinator	EM	NE	PR	PR	EM	PR	PR
Site Coordinator forms partnerships with local businesses, agencies and organization in the community to offer internships, job shadowing, ad mentoring opportunities to PLC students	EM	EM	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR
Site Coordinator schedule group college tours, career/college day, job shadowing experiences with local businesses (hospitals, etc)	EM	EM	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR
Site Coordinator partners with the technical college to set up Compass testing for all returning 11th and 12th graders who haven't tested			PR	PR	PR	PR	PR
<b>1st semester</b> - Advisors identify new students on track to graduate and interested in dual enrollment. Work towards enrolling them by start of <b>2nd semester</b>				PR	PR	PR	PR

Carrollton City. Carrollton City PLC has been working toward implementing career capstone and job shadowing. They have met with West Central Technical College and hope to have a partnership with them soon to do COMPASS testing. They have commenced some campus tours and have had students participate in job shadowing that is available at the traditional high school.

Floyd County. Floyd County PLC implemented dual enrollment last year. They work with Georgia Northwestern and Georgia Highlands and have several dually enrolled students. COMPASS testing is completed at the College and Career Academy and guest speakers are invited to speak to students about a variety of careers. Many community partners and college representatives come in to visit and speak with students. Job shadowing is also in place led by CIS. PLC has also tapped into WIA project to support this area. They have partnered with Berry College and have interns from the college to work with students.

Richmond County. Richmond County PLC has a relationship with Augusta Technical College which provides testing for students. They have a partnership for dual enrollment, but transportation is a barrier to implementation. The site coordinator has arranged college and technical college tours for students. They have partnered with Junior Achievement for job shadowing. Job shadowing opportunities have been provided with John Deere, Publix, Crock Center, Walton Options and Habitat for Humanity.

**Incentive Program.** Table 1j below provides the summary of assessments for the three Race to the Top PLCs in the program area of Incentive Program.

**Table 1j:** Summary of Assessments of PLC Implementation - Incentive Programs

	YEAR 1		YEAR 2			YEAR 3
	End of 1st Semester	2nd Semester	Expected	Richmond County 2/26/13 Assessment	Floyd County 3/5/13 Assessment	Expected
<b>INCENTIVE PROGRAM - Site Coordinator</b>						
Establish and maintain school-wide incentive program for:	EM	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR
* Attendance		PR			PR	PR
* Academic Achievement		PR			PR	PR
* Good Citizenship (participating in various activities)		PR			PR	PR
* Conduct		PR			PR	PR
Work with local businesses to build upon established partnerships for donations, awards and incentives	EM	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR

Carrollton City. Carrollton City PLC has performed well in developing incentive programs this year. They have developed relationships with Papa John’s, Chick-Fil-A, Taco Bell and Subway. They have pizza parties for students who are on track academically with no disciplinary incidents. They have a Tacos for Grads incentive program with Taco Bell. A Student of the Month program has been implemented. Students who complete courses are celebrated on a “Got Credits” bulletin board.

Floyd County. Floyd County PLC also has a well-established incentive program. Local businesses provide gift cards, and they have prizes for good performance. Students who graduate are celebrated publicly -- with a graduation walk down the hall and posting of their picture on a mortarboard in their school color.

Richmond County. Richmond County PLC has been able to provide incentives to students in the form of gift cards. Students are recognized for perfect attendance, and there is a Student of the Minimester. They want to further develop this and feel that their site coordinator needs more time to devote to developing business partnerships.

**Mentor Program.** Table 1k below provides the summary of assessments for the three Race to the Top PLCs in the program area of Mentor Program.

**Table 1k:** Summary of Assessments of PLC Implementation - Mentor Programs

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2			YEAR 3
	End of 1st Semester		2nd Semester				
	Expected	Carrollton City 2/25/13 Assessment	Expected	Expected	Richmond County 2/26/13 Assessment	Floyd County 3/5/13 Assessment	Expected
<b>MENTOR PROGRAM - Site Coordinator</b>							
Actively recruiting, screening and training mentors	PL	EM	EM	PR	PR	PR	PR
Students are matched with mentors, either individually or in groups of 3-5 students	PL	EM	EM	PR	EM	EM	PR

Carrollton City. Carrollton City PLC has begun implementation of their mentor program with the help of CIS. West Georgia College has been a source for some mentors. Currently they have 6 regular mentors in place and have been conducting workshops for recruitment.

Floyd County. Floyd County PLC has had a difficult time fully implementing the mentor program. Although the CIS affiliate has a long standing mentoring program, the location of the PLC is a barrier to getting mentors into the site. Staff act as mentors for most students. They still hope to increase the numbers and place more mentors at the site.

Richmond County. Richmond County PLC has also had difficulty attracting mentors. The CIS site coordinator has done outreach and trained a large group from a local church, but the mentors never started. They are currently conducting outreach with Ft. Gordon and hopes to get mentors in the future from within the military. The biggest challenge is the amount of time that the CIS site coordinator has to devote to recruiting, training and engaging mentors.

**Parent Engagement.** Table 1l below provides the summary of assessments for the three Race to the Top PLCs in the program area of Parent Engagement.

**Table 1l:** Summary of Assessments of PLC Implementation - Parent Engagement

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2			YEAR 3
	End of 1st Semester		2nd Semester				
	Expected	Carrollton City 2/25/13 Assessment	Expected	Expected	Richmond County 2/26/13 Assessment	Floyd County 3/5/13 Assessment	Expected
<b>PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT</b>							
At least 95% of parents are contacted <b>quarterly</b> via telephone, email, newsletter, home visits and/or visit the PLC for conferences	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR	EX	PR
At least two PLC-provided workshops or other special events are offered per semester with documented outreach to help ensure participation	PL	PR	EM	PR	PR	EX	PR

Carrollton City. Carrollton City PLC has regular outreach to parents. The CIS site coordinator calls parents if students do not show up for school and the AC and learning facilitators provide regular updates to parents. The PLC maintains a googledocs log for parent contacts. They held three parent events during the first semester including a parent appreciation night, a parent meet-and-greet and a parent holiday luncheon.

Floyd County. Floyd County PLC has done an exemplary job of engaging parents. The PLC holds parent meetings once a month. Parents attend an orientation to PLC that includes training on helping their child to be successful and community resources. Parent meetings have covered subjects such as finance and budgeting and dealing with holiday stress. The PLC hosted a college fair with nine colleges represented to provide students and their parents assistance in completing the FAFSA form and information on helping students enter college.

Richmond County. Richmond County PLC has also performed well in engaging parents. Parents are contacted by the site coordinator, AC and learning facilitators with student progress. Parents receive weekly progress reports on their students. They have held several parent events including a Parent Progress Report Night in which they explained to parents how they can monitor student progress. They plan to hold this training again in the second semester.

### **Program Refinements in Progress**

#### **Preparing for the Common Core-Georgia Performance Standards Transition:**

Last year CIS of Georgia staff investigated how to help the PLC staff transition to the Common Core-Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS). Discussions began with Jerry Randolph and Jan Wiche of Georgia DOE, and then we participated in Georgia DOE's Elluminate and GPB sessions throughout the year. West Georgia RESA's Barbara Bishop invited us to attend her CCGPS training with Carrollton City staff, but this was not as useful as we had hoped since the event was designed for 6th grade language arts teachers. We did learn some things from Ms. Bishop that helped us develop a plan for the PLCs that included monthly forums for PLC Mathematics and ELA Learning Facilitators to discuss the CCGPS transition with others serving in a similar role. For the first discussions held in March 2012, learning facilitators were asked to be up-to-date on the Elluminate and GPB sessions, to share what support they are receiving from their districts and RESAs that was helpful, and brainstorm additional supports that CIS of Georgia might be able to provide. Those calls were poorly attended, with three facilitators attending the math call (two from the same site) and only one language arts facilitator on the ELA call. This led us to revise our plan.

CIS of Georgia also contracted with two presenters, Georgia DOE's Mary Lynn Huie and Northeast Georgia RESA's Kaycie Maddox, to offer full day planning sessions in literacy and math, respectively, at the PLC Summer Institute in July 2012. The intent was for learning facilitators to build upon Georgia DOE's guidance on CCGPS suggested practices and plan to employ those strategies in the PLC setting.

These were excellent sessions, upon which our transition plan has developed. Several of the attendees have been invited to form our PLC Curriculum Team, after CIS of Georgia's field support, curriculum and training coordinator further investigated by attending Dr. Huie's Literacy Design Collaborative training in the fall and spring, the GACIS Fall Conference and the National Association for Alternative Education's conference. A one-day consult was also held with Common Core and professional development experts from Apex Learning.

The objective was defined: to develop tools designed around the PLC instructional model that help learning facilitators across the PLC network implement the Common Core-Georgia Performance Standards (CCGPS) in our non-traditional setting. We would tackle not only English/Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics, but also the literacy and college/career readiness standards that impact the other subjects.

CIS of Georgia field support coordinators nominated PLC learning facilitators who we regarded as "experts in their field" to serve on our PLC Curriculum Team, which functions similar to a curriculum department in a traditional high school, and sought approval from their respective academic coordinators. Other commitments interfered and the teams developed unevenly with four representatives each in math and social studies, three in ELA, one in CTAE and none in science. We are still seeking at least two representatives from science to join us for the next meeting on April 26.

The PLC Curriculum Team's Kick Off Meeting was held March 1, 2013. The goal was to gain clarity on necessary next steps to create the following to share with other learning facilitators in the PLC network:

- at least one sample unit plan with rubrics for each assigned CCGPS course that includes links to as many of the texts as possible and describes four recommended strategies to use with students (whole group instruction with interactive whiteboard, whole group instruction with individual computers, and differentiated instructional strategies). ELA facilitators should focus on an informational text.
- a presentation that will be delivered at PLC Summer Training 2013.

Team members developed teaching tasks for each unit that they shared on a webinar on March 22. The next meeting on April 26 will feature Dr. Huie conducting an orientation to the Literacy Design Collaborative's Module Creator, which the ELA, social studies and CTAE facilitators will be using to construct their lessons. Several more meetings, including a peer review of draft lessons using a rubric that team members provided input on, are planned between now and the presentation that will be held July 16, 17 or 18.

## First Semester Student Services and Outcomes

### Student Data Collection at Performance Learning Centers

Staff at each PLC are required to track processes such as the services delivered to students, student participation in key program components such as advisory and academic service learning. Student progress is monitored in the areas of academic performance, attendance, behavior, promotion/graduation and plans for the future. There are three main data collection tools used for collecting data on the student experience at Performance Learning Centers:

- **Communities In Schools Data Management System (CISDM).** CIS provides each PLC with all reporting instruments including an online database system (CISDM) to track student demographics, risk factors, program participation, services and performance in the PLC program. In addition, school-wide services available to all students are also tracked.
- **PLC Monthly Report.** The PLC monthly report was developed for the new school year, replacing the weekly report. In the monthly report, PLCs provide information on student enrollment, including entrances, exits and exit reasons, student attendance, parent and community involvement in the PLC.
- **Student Surveys.** Student surveys provide us with much information and insight into the more subjective aspects of the PLC school experience and its impact on students. Communities In Schools of Georgia administers the surveys online via SurveyMonkey. The online surveys allowed us to provide immediate access to survey results for the academic coordinators and CIS executive directors.

At the Floyd and Richmond County PLCs started during the 2011-12 school year, the CIS site coordinators alone are responsible for entering information on the student experience at the PLC into CISDM. The Carrollton City PLC which started in the 2012-13 school year follows a different pattern with data entry tasks shared between the site coordinator and administrative assistant. Each PLC collects and enters student demographics, intake information, baseline (pre-PLC) behavioral and academic performance data, as well as grades, attendance and discipline during the students' time at the PLC into the CIS data system. The site coordinator is also asked to track services and student participation in service learning and other essential elements of the program, such as college and career readiness and advisory.

**Data Quality for 2012-13.** Challenges were encountered with data collections at the Richmond County PLC during their first year operations, where the lack of an academic coordinator for much of the year resulted in the site coordinator not having access to the district data system. Natalie H. Robinson, the new academic coordinator at the PLC in Richmond, has been very committed to collecting complete data for the 2012-13 school year. However, as some PLC students are enrolled at the PLC across multiple years, much of the data entered into the database from the previous year had to be corrected to obtain complete data for this school year for those students. Overall, the data quality at Richmond PLC has improved greatly this year.

Data collection at the Carrollton City and Floyd County PLC sites has been quite good this year. The CIS of Georgia evaluation department commenced checks of data quality in fall of this year, comparing enrollment reported in the monthly reports to what has been entered into CISDM. This has allowed us to identify some data challenges and work with the sites on correcting data.

**Student Enrollment.** The four tables that follow (Table 2, 2C, 2F and 2R) detail the month-to-month enrollment and exits overall and at each of the three Race to the Top Performance Learning Centers during the 2012-13 school year. In all, 251 students were enrolled at the three Performance Learning Center locations over the course of the first semester, with Carrollton City PLC serving a total of 60 students, Floyd County PLC serving a total of 60 students and Richmond County serving 131. On average, 227.2 students were actively enrolled per month at the PLCs, with an average of 12 students exiting each month. The PLCs added students each month as students exited, bringing on an average of 39.2 new students each month.

In total, 60 students exited during the first half of the school year, 12 of which were graduates. Among the other exiting students were 14 who transferred to their home high school or out of the system, 26 dropouts, 7 who went on to pursue GEDs, and 1 students who was deceased.

**Table 2: Enrollment and Exits at all PLCS 2013**

RT3 PERFORMANCE LEARNING CENTERS 2012	Month						YTD	YTD TYPE
	Aug-12	Sep-12	Oct-12	Nov-12	Dec-12	YTD		
<b>STUDENT ENROLLMENT</b>								
# of Students Enrolled At the End of Previous Month	55	207	234	228	216	188.0	Average	
# of Students Added During the Month	154	32	6	4	0	39.2	Average	
# of Students Exited During the Month	2	5	12	16	25	12.0	Average	
# Enrolled at End of the Month	207	234	228	216	191	215.2	Average	
Total Students Active During Month	209	239	240	232	216	227.2	Average	
Total Enrolled Year To Date	209	241	247	251	251	251.0	Total	
<b>STUDENT EXIT REASONS</b>								
Returned to Home High School	1	0	3	2	0	6	Total	
Transferred from School System	1	3	1	1	2	8	Total	
Dropped Out	0	1	6	9	10	26	Total	
Department of Juvenile Justice	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
GED	0	0	1	2	4	7	Total	
Other	0	0	0	1	0	1	Total	
Certificate of Attendance	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
<b>Graduated Total (See Detail Below)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>Total</b>	
To 4 Year College	0	0	0	0	6	6	Total	
To 2 Year College	0	1	0	1	1	3	Total	
To Technical College	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
To Military	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
To Employment	0	0	1	0	1	2	Total	
Other Graduate/Unknown	0	0	0	0	1	1	Total	

### Carrollton City PLC Enrollment

At Carrollton City PLC, 60 students were enrolled over the course of the first semester. On average, 57.2 students per month were actively enrolled monthly at the PLC, with an average of 1.4 students exiting each month. Carrollton City PLC did not add new students each month as students exited, with all new students entering during the first month of operations.

In total, 7 students exited during the first semester, one of which was a graduate. Carrollton City PLC did document student plans upon graduation, with the graduate having plans to continue on to attend a 2-year college program.

Among the other exiting students were 3 who transferred out of the system, 1 returning to their home high school, and 2 dropouts.

**Table 2C: Enrollment and Exits at Carrollton City PLC 2013**

SITE: Carrollton City PLC	Month						YTD	YTD TYPE
	Aug-12	Sep-12	Oct-12	Nov-12	Dec-12	YTD		
<b>STUDENT ENROLLMENT</b>								
# of Students Enrolled At the End of Previous Month	0	60	58	55	53	45.2	Average	
# of Students Added During the Month	60	0	0	0	0	12.0	Average	
# of Students Exited During the Month	0	2	3	2	0	1.4	Average	
# Enrolled at End of the Month	60	58	55	53	53	55.8	Average	
Total Students Active During Month	60	60	58	55	53	57.2	Average	
Total Enrolled Year To Date	60	60	60	60	60	60.0	Total	
<b>STUDENT EXIT REASONS</b>								
Returned to Home High School	0	0	1	0	0	1	Total	
Transferred from School System	0	2	1	0	0	3	Total	
Dropped Out	0	0	1	1	0	2	Total	
Department of Juvenile Justice	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
GED	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
Certificate of Attendance	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
<b>Graduated Total (See Detail Below)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Total</b>	
To 4 Year College	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
To 2 Year College	0	0	0	1	0	1	Total	
To Technical College	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
To Military	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
To Employment	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
Other Graduate/Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	

## Floyd County PLC Enrollment

At Floyd County PLC, 60 students were enrolled over the course of the first semester, an increase of 33.3% over the previous year first semester (45 students). Twenty students enrolled at the end of the 2011-12 school year returned to the PLC after the summer. On average, 53.2 students per month were actively enrolled at the PLC, with an average of 2.6 students exiting each month. Floyd PLC added students each month as students exited, bringing on an average of 8.0 new students each month.

In total, 13 students exited during the first half of the year, five of which were graduates. Floyd County PLC did document student plans upon graduation. Four students left with plans to attend a 2 year college, and 1 was going to pursue employment.

Among the other exiting students were 4 who transferred out of the system, 2 who returned to their home high schools, and 2 dropouts.

**Table 2F: Enrollment and Exits at Floyd County PLC 2013**

<b>SITE: Floyd County PLC</b>	<b>Month</b>							
<b>STUDENT ENROLLMENT</b>	<b>Aug-12</b>	<b>Sep-12</b>	<b>Oct-12</b>	<b>Nov-12</b>	<b>Dec-12</b>	<b>YTD</b>	<b>YTD TYPE</b>	
# of Students Enrolled At the End of Previous Month	20	52	51	51	52	45.2	Average	
# of Students Added During the Month	34	1	3	2	0	8.0	Average	
# of Students Exited During the Month	2	2	3	1	5	2.6	Average	
# Enrolled at End of the Month	52	51	51	52	47	50.6	Average	
Total Students Active During Month	54	53	54	53	52	53.2	Average	
Total Enrolled Year To Date	54	55	58	60	60	60.0	Total	
<b>STUDENT EXIT REASONS</b>	<b>Aug-12</b>	<b>Sep-12</b>	<b>Oct-12</b>	<b>Nov-12</b>	<b>Dec-12</b>	<b>YTD</b>	<b>YTD TYPE</b>	
Returned to Home High School	1	0	1	0	0	2	Total	
Transferred from School System	1	0	0	1	2	4	Total	
Dropped Out	0	1	1	0	0	2	Total	
Department of Juvenile Justice	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
GED	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
Other	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
Certificate of Attendance	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
<b>Graduated Total (See Detail Below)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>Total</b>	
To 4 Year College	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
To 2 Year College	0	1	0	0	1	2	Total	
To Technical College	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
To Military	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
To Employment	0	0	1	0	1	2	Total	
Other Graduate/Unknown	0	0	0	0	1	1	Total	

## Richmond County PLC Enrollment

At Richmond County PLC, 131 students were enrolled during the first semester of the 2012-13 school year, an increase of 35.1% over the previous year first semester (97 students). Thirty-five students enrolled at the end of the 2011-12 school year returned to the PLC after the summer. On average, 116.8 students per month were actively enrolled at the PLC, with an average of 8.0 students exiting each month. Richmond County PLC also added students each month as students exited, bringing on an average of 19.2 new students each month.

In total, 40 students exited during the first semester of the year, six of which were graduates. Richmond County PLC did document student plans upon graduation, with all 6 having plans to attend 4 year college. Among the other exiting students were 3 who returned to their home high school, 1 who transferred out of the system, 22 dropouts, 7 students who left to pursue GEDs and 1 student who was deceased.

**Table 2R: Enrollment and Exits at Richmond County PLC 2013**

SITE: Richmond County PLC	Month						
STUDENT ENROLLMENT	Aug-12	Sep-12	Oct-12	Nov-12	Dec-12	YTD	YTD TYPE
# of Students Enrolled At the End of Previous Month	35	95	125	122	111	97.6	Average
# of Students Added During the Month	60	31	3	2	0	19.2	Average
# of Students Exited During the Month	0	1	6	13	20	8.0	Average
# Enrolled at End of the Month	95	125	122	111	91	108.8	Average
Total Students Active During Month	95	126	128	124	111	116.8	Average
Total Enrolled Year To Date	95	126	129	131	131	131.0	Total
STUDENT EXIT REASONS	Aug-12	Sep-12	Oct-12	Nov-12	Dec-12	YTD	YTD TYPE
Returned to Home High School	0	0	1	2	0	3	Total
Transferred from School System	0	1	0	0	0	1	Total
Dropped Out	0	0	4	8	10	22	Total
Department of Juvenile Justice	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total
GED	0	0	1	2	4	7	Total
Other	0	0	0	1	0	1	Total
Certificate of Attendance	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total
<b>Graduated Total (See Detail Below)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>Total</b>
To 4 Year College	0	0	0	0	6	6	Total
To 2 Year College	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total
To Technical College	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total
To Military	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total
To Employment	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total
Other Graduate/Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total

**Student Demographics.** During the 2012-13 school year, 251 students attended the three Race to the Top Performance Learning Center locations in Georgia. Student demographics including gender, ethnicity and grade level can be found on the next four tables (Table 3, 3C, 3F, 3R).

**Ethnicity and Gender.** The student population served across the three PLCs during the first semester of the 2013 school year is ethnically diverse, with 61.8% of students being African American, 4.8% Hispanic, 2.4% multi-racial and 30.7% white. However, closer examination of the individual PLCs shows that the student ethnic populations at each of the PLCs differed greatly (see Tables 3C, 3F and 3R). Overall, Carrollton City and Richmond County PLCs were more ethnically diverse, while the Floyd County PLC student population is primarily white (78.3%).

As to gender, slightly more males were enrolled overall (54.6%) than females (45.4%). This is the reverse of the trend of the 2011-12 school year. Overall, African American males had the largest enrollment across all PLCs (32.7%), followed by African American females (29.1%), white males (19.1%) and white females (11.6%).

**Student Grade Level.** Freshmen comprised 25.5% of PLC students, with 22.3% being sophomores, 24.7% being juniors, and 24.7% classified as seniors during the first semester. The Carrollton City PLC also serves 8th graders, who constitute 2.8% of PLC enrolled students.

**Table 3: Student Demographics at All PLCs 2013**

TOTAL 2013 RT3 PLCs		Student Grade Level, Gender and Ethnicity						
Gender	Ethnicity	8th Grade	9th Grade	10th Grade	11th Grade	12th Grade	Total	
All Students	Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	1	1	
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	
	Black or African American	5	40	34	39	37	155	
		2.0%	15.9%	13.5%	15.5%	14.7%	61.8%	
	Hispanic	0	3	3	1	5	12	
		0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	0.4%	2.0%	4.8%	
	Multi-Racial	0	2	3	0	1	6	
		0.0%	0.8%	1.2%	0.0%	0.4%	2.4%	
White		2	19	16	22	18	77	
		0.8%	7.6%	6.4%	8.8%	7.2%	30.7%	
Total		7	64	56	62	62	251	
		2.8%	25.5%	22.3%	24.7%	24.7%	100.0%	
Female	Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	1	1	
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	
	Black or African American	4	20	15	19	15	73	
		1.6%	8.0%	6.0%	7.6%	6.0%	29.1%	
	Hispanic	0	2	2	1	1	6	
		0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.4%	0.4%	2.4%	
	Multi-Racial	0	1	3	0	1	5	
		0.0%	0.4%	1.2%	0.0%	0.4%	2.0%	
White		1	4	9	8	7	29	
		0.4%	1.6%	3.6%	3.2%	2.8%	11.6%	
Female Total		5	27	29	28	25	114	
		2.0%	10.8%	11.6%	11.2%	10.0%	45.4%	
Male	Black or African American	1	20	19	20	22	82	
		0.4%	8.0%	7.6%	8.0%	8.8%	32.7%	
	Hispanic	0	1	1	0	4	6	
		0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	1.6%	2.4%	
	Multi-Racial	0	1	0	0	0	1	
		0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	
	White		1	15	7	14	11	48
			0.4%	6.0%	2.8%	5.6%	4.4%	19.1%
Male Total		2	37	27	34	37	137	
		0.8%	14.7%	10.8%	13.5%	14.7%	54.6%	

### Carrollton City PLC Student Ethnicity, Gender and Grade Level

The student population served by Carrollton City PLC during the first semester of the 2013 school year is ethnically diverse, with 61.7% of students being African American, 6.7% Hispanic, 8.3% multi-racial and 23.3% white. Compared to the district ethnic distribution, African American students are over-represented at nearly double the district population (31.7% African American in district), and white students constitute about half the percentage attending in the district overall.

As to gender, more females were enrolled at Carrollton City PLC overall (56.7%) than males (43.3%). Overall, African American females had the largest enrollment (35.0%), followed by African American males (26.7%), white males (13.3%) and white females (10.0%).

The Carrollton City PLC serves students from 8th grade to 12th grade. Eighth grade students constitute 11.7% of PLC enrolled students, with 46.7% being freshmen, 15.0% being sophomores, 6.7% being juniors, and 10.0% classified as seniors during the first semester.

**Table 3C: Student Demographics at Carrollton City PLC 2013**

SITE: Carrollton City PLC		Student Grade Level, Gender and Ethnicity					
Gender	Ethnicity	8th Grade	9th Grade	10th Grade	11th Grade	12th Grade	Total
All Students	Black or African American	5	19	4	6	3	37
		8.3%	31.7%	6.7%	10.0%	5.0%	61.7%
	Hispanic	0	1	1	0	2	4
		0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	3.3%	6.7%
	Multi-Racial	0	2	3	0	0	5
		0.0%	3.3%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%
	White	2	6	1	4	1	14
	3.3%	10.0%	1.7%	6.7%	1.7%	23.3%	
	Total	7	28	9	10	6	60
		11.7%	46.7%	15.0%	16.7%	10.0%	100.0%
Female	Black or African American	4	9	3	4	1	21
		6.7%	15.0%	5.0%	6.7%	1.7%	35.0%
	Hispanic	0	1	1	0	1	3
		0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	5.0%
	Multi-Racial	0	1	3	0	0	4
		0.0%	1.7%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%
	White	1	4	0	1	0	6
	1.7%	6.7%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	10.0%	
	Female Total	5	15	7	5	2	34
		8.3%	25.0%	11.7%	8.3%	3.3%	56.7%
Male	Black or African American	1	10	1	2	2	16
		1.7%	16.7%	1.7%	3.3%	3.3%	26.7%
	Hispanic	0	0	0	0	1	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%
	Multi-Racial	0	1	0	0	0	1
		0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%
	White	1	2	1	3	1	8
	1.7%	3.3%	1.7%	5.0%	1.7%	13.3%	
	Male Total	2	13	2	5	4	26
		3.3%	21.7%	3.3%	8.3%	6.7%	43.3%

### Floyd County PLC Student Ethnicity, Gender and Grade Level

The student population served by Floyd County PLC during the first semester of the 2013 school year is largely white, with 78.3% of students being white, 10.0% African American, 10.0% Hispanic, and 1.7% multi-racial. While the PLC student population is comprised mostly of white students, minority students are represented at a rate higher than the district average.

As to gender, more males were enrolled at Floyd County PLC overall (53.3%) than females (46.7%). Overall, white males had the largest enrollment (43.3%), followed by white females (35.0%), African American females (6.7%), Hispanic males (5.6%), with African American males and Hispanic females each constituting 3.3% of the student population.

Freshmen comprised 23.3% of Floyd County PLC students, with 28.3% being sophomores, 21.7% being juniors, and 26.7% classified as seniors during the first semester.

**Table 3F: Student Demographics at Floyd County PLC 2013**

SITE: Floyd County PLC		Student Grade Level, Gender and Ethnicity				
Gender	Ethnicity	9th Grade	10th Grade	11th Grade	12th Grade	Total
All Students	Black or African American	2	2	1	1	6
		3.3%	3.3%	1.7%	1.7%	10.0%
	Hispanic	1	2	1	2	6
		1.7%	3.3%	1.7%	3.3%	10.0%
	Multi-Racial	0	0	0	1	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%
	White	11	13	11	12	47
		18.3%	21.7%	18.3%	20.0%	78.3%
Total	14	17	13	16	60	
	23.3%	28.3%	21.7%	26.7%	100.0%	
Female	Black or African American	1	1	1	1	4
		1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	6.7%
	Hispanic	0	1	1	0	2
		0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	3.3%
	Multi-Racial	0	0	0	1	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%
	White	0	8	7	6	21
		0.0%	13.3%	11.7%	10.0%	35.0%
Female Total	1	10	9	8	28	
	1.7%	16.7%	15.0%	13.3%	46.7%	
Male	Black or African American	1	1	0	0	2
		1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%
	Hispanic	1	1	0	2	4
		1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	3.3%	5.6%
	Multi-Racial	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	White	11	5	4	6	26
		18.3%	8.3%	6.7%	10.0%	43.3%
Male Total	13	7	4	8	32	
	21.7%	11.7%	6.7%	13.3%	53.3%	

### Richmond County PLC Student Ethnicity, Gender and Grade Level

The student population served by Floyd County PLC during the first semester of the 2013 school year is largely African American, with 85.5% of students being African American, 12.2% white, 1.5% Hispanic, and 0.8% Asian/Pacific Islander. African American students are represented at a rate higher than the district average (72.7% African American). White and Hispanic students are under-represented relative to the district population.

As to gender, more males were enrolled at Richmond County PLC overall (60.3%) than females (39.7%). Overall, African American males had the largest enrollment (48.9%), followed by African American females (36.6%), and white males (10.7%). White females made up 1.5% of the students, followed by male and female Hispanic students, each constituting 0.8% of the student population.

Freshmen comprised 16.8% of Richmond County PLC students, with 22.9% being sophomores, 29.8% being juniors, and 30.5% classified as seniors during the first semester.

**Table 3R: Student Demographics at Richmond County PLC 2013**

SITE: Richmond County PLC		Student Grade Level, Gender and Ethnicity				
Gender	Ethnicity	9th Grade	10th Grade	11th Grade	12th Grade	Total
All Students	Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0	1	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%
	Black or African American	19	28	32	33	112
		14.5%	21.4%	24.4%	25.2%	85.5%
	Hispanic	1	0	0	1	2
		0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	1.5%
	White	2	2	7	5	16
		1.5%	1.5%	5.3%	3.8%	12.2%
	<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>131</b>
		<b>16.8%</b>	<b>22.9%</b>	<b>29.8%</b>	<b>30.5%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
Female	Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	0	1	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%
	Black or African American	10	11	14	13	48
		7.6%	8.4%	10.7%	9.9%	36.6%
	Hispanic	1	0	0	0	1
		0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
	White	0	1	0	1	2
		0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	1.5%
	<b>Female Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>52</b>
		<b>8.4%</b>	<b>9.2%</b>	<b>10.7%</b>	<b>11.5%</b>	<b>39.7%</b>
Male	Black or African American	9	17	18	20	64
		6.9%	13.0%	13.7%	15.3%	48.9%
	Hispanic	0	0	0	1	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%
	White	2	1	7	4	14
		1.5%	0.8%	5.3%	3.1%	10.7%
	<b>Male Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>79</b>
		<b>8.4%</b>	<b>13.7%</b>	<b>19.1%</b>	<b>19.1%</b>	<b>60.3%</b>

**Age of Student Population.** The tables on the page that follows (Table 4, 4C, 4F, 4R) present age of the student population overall and at each PLC at the start of the 2012-13 school year, showing the minimum, maximum and average age of PLC students by grade level relative to their expected maximum age if a student is on track for on-time graduation. For the high school level students, the average age figures indicate student populations that are behind for on-time graduation, so for many, the self-paced learning environment at Performance Learning Centers is a final chance of achieving a high school diploma. Freshmen average age was 16, 1 year older than students would be if they had never been retained. Tenth graders were, on average, 1.3 years older than expected, juniors 0.9 years older and seniors 0.6 years older on average.

The maximum ages for the grade levels indicate that some of the students are as much as 4.9 years over the maximum expected age for their grade level. For 9th graders, the highest age reported was 19.9, for sophomores the highest age was 20.2, for juniors 20 and 20.7 for seniors.

**Table 4: Student Age by Grade Level, Gender and Ethnicity - All PLCs 2012**

2013 RT3 PLCs		Student Grade Level, Gender and Ethnicity																	
Age at Beginning of the Year		8th Grade			9th Grade			10th Grade			11th Grade			12th Grade			Total		
	Expected Max Age	14			15			16			17			18					
Gender	Ethnicity	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max
Female	Asian or Pacific Islander													20.3	20.3	20.3	20.3	20.3	20.3
	Black or African American	13.6	13.1	14.3	16.3	14.1	19.9	17.9	15.4	20.2	18	14.1	20	18.9	17.9	20.6	17.5	13.1	20.6
	Hispanic				17	16.4	17.6	17.1	15.4	18.8	17.1	17.1	17.1	17.3	17.3	17.3	17.1	15.4	18.8
	Multi-Racial				14	14	14	16.3	15.5	16.9				18.4	18.4	18.4	16.2	14	18.4
	White	13.2	13.2	13.2	14.9	14.2	16.1	16.2	14.9	17.3	17	16.1	17.7	17.9	17.2	19.3	16.6	13.2	19.3
	Total Females	13.5	13.1	14.3	16.1	14	19.9	17.1	14.9	20.2	17.7	14.1	20	18.6	17.2	20.6	17.2	13.1	20.6
Male	Black or African American	14.2	14.2	14.2	16	14	19.4	17.8	15.4	20.1	18.4	16.5	19.9	18.8	16.9	20.7	17.7	14	20.7
	Hispanic				16.5	16.5	16.5	16.6	16.6	16.6				19.1	18.1	20.7	18.2	16.5	20.7
	Multi-Racial				14.7	14.7	14.7										14.7	14.7	14.7
	White	13.7	13.7	13.7	15.7	14.2	17.5	16.9	15.3	19.3	17.8	16.3	19.7	17.9	16.9	19.4	17	13.7	19.7
	Total Males	13.9	13.7	14.2	15.9	14	19.4	17.5	15.3	20.1	18.1	16.3	19.9	18.6	16.9	20.7	17.5	13.7	20.7
Total	Asian or Pacific Islander													20.3	20.3	20.3	20.3	20.3	20.3
	Black or African American	13.7	13.1	14.3	16.2	14	19.9	17.8	15.4	20.2	18.2	14.1	20	18.9	16.9	20.7	17.6	13.1	20.7
	Hispanic				16.8	16.4	17.6	16.9	15.4	18.8	17.1	17.1	17.1	18.7	17.3	20.7	17.7	15.4	20.7
	Multi-Racial				14.4	14	14.7	16.3	15.5	16.9				18.4	18.4	18.4	16	14	18.4
	White	13.4	13.2	13.7	15.6	14.2	17.5	16.5	14.9	19.3	17.5	16.1	19.7	17.9	16.9	19.4	16.8	13.2	19.7
Total	13.6	13.1	14.3	16	14	19.9	17.3	14.9	20.2	17.9	14.1	20	18.6	16.9	20.7	17.3	13.1	20.7	

On average, students at Carrollton City PLC did not have as wide a gap in age compared with expectations. Freshmen were on average 0.2 years younger than the expected maximum age, sophomores 0.5 years older, juniors 0.5 years younger and seniors 0.1 year older.

The maximum ages for the grade levels indicate that some of the students are as much as 2.8 years over the maximum expected age for their grade level. For 9th graders, the highest age reported was 16.5, for sophomores the highest age was 18.2, for juniors 18.1 and 19.7 for seniors. Given that it is possible for students to earn twice the credits per year at PLC than they would at a traditional school, it is possible that over 85 percent of the students enrolled at the Carrollton City PLC could graduate on-time or early.

**Table 4C: Student Age by Grade Level, Gender and Ethnicity - Carrollton City PLC 2013**

SITE: Carrollton City PLC		Student Grade Level, Gender and Ethnicity																	
Age at Beginning of the Year		8th Grade			9th Grade			10th Grade			11th Grade			12th Grade			Total		
Expected Max Age		14			15			16			17			18					
Gender	Ethnicity	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max
Female	Black or African American	13.6	13.1	14.3	14.8	14.1	15.6	16.3	15.4	16.8	16.5	14.1	18.1	19.7	19.7	19.7	15.3	13.1	19.7
	Hispanic				16.4	16.4	16.4	18.8	18.8	18.8				17.3	17.3	17.3	17.5	16.4	18.8
	Multi-Racial				14	14	14	16.3	15.5	16.9							15.7	14	16.9
	White	13.2	13.2	13.2	14.9	14.2	16.1				16.1	16.1	16.1				14.8	13.2	16.1
	Total Females	13.5	13.1	14.3	14.9	14	16.4	16.6	15.4	18.8	16.4	14.1	18.1	18.5	17.3	19.7	15.5	13.1	19.7
Male	Black or African American	14.2	14.2	14.2	14.8	14	15.6	15.4	15.4	15.4	16.7	16.7	16.7	17.6	16.9	18.3	15.3	14	18.3
	Hispanic													18.9	18.9	18.9	18.9	18.9	18.9
	Multi-Racial				14.7	14.7	14.7										14.7	14.7	14.7
	White	13.7	13.7	13.7	14.6	14.2	15	16.7	16.7	16.7	16.4	16.3	16.4	17.4	17.4	17.4	15.7	13.7	17.4
	Total Males	13.9	13.7	14.2	14.8	14	15.6	16.1	15.4	16.8	16.6	14.1	18.1	18.3	16.9	19.7	15.4	13.1	19.7
Total	Black or African American	13.7	13.1	14.3	14.8	14	15.6	16.1	15.4	16.8	16.6	14.1	18.1	18.3	16.9	19.7	15.4	13.1	19.7
	Hispanic				16.4	16.4	16.4	18.8	18.8	18.8				18.1	17.3	18.9	17.9	16.4	18.9
	Multi-Racial				14.4	14	14.7	16.3	15.5	16.9							15.5	14	16.9
	White	13.4	13.2	13.7	14.8	14.2	16.1	16.7	16.7	16.7	16.4	16.1	16.7	17.4	17.4	17.4	15.4	13.2	17.4
	Total	13.6	13.1	14.3	14.8	14	16.4	16.5	15.4	18.8	16.5	14.1	18.1	18.1	16.9	19.7	15.5	13.1	19.7

Students at Floyd County PLC also did not have as wide a gap in age compared with expectations. Freshmen were on average 0.7 years older than expected, sophomores 0.4 years older, juniors 0.4 years older and seniors 0.3 years younger than the expected maximum age at entry.

The maximum ages for the grade levels indicate that some of the students are as much as 2.2 years over the maximum expected age for their grade level. For 9th graders, the highest age reported was 16.9, for sophomores the highest age was 18.2, for juniors 18.8 and 18.8 for seniors. Given that it is possible for students to earn twice the credits per year at PLC than they would at a traditional school, it is possible that over 80 percent of the students enrolled at the Floyd County PLC have the potential to graduate on-time or early.

**Table 4F: Student Age by Grade Level, Gender and Ethnicity - Floyd County PLC 2013**

SITE: Floyd County PLC		Student Grade Level, Gender and Ethnicity														
Age at Beginning of the Year		9th Grade			10th Grade			11th Grade			12th Grade			Total		
Expected Max Age		15			16			17			18					
Gender	Ethnicity	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max
Female	Black or African American	14.6	14.6	14.6	18.2	18.2	18.2	17	17	17	17.9	17.9	17.9	16.9	14.6	18.2
	Hispanic				15.4	15.4	15.4	17.1	17.1	17.1				16.3	15.4	17.1
	Multi-Racial										18.4	18.4	18.4	18.4	18.4	18.4
	White				16.2	14.9	17.3	17.2	16.2	17.7	17.7	17.2	18.8	16.9	14.9	18.8
	Total Females	14.6	14.6	14.6	16.3	14.9	18.2	17.1	16.2	17.7	17.8	17.2	18.8	16.9	14.6	18.8
Male	Black or African American	15.3	15.3	15.3	16.7	16.7	16.7							16	15.3	16.7
	Hispanic	16.5	16.5	16.5	16.6	16.6	16.6				18.3	18.1	18.5	17.4	16.5	18.5
	White	15.8	15.1	16.9	16.5	15.3	17.5	18	16.7	18.8	17.4	16.9	18.1	16.6	15.1	18.8
	Total Males	15.8	15.1	16.9	16.5	15.3	17.5	18	16.7	18.8	17.6	16.9	18.5	16.7	15.1	18.8
	Total	Black or African American	14.9	14.6	15.3	17.4	16.7	18.2	17	17	17	17.9	17.9	17.9	16.6	14.6
Hispanic		16.5	16.5	16.5	16	15.4	16.6	17.1	17.1	17.1	18.3	18.1	18.5	17	15.4	18.5
Multi-Racial											18.4	18.4	18.4	18.4	18.4	18.4
White		15.8	15.1	16.9	16.3	14.9	17.5	17.5	16.2	18.8	17.5	16.9	18.8	16.8	14.9	18.8
Total		15.7	14.6	16.9	16.4	14.9	18.2	17.4	16.2	18.8	17.7	16.9	18.8	16.8	14.6	18.8

Of the three Race to the Top PLCs, Richmond County PLC students were by far much farther behind, with freshmen being on average 2.6 years older than expected, with a maximum age of 19.9, sophomores being 2.1 years older with a maximum age of 20.2, juniors 1.5 years older with a maximum age of 20 and seniors 1.0 year older with a maximum age of 20.7. The high age of the Richmond students may account, in part, for high number of dropouts and GED exits at the site. Given the student population that entered the PLC during the first semester, there is a low chance that a large percentage of students at the site will graduate on time. However, the Richmond County PLC has recently instituted a better referral process, which may allow a higher percentage of students to graduate on-time in the future.

**Table 4R: Student Age by Grade Level, Gender and Ethnicity - Richmond County PLC 2013**

SITE: Richmond County PLC		Student Grade Level, Gender and Ethnicity														
Age at Beginning of the Year		9th Grade			10th Grade			11th Grade			12th Grade			Total		
Expected Max Age		15			16			17			18					
Gender	Ethnicity	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max	Average	Min	Max
Female	Asian or Pacific Islander										20.3	20.3	20.3	20.3	20.3	20.3
	Black or African American	17.8	15.9	19.9	18.2	16	20.2	18.5	16.9	20	19	18.2	20.6	18.4	15.9	20.6
	Hispanic	17.6	17.6	17.6										17.6	17.6	17.6
	White				16.5	16.5	16.5							19.3	19.3	19.3
	Total Females	17.8	15.9	19.9	18.1	16	20.2	18.5	16.9	20	19.1	18.2	20.6	18.4	15.9	20.6
Male	Black or African American	17.4	16.4	19.4	18	16.9	20.1	18.6	17.9	19.9	19	18	20.7	18.4	16.4	20.7
	Hispanic										20.7	20.7	20.7	20.7	20.7	20.7
	White	16.8	16.1	17.5	19.3	19.3	19.3	18.2	16.4	19.7	18.8	18.1	19.4	18.2	16.1	19.7
	Total Males	17.3	16.1	19.4	18.1	16.9	20.1	18.5	16.4	19.9	19	18	20.7	18.4	16.1	20.7
Total	Asian or Pacific Islander										20.3	20.3	20.3	20.3	20.3	20.3
	Black or African American	17.6	15.9	19.9	18.1	16	20.2	18.6	16.9	20	19	18	20.7	18.4	15.9	20.7
	Hispanic	17.6	17.6	17.6							20.7	20.7	20.7	19.1	17.6	20.7
	White	16.8	16.1	17.5	17.9	16.5	19.3	18.2	16.4	19.7	18.9	18.1	19.4	18.2	16.1	19.7
	Total	17.6	15.9	19.9	18.1	16	20.2	18.5	16.4	20	19	18	20.7	18.4	15.9	20.7

**Risk Factors for Race To the Top PLC Students.** The tables (Table 5, 5C, 5F, 5R) that follow enumerate the risk factors that students came to PLC, broken down by race and ethnicity, with percent of total student population indicated for each risk factor. The risk factors are classified by family and student risk factors for dropping out of school. Each PLC site coordinator conducts an intake interview of the students and review of their records to determine risk factors. Further information may be provided through discussions with students and parents or during home visits to the family. For all students, the three most prevalent family risk factors shown below are students not living with both natural parents (31.9%), low educational expectations (18.7%), and low socio-economic status (30.3%), and parents with low education levels (36.3%).

For student risk factors, low commitment to school (40.6%), poor academic performance and overage for grade (41.0% each), were most common, followed by lack of effort (27.9%) and poor attendance (22.3%). Adult obligations such as teen parenting (7.6%) and pregnancy (4.0%) are a smaller but extremely high-risk group.

**Table 5: Risk Factors - All PLCs 2013**

2013 Race To The Top PLC Students Number & Percent of Students with Risk Factor		Student Risk Factors by Race and Gender															
Risk Factor Type	Risk Factor	Ethnicity and Gender															Grand Total
		Asian		Black or African American			Hispanic			Multi-Racial			White				
		F	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	F	Total	F	M	Total		
Family	Family disruption	0	0	5	2	7	0	3	3	1	0	1	12	15	27	38	
		0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.8%	2.8%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	4.8%	6.0%	10.8%	15.1%	
	High family mobility	0	0	2	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	
		0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.4%	1.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.8%	2.4%	
	Lack of family conversations about school	0	0	3	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	23	29	
		0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	6.4%	9.2%	11.6%	
	Large number of siblings	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	5	
		0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.8%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	2.0%	
	Low educational expectations	0	0	3	4	7	1	4	5	1	0	1	12	22	34	47	
		0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	1.6%	2.8%	0.4%	1.6%	2.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	4.8%	8.8%	13.5%	18.7%	
	Low parent/guardian contact with school	0	0	5	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	5	15	
		0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.6%	0.4%	2.0%	6.0%	
	Low socioeconomic status	0	0	13	11	24	4	5	9	2	0	2	14	27	41	76	
	0.0%	0.0%	5.2%	4.4%	9.6%	1.6%	2.0%	3.6%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	5.6%	10.8%	16.3%	30.3%		
Not living with both natural parents	0	0	27	28	55	2	1	3	3	0	3	6	13	19	80		
	0.0%	0.0%	10.8%	11.2%	21.9%	0.8%	0.4%	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	2.4%	5.2%	7.6%	31.9%		
Parents with low education levels	0	0	2	5	7	1	4	5	1	0	1	11	16	27	40		
	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	2.0%	2.8%	0.4%	1.6%	2.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	4.4%	6.4%	10.8%	15.9%		
Sibling has dropped out of school	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		
	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%		
<b>Family Risk Factors Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>337</b>	
Student	Aggressive behavior	0	0	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	11	
		0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.4%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	2.4%	2.8%	4.4%	
	Emotional disturbance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	9	9	
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	1.2%	3.6%	3.6%	
	Excessive after school work hours	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	
	Excessive social activity out of school	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	5	
		0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	2.0%	
	High risk behavior (e.g., alcohol, drugs, etc.)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	3	3	6	8	
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	2.4%	3.2%	
	High risk peer group (e.g., gangs)	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	1.6%	
	Lack of effort	0	0	9	18	27	1	4	5	1	0	1	11	26	37	70	
		0.0%	0.0%	3.6%	7.2%	10.8%	0.4%	1.6%	2.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	4.4%	10.4%	14.7%	27.9%	
	Learning disability	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	
		0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.8%	1.6%	
	Low commitment to school	1	1	16	30	46	2	4	6	1	0	1	17	31	48	102	
		0.4%	0.4%	6.4%	12.0%	18.3%	0.8%	1.6%	2.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	6.8%	12.4%	19.1%	40.6%	
	Low educational expectations	0	0	5	1	6	2	3	5	1	0	1	8	15	23	35	
		0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.4%	2.4%	0.8%	1.2%	2.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	3.2%	6.0%	9.2%	13.9%	
	Misbehavior	0	0	1	7	8	1	1	2	0	0	0	5	8	13	23	
		0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	2.8%	3.2%	0.4%	0.4%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.0%	3.2%	5.2%	9.2%	
	No extracurricular activity	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	3	4	7	9	
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	1.2%	1.6%	2.8%	3.6%	
	Other	1	1	46	49	95	1	2	3	3	1	4	10	19	29	132	
		0.4%	0.4%	18.3%	19.5%	37.8%	0.4%	0.8%	1.2%	1.2%	0.4%	1.6%	4.0%	7.6%	11.6%	52.6%	
	Over age for grade	1	1	24	40	64	0	5	5	0	0	0	10	23	33	103	
	0.4%	0.4%	9.6%	15.9%	25.5%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.0%	9.2%	13.1%	41.0%		
Poor academic performance	0	0	23	37	60	3	2	5	0	0	0	11	27	38	103		
	0.0%	0.0%	9.2%	14.7%	23.9%	1.2%	0.8%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	10.8%	15.1%	41.0%		
Poor attendance	0	0	14	11	25	0	2	2	0	0	0	11	18	29	56		
	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	4.4%	10.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	7.2%	11.6%	22.3%		
Pregnancy	0	0	3	0	3	2	0	2	2	0	2	3	0	3	10		
	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	4.0%		
Retained in grade	0	0	22	42	64	2	1	3	0	0	0	8	21	29	96		
	0.0%	0.0%	8.8%	16.7%	25.5%	0.8%	0.4%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	8.4%	11.6%	38.2%		
Teenage Parent	0	0	6	3	9	2	1	3	2	0	2	5	0	5	19		
	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	1.2%	3.6%	0.8%	0.4%	1.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%	7.6%		
<b>Student Risk Factors Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>418</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>323</b>	<b>800</b>	
<b>All Risk Factors Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>1137</b>	

**Risk Factors for Carrollton City PLC Students.** The table below displays student and family risk factors for students at Carrollton City PLC. The most common family risk factors at that site were students not living with both natural parents (33.3%), followed by low socioeconomic status at 6.7% of students. The most common student risk factors were poor academic performance (31.7%) and low commitment to school (26.7%). Five percent of the student population were pregnant or teens with children.

**Table 5C: Risk Factors - Carrollton City PLC 2013**

SITE: Carrollton City PLC														
Student Risk Factors by Race and Gender														
Number & Percent of Students with Risk Factor		Ethnicity and Gender											Grand Total	
Risk Factor Type	Risk Factor	Black or African American			Hispanic			Multi-Racial			White			
		F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	
Family	Family disruption	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Large number of siblings	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%
	Low educational expectations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Low parent/guardian contact with school	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Low socioeconomic status	0	2	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	4
0.0%		3.3%	3.3%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%	
Not living with both natural parents	9	7	16	1	1	2	2	0	2	0	0	0	20	
	15.0%	11.7%	26.7%	1.7%	1.7%	3.3%	3.3%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	
Parents with low education levels	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	
<b>Family Risk Factors Total</b>		<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>26</b>	
Student	Aggressive Behavior	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%
	Emotional disturbance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%
	Lack of effort	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
		0.0%	10.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%
	Learning Disability	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		1.7%	1.7%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%
	Low commitment to school	3	10	13	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	16
		5.0%	16.7%	21.7%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	3.3%	26.7%
	Low educational expectations	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%
	No Extracurricular Activity	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%
	Other	12	6	18	0	1	1	3	1	4	6	6	12	35
		20.0%	10.0%	30.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	5.0%	1.7%	6.7%	10.0%	10.0%	20.0%	58.3%
	Over age for grade	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
		1.7%	3.3%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%
	Poor academic performance	7	9	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	19
11.7%		15.0%	26.7%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	3.3%	31.7%	
Poor attendance	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	
	1.7%	3.3%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	3.3%	8.3%	
Pregnancy	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	
	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%	
Retained in grade	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	
Teenage Parent	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	
	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	3.3%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%	
<b>Student Risk Factors Total</b>		<b>28</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100</b>	
<b>All Risk Factors Total</b>		<b>37</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>126</b>	

**Table 5F: Risk Factors - Floyd PLC 2013**

SITE: Floyd County PLC		Student Risk Factors by Race and Gender											
Number & Percent of Students with Risk Factor		Ethnicity and Gender										Grand Total	
Risk Factor Type	Risk Factor	Black or African American			Hispanic			Multi-Racial		White			
		F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	Total	F	M	Total	
Family	Family disruption	2	0	2	0	3	3	1	1	12	14	26	32
		3.3%	0.0%	3.3%	0.0%	5.0%	5.0%	1.7%	1.7%	20.0%	23.3%	43.3%	53.3%
	High family mobility	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
		1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	3.3%
	Lack of family conversations about	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	15	22	26
		3.3%	3.3%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.7%	25.0%	36.7%	43.3%
	Large number of siblings	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	2
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	3.3%
	Low educational expectations	2	2	4	1	3	4	1	1	12	22	34	43
		3.3%	3.3%	6.7%	1.7%	5.0%	6.7%	1.7%	1.7%	20.0%	36.7%	56.7%	71.7%
Low parent/guardian contact with school	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	5	
	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.7%	0.0%	6.7%	8.3%	
Low socioeconomic status	5	2	7	3	5	8	1	1	14	25	39	55	
	8.3%	3.3%	11.7%	5.0%	8.3%	13.3%	1.7%	1.7%	23.3%	41.7%	65.0%	91.7%	
Not living with both natural parents	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	12	15	
	1.7%	1.7%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	8.3%	11.7%	20.0%	25.0%	
Parents with low education levels	1	2	3	1	4	5	1	1	11	16	27	36	
	1.7%	3.3%	5.0%	1.7%	6.7%	8.3%	1.7%	1.7%	18.3%	26.7%	45.0%	60.0%	
<b>Family Risk Factors Total</b>		<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>216</b>
Student	Aggressive Behavior	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	8
		1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	10.0%	11.7%	13.3%
	Emotional disturbance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	8	8
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	5.0%	13.3%	13.3%
	Excessive after school work hours	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%
	Excessive social activity out of school	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4
		1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	5.0%	6.7%
	High risk behavior (e.g., alcohol, drugs, etc.)	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	3	3	6	8
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%	5.0%	10.0%	13.3%
	High risk peer group (e.g., gangs)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%
	Lack of effort	4	1	5	1	4	5	1	1	10	23	33	44
		6.7%	1.7%	8.3%	1.7%	6.7%	8.3%	1.7%	1.7%	16.7%	38.3%	55.0%	73.3%
	Learning disability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	3.3%	3.3%
	Low commitment to school	1	3	4	1	4	5	1	1	16	26	42	52
		1.7%	5.0%	6.7%	1.7%	6.7%	8.3%	1.7%	1.7%	26.7%	43.3%	70.0%	86.7%
	Low educational expectations	1	1	2	1	3	4	1	1	8	15	23	30
		1.7%	1.7%	3.3%	1.7%	5.0%	6.7%	1.7%	1.7%	13.3%	25.0%	38.3%	50.0%
	Misbehavior	1	1	2	1	1	2	0	0	5	7	12	16
		1.7%	1.7%	3.3%	1.7%	1.7%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	11.7%	20.0%	26.7%
	No extracurricular activity	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	7	8
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	5.0%	6.7%	11.7%	13.3%
	Over age for grade	4	2	6	0	4	4	0	0	9	19	28	38
		6.7%	3.3%	10.0%	0.0%	6.7%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	15.0%	31.7%	46.7%	63.3%
	Poor academic performance	2	2	4	1	1	2	0	0	10	17	27	33
	3.3%	3.3%	6.7%	1.7%	1.7%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	28.3%	45.0%	55.0%	
Poor attendance	2	1	3	0	2	2	0	0	8	17	25	30	
	3.3%	1.7%	5.0%	0.0%	3.3%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	13.3%	28.3%	41.7%	50.0%	
Pregnancy	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3	0	3	5	
	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	5.0%	0.0%	5.0%	8.3%	
Retained in grade	2	2	4	0	1	1	0	0	6	14	20	25	
	3.3%	3.3%	6.7%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	10.0%	23.3%	33.3%	41.7%	
Teenage Parent	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	5	0	5	8	
	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	0.0%	1.7%	1.7%	1.7%	8.3%	0.0%	8.3%	13.3%	
<b>Student Risk Factors Total</b>		<b>19</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>322</b>
<b>All Risk Factors Total</b>		<b>34</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>538</b>

**Risk Factors for Floyd PLC Students.** The table above displays student and family risk factors for students at Floyd PLC. The most common family risk factors were low socioeconomic status at 91.7% of students, low educational expectations (71.7%), and parents with low education levels at 60%.

For student risk factors, low commitment to school was the most common factor with 86.7% of students, followed by lack of effort (73.3%) and over age for grade (63.3%). Poor attendance and lack of effort affected 94% and 91% of all students, both affecting over 90% of students. More than half of the students had a past history of poor academic performance and attendance. The PLC had the highest percentage of students who were parents, at 13.3% of the student population.

**Table 5R: Risk Factors - Richmond PLC 2013**

Number & Percent of Students with Risk Factor		Ethnicity and Gender											Grand Total
Risk Factor Type	Risk Factor	Asian		Black or African American			Hispanic			White			
		F	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	
Family	Family disruption	0	0	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	6
		0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	1.5%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	4.6%
	High family mobility	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	1	1	4
		0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	1.5%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	3.1%
	Lack of Family Conversation About School	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	3
		0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	2.3%
	Large Number of Siblings	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
		0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%
	Low educational expectations	0	0	1	2	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	17
		0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	1.5%	2.3%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.0%
	Low parent/guardian contact with school	0	0	4	5	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	10
		0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	3.8%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	7.6%
	Low socioeconomic status	0	0	8	7	15	0	0	0	0	2	2	17
	0.0%	0.0%	6.1%	5.3%	11.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%	13.0%	
Not living with both natural parents	0	0	17	20	37	1	0	1	1	6	7	45	
	0.0%	0.0%	13.0%	15.3%	28.2%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	4.6%	5.3%	34.4%	
Parents with Low Education Levels	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	1.5%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	
Sibling has Dropped Out of School	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	
<b>Family Risk Factors Total</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>95</b>
Student	Aggressive behavior	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%
	Excessive Social Activity Out of School	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%
	High risk peer group	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%
	Lack of effort	0	0	5	11	16	0	0	0	1	3	4	20
		0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	8.4%	12.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	2.3%	3.1%	15.3%
	Low commitment to school	1	1	12	17	29	0	0	0	0	4	4	34
		0.8%	0.8%	9.2%	13.0%	22.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	3.1%	26.0%
	Low educational expectations	0	0	3	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	4
		0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	2.3%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%
	Misbehavior	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	5
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	3.8%
	Over age for grade	1	1	19	36	55	0	1	1	1	4	5	62
		0.8%	0.8%	14.5%	27.5%	42.0%	0.0%	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%	3.1%	3.8%	47.3%
Poor academic performance	0	0	14	26	40	1	1	2	1	8	9	51	
	0.0%	0.0%	10.7%	19.8%	30.5%	0.8%	0.8%	1.5%	0.8%	6.1%	6.9%	38.9%	
Poor attendance	0	0	11	8	19	0	0	0	2	0	2	21	
	0.0%	0.0%	8.4%	6.1%	14.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	1.5%	16.0%	
Pregnancy	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	
Retained in grade	0	0	19	40	59	1	0	1	2	7	9	69	
	0.0%	0.0%	14.5%	30.5%	45.0%	0.8%	0.0%	0.8%	1.5%	5.3%	6.9%	52.7%	
Teenage Parent	0	0	6	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	
	0.0%	0.0%	4.6%	1.5%	6.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.1%	
<b>Student Risk Factors Total</b>		<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>378</b>

**Risk Factors for Richmond PLC Students.** The table on the preceding page displays student and family risk factors for students at Richmond PLC. The most common family risk factors was not living with both natural parents at 34.4% of students, and low socioeconomic status and low educational expectations at 13%.

For student risk factors, retained in grade (52.7%) and overage for grade (47.3%) were most common, followed by low commitment to school (26%) and lack of effort (15.3%). Teenage parents made up 6.1% of the student population.

**Student Daily Attendance.** Table 6 below shows the average student daily attendance at each PLC for each month of the year. Given that students can proceed at their own pace academically, many PLCs tend to maintain much more flexible attendance policies, making special allowances for students who must work or who are dealing with challenges such as health issues, pregnancy and/or parenting students. However, it is recommended that PLCs develop and enforce attendance policies so that students who are not demonstrating sufficient commitment to the program can be removed, opening a slot for other students.

Attendance at Carrollton City was the highest among the three Race to the Top PLCs, with an average monthly attendance rate of 92.5%. Attendance at the Floyd County PLC averaged 88.7% per month over the year, up slightly from the previous year, with a low of 85.9% attendance in December 2012 and a high of 92.6% in September. Attendance at Richmond County PLC has been much lower than we usually experience at PLCs. The PLC had an average of 63.5% student attendance over the course of the semester, with a low of 57.3% daily attendance in December. The PLC has had challenges with transportation for students. Richmond County PLC moved to a single session in the second semester which they hope will improve attendance.

**Table 6: Daily Attendance All PLCs 2013**

SITE: Carrollton City PLC		Month						
Attendance	Aug-12	Sep-12	Oct-12	Nov-12	Dec-12	YTD	YTD TYPE	
Average Daily Attendance	90.6	93.3	94.0	92.1	92.7	92.5	Average	
SITE: Floyd County PLC		Month						
Attendance	Aug-12	Sep-12	Oct-12	Nov-12	Dec-12	YTD	YTD TYPE	
Average Daily Attendance	92.6	88.1	87.5	89.5	85.9	88.7	Average	
SITE: Richmond County PLC		Month						
Attendance	Aug-12	Sep-12	Oct-12	Nov-12	Dec-12	YTD	YTD TYPE	
Average Daily Attendance	74.2	63.3	59.1	63.4	57.3	63.5	Average	

**Community and Parent Involvement, and College and Career Readiness.** The tables (Tables 7, 7C, 7F and 7R) that follow provide an overview of the month-by-month community and parent involvement at the PLCs and College and Career Readiness participation among students.

According to our developmental timeline, mentoring is a service that is expected to be the planning and emerging stages during the first year, and is not expected to be fully implemented until the third year of the program. Currently, this is not a strong area for any of the PLCs. Carrollton City PLC and Floyd County PLC each have a small number of mentors. In the case of Floyd County, the remote location of the site has been a challenge in attracting mentors and as such, staff often serve in this capacity. Richmond County PLC did not have any mentors during the first half of the year, despite having started well during their first year. They have done outreach with churches and the military and have provided mentor training, but the program has not started for the second year. It is hoped that the move to a single session will free the site coordinator to work on mentor recruitment and engagement.

Tutoring services are taking place, with an average of 43.2 students matched with tutors each month. Carrollton City has performed the best in attracting tutors, with an average of 33.2 students with a tutor per month. At the Floyd County PLC, the site coordinator does provide some tutoring and the site has averaged 10 volunteer tutors per month. Tutorial services need to be strengthened at the Richmond County PLC.

Parent involvement is very much encouraged at the PLC. Across all PLCs, 555 parent phone contacts and 131 parent conferences were held over the first half of the year. Parents are encouraged to visit the PLCs and 213 parents did visit during the first half of the year. The Carrollton City and Floyd County site coordinators have conducted some home visits during the year.

With respect to College and Career Readiness, an average of 87.2 students participated in Charting for Success lessons during the first half of the year. PLCs reported a total of 9 students applying to post-secondary study as part of the program and 2 completed the FAFSA. It is expected that many more students will complete the FAFSA by the end of the year, as this is an activity that is usually conducted during second semester after parents have completed tax returns for the prior year. The two older PLCs are most consistent in providing Charting for Success services, which need to be implemented at Carrollton City PLC.

**Table 7: Community and Parent Involvement and College/Career Readiness at All PLCs 2013**

2013 RT3 PLCs	Month					YTD	YTD TYPE
	Aug-12	Sep-12	Oct-12	Nov-12	Dec-12		
<b>Community Involvement</b>							
# of Students in need of a mentor	0	29	85	40	29	36.6	Average
Total Students Matched with a Mentor	0	1	2	3	3	1.8	Average
# of Students Mentored During the Month	0	26	68	81	4	35.8	Average
# of Students Tutored	10	31	18	12	2	14.6	Average
# of students matched with a tutor (among active students)	10	46	68	39	53	43.2	Average
# of students in need of a tutor	0	30	54	29	53	33.2	Average
<b>Parent Involvement</b>	<b>Aug-12</b>	<b>Sep-12</b>	<b>Oct-12</b>	<b>Nov-12</b>	<b>Dec-12</b>	<b>YTD</b>	<b>YTD TYPE</b>
# of Home Visits	0	4	2	0	0	6	Total
# Parent Phone Contacts	30	164	166	120	75	555	Total
# of Parent Conferences	15	24	17	24	51	131	Total
# of Parents Visiting PLC	95	27	38	22	31	213	Total
<b>College and Career Readiness</b>	<b>Aug-12</b>	<b>Sep-12</b>	<b>Oct-12</b>	<b>Nov-12</b>	<b>Dec-12</b>	<b>YTD</b>	<b>YTD TYPE</b>
# of Students Participating in Charting for Success Lesson	59	168	118	90	1	87.2	Average
# of Students Applying to Postsecondary Study	1	1	4	2	1	9	Total
# of Students Accepted to Post-Secondary Study	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total
# of Students Completing FAFSA	0	0	0	1	1	2	Total

**Table 7C: Community and Parent Involvement and College/Career Readiness - Carrollton City PLC 2013**

SITE: Carrollton City PLC	Month						YTD	YTD TYPE
	Aug-12	Sep-12	Oct-12	Nov-12	Dec-12	YTD		
<b>Community Involvement</b>								
# of Students in need of a mentor	0	29	15	0	29	14.6	Average	
Total Students Matched with a Mentor	0	0	1	3	1	1.0	Average	
# of Students Mentored During the Month	0	0	2	2	2	1.2	Average	
# of Students Tutored	0	2	4	2	2	2.0	Average	
# of students matched with a tutor(among active students)	0	30	54	29	53	33.2	Average	
# of students in need of a tutor	0	30	54	29	53	33.2	Average	
<b>Parent Involvement</b>	<b>Aug-12</b>	<b>Sep-12</b>	<b>Oct-12</b>	<b>Nov-12</b>	<b>Dec-12</b>	<b>YTD</b>	<b>YTD TYPE</b>	
# of Home Visits	0	0	1	0	0	1	Total	
# Parent Phone Contacts	11	60	54	54	15	194	Total	
# of Parent Conferences	3	1	8	9	1	22	Total	
# of Parents Visiting PLC	50	3	10	9	31	103	Total	
<b>College and Career Readiness</b>	<b>Aug-12</b>	<b>Sep-12</b>	<b>Oct-12</b>	<b>Nov-12</b>	<b>Dec-12</b>	<b>YTD</b>	<b>YTD TYPE</b>	
# of Students Participating in Charting for Success Lesson	1	0	0	0	1	0.4	Average	
# of Students Applying to Postsecondary Study	0	0	0	1	1	2	Total	
# of Students Accepted to Post-Secondary Study	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
# of Students Completing FAFSA	0	0	0	1	1	2	Total	

**Table 7F: Community and Parent Involvement and College/Career Readiness - Floyd PLC 2013**

SITE: Floyd County PLC	Month						YTD	YTD TYPE
	8/1/201	Sep-12	Oct-12	Nov-12	Dec-12	YTD		
<b>Community Involvement</b>								
# of Students in need of a mentor	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Average	
Total Students Matched with a Mentor	0	1	1	0	2	0.8	Average	
# of Students Mentored During the Month	0	1	2	2	2	1.4	Average	
# of Students Tutored	10	16	14	10	0	10.0	Average	
# of students matched with a tutor(among active students)	10	16	14	10	0	10.0	Average	
# of students in need of a tutor	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Average	
<b>Parent Involvement</b>	<b>Aug-12</b>	<b>Sep-12</b>	<b>Oct-12</b>	<b>Nov-12</b>	<b>Dec-12</b>	<b>YTD</b>	<b>YTD TYPE</b>	
# of Home Visits	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
# Parent Phone Contacts	19	52	60	38	60	229	Total	
# of Parent Conferences	7	16	2	15	50	90	Total	
# of Parents Visiting PLC	15	14	17	8	0	54	Total	
<b>College and Career Readiness</b>	<b>Aug-12</b>	<b>Sep-12</b>	<b>Oct-12</b>	<b>Nov-12</b>	<b>Dec-12</b>	<b>YTD</b>	<b>YTD TYPE</b>	
# of Students Participating in Charting for Success Lesson	58	51	54	30	0	38.6	Average	
# of Students Applying to Postsecondary Study	1	1	4	1	0	7	Total	
# of Students Accepted to Post-Secondary Study	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
# of Students Completing FAFSA	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	

**Table 7R: Community and Parent Involvement and College/Career Readiness - Richmond PLC 2013**

SITE: Richmond County PLC	Month						YTD	YTD TYPE
	Aug-12	Sep-12	Oct-12	Nov-12	Dec-12	YTD		
<b>Community Involvement</b>								
# of Students in need of a mentor	0	0	70	40	0	22.0	Average	
Total Students Matched with a Mentor	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Average	
# of Students Mentored During the Month	0	25	64	77	0	33.2	Average	
# of Students Tutored	0	13	0	0	0	2.6	Average	
# of students matched with a tutor(among active students)	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Average	
# of students in need of a teacher	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Average	
<b>Parent Involvement</b>	<b>Aug-12</b>	<b>Sep-12</b>	<b>Oct-12</b>	<b>Nov-12</b>	<b>Dec-12</b>	<b>YTD</b>	<b>YTD TYPE</b>	
# of Home Visits	0	4	1	0	0	5	Total	
# Parent Phone Contacts	0	52	52	28	0	132	Total	
# of Parent Conferences	5	7	7	0	0	19	Total	
# of Parents Visiting PLC	30	10	11	5	0	56	Total	
<b>College and Career Readiness</b>	<b>Aug-12</b>	<b>Sep-12</b>	<b>Oct-12</b>	<b>Nov-12</b>	<b>Dec-12</b>	<b>YTD</b>	<b>YTD TYPE</b>	
# of Students Participating in Charting for Success Lesson	0	117	64	60	0	48.2	Average	
# of Students Applying to Postsecondary Study	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
# of Students Accepted to Post-Secondary Study	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	
# of Students Completing FAFSA	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total	

**Student Exit Status.** Table 8 shows end of the year status for student by site for the 60 students taking part in the Race to the Top PLC program who left during the first semester of the 2012-13 school year. Among these students, 12 (20.0%) achieved their high school diplomas, with Carrollton City PLC graduating 1 student, Floyd County PLC graduating 5 students and Richmond County graduating 6 students. Three quarters of the graduates left with plans to continue their education at 2 or 4 year colleges.

**Table 8: Exit Status**

PLC		Dropout Exits			Other Exits	Graduated				Transfers		Total
		Dropped out	GED	Work by Choice	Deceased	To 2-yr College	To 4-yr College	To Employment	Graduated Other	Out of System	To Home School	
All Sites	N	25	7	1	1	3	6	2	1	8	6	60
	%	41.7%	11.7%	1.7%	1.7%	5.0%	10.0%	3.3%	1.7%	13.3%	10.0%	100.0%
Carrollton City	N	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	7
	%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	42.9%	14.3%	100.0%
Floyd County	N	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	4	2	13
	%	15.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.4%	0.0%	15.4%	7.7%	30.8%	15.4%	100.0%
Richmond County	N	21	7	1	1	0	6	0	0	1	3	40
	%	52.5%	17.5%	2.5%	2.5%	0.0%	15.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	7.5%	100.0%

Fourteen students transferred out of the PLCs, with 6 of those returning to their home schools. One student exit was a student who was deceased. The most common exits during the first semester were those which would be classified as dropouts, with a total of 33 students leaving the program for lack of attendance or academic progress, going on to GED programs or leaving to work. The highest number of dropouts came from Richmond County PLC, not surprising given the high age of students in the program. The Richmond County Academic Coordinator has been working with graduation coaches at the home high schools to identify students who would best benefit from the program. Students who were too old or not making adequate progress were given the option of entering a GED program.

Table 9 shows the total number of graduates for each PLC site during the first semester. Among the graduates during the first semester of the 2013 school year was 1 student from Floyd County who started the year classified as a junior.

**Table 9: Number of Graduates First Semester 2012-13 School Year by PLC Site**

	All Sites	Carrollton City	Floyd	Richmond
Number of Graduates	12	1	5	6

Table 10 below enumerates the number of graduates in Richmond County that came from schools classified by the Georgia Department of Education as priority or focus schools. One of the 6 first semester graduates from Richmond PLC was from one of the lowest performing schools in the state, officially graduating from Academy of Richmond County High School, which is classified as a focus school. None of the Floyd County high schools or Carrollton City High School are classified as priority or focus schools.

**Table 10: Graduates from Priority and Focus Schools – Richmond County PLC 2013**

Richmond County Lowest Performing High Schools	Classification	Number of Graduates
Academy of Richmond County High School	Focus (Grad Rate)	1
<b>Total Graduates from Priority or Focus High Schools</b>		<b>1</b>

**Academic Performance.** Student academic performance at the PLC is gauged by improvement in the primary academic disciplines of math, science, language arts and social studies. The number of students included in the academic average and individual discipline analyses of improvement will differ at times markedly, as some PLC students may not have needed classes in particular disciplines. In other cases, students are not included in the analyses as they lacked prior academic information, such as with incoming freshmen or students who entered the PLC from other school systems. Averages are based on all classes each student took within each discipline. Elective courses are not included in analysis of academic improvement.

**Academic Average.** Table 11 shows descriptive statistics for academic average (average of all academic courses taken – math, science, language arts and social studies) across all PLCs and by individual PLC sites. Included are the number of students enrolled in and completing academic courses, average grade earned, average number of credits earned during first semester, number with pre/post comparison for means difference testing, the percent of students who demonstrated improvement and their pre-PLC average grade and average grade during PLC. Pre-post testing was possible with 154 of the students, with 85.7% showing improvement from their pre-PLC performance, increasing their average from 73.9 to 80.7 in academic courses. Pre-post testing includes all courses taken by students during their enrollment in PLC and may include courses taken during the 2012 and 2013 school years.

Of the 231 students enrolled in PLC, 177 took and completed at least one course in an academic subject area during the first semester. Students completing courses generally earned 0.5 to 1 credit per course. Students averaged academic class grades of 80.7 and earned an average of 3.6 credits in academic subjects. Fifty-seven Carrollton City PLC students posted an average of 79.4, with students earning an average of 3.97 credits. The 54 Floyd County students taking and completing academic courses posted an average grade of 84.5 with 5.39 credits earned during the first semester, and the 66 Richmond County students 78.7 with 1.32 credits earned.

Pre-post testing was possible with 56 of the Carrollton City students, 44 of the Floyd students and 54 of the Richmond County Students, with 82.1%, 95.5% and 81.5% showing improvement, respectively.

**Table 11: Descriptive Statistics for Academic Courses by Site**

Performance Learning Center	Number of Student Enrolled in and Completing Academic Subject Area Courses	Average in Academic Subjects	Average Credits Earned 1st Semester 2012	Number with Pre-Post Comparison	Percent of Students Improved	Pre-Average	Post - Average
All Sites	177	80.7	3.4	154	85.7%	73.9	80.7
Carrollton City	57	79.4	3.97	56	82.1%	73.2	79.5
Floyd	54	84.5	5.39	44	95.5%	74.1	84.8
Richmond	66	78.7	1.32	54	81.5%	74.5	78.7

Table 12 enumerates improvement across both PLCs and by individual PLC in academic average (average of all academic courses taken). Mean difference testing compares program year PLC academic averages to performance before entry into the PLC. On average, students in the PLC improved their academic average to 80.7 from 73.9 prior to PLC, a gain of 6.8 points on average academically. The greatest change in academic average was at Floyd County PLC, with a mean difference of 10.7. Improvement in academic average is significant at the  $p < 0.0001$  level overall and for each of the PLCs.

**Table 12: Paired T-Test Results for Academic Average**

Site	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean Differences (Post – Pre)	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
2013 RT3 PLC Sites	6.82	8.35	.673	5.49	8.15	10.132	153	.000
Carrollton City	6.29	8.704	1.163	3.96	8.62	5.411	55	.000
Floyd County PLC	10.69	8.664	1.306	8.05	13.32	8.181	43	.000
Richmond County PLC	4.21	6.486	0.883	2.44	5.98	4.767	53	.000

**Language Arts.** Table 13 shows descriptive statistics for language arts across all PLCs and by individual PLC sites. Included are the number of students enrolled and completing in language arts courses during the first semester, average grade in language arts, average number of credits earned, number with pre/post comparison for means difference testing, the percent of students who demonstrated improvement compared to pre-PLC performance and the average pre and post grades in language arts. Pre-post testing was possible with 118 of the students, with 73.7% showing improvement. Pre-post testing includes all language arts courses taken by students during their enrollment in PLC and may include courses taken during the 2012 and 2013 school years.

Of the 231 students enrolled in PLC the first semester, 126 took and completed at least one course in language arts. Students averaged language arts class grades of 79.6 and earned an average of 0.859

credits in that subject area. Carrollton City students posted an average of 76.7 in language arts with an average of 0.696 credits earned, Floyd County students posted an average grade of 83.7 with average 1.067 credits earned and Richmond County students 80.4 with 0.95 credits earned.

Pre-post testing was possible with 56 of the Carrollton City students, 32 of the Floyd students and 38 of the Richmond County Students, with 57.4%, 86.5% and 88.9% showing improvement, respectively.

**Table 13: Descriptive Statistics for Language Arts by Site**

Performance Learning Center	Number of Student Enrolled in and Completing Language Arts Courses	Average in Language Arts	Average Credits Earned 1st Semester	Number with Pre-Post Comparison	Percent of Students Improved	Pre-Average	Post - Average
All Sites	126	79.6	.859	118	73.7%	73.0	80.2
Carrollton City	56	76.7	.696	54	57.4%	73.8	76.5
Floyd	32	83.7	1.067	37	86.5%	70.5	85.3
Richmond	38	80.4	.950	27	88.9%	74.8	80.7

Table 14 enumerates improvement across all PLCs and by individual PLC in the discipline of language arts. Mean difference testing compares program year PLC language arts averages to performance before entry into the PLC. On average, students in the PLC improved their language arts average to 80.2 from 73.0 prior to PLC, a gain of 7.24 points on average in language arts. Improvement in language arts average is significant at the  $p < 0.0001$ . The greatest change in language arts average was at Floyd County PLC, with a mean difference of 14.82. Improvement in academic average was significant at the  $p < 0.0001$  level for the Floyd and Richmond County PLCs. Students at Carrollton City showed modest gains, but the improvement was not statistically significant.

**Table 14: Paired T-Test Results for Language Arts**

Site	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean Differences (Post – Pre)	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
2013 RT3 PLC Sites	7.24	12.53	1.15	4.96	9.53	6.284	117	.000
Carrollton City	2.76	12.686	1.73	-0.70	6.22	1.598	53	.116
Floyd County PLC	14.82	12.537	2.06	10.6	19.0	7.195	36	.000
Richmond County PLC	5.84	5.931	1.141	3.49	8.19	5.117	26	.000

**Social Studies.** Table 15 shows descriptive statistics for social studies across all PLCs and by individual PLC sites. Included are the number of students enrolled in and completing social studies courses, average in social studies courses, average number of credits earned, number with pre/post comparison for means difference testing, the percent of students who demonstrated improvement compared to

pre-PLC performance and the average pre- and post- subject area grades. Pre-post testing was possible with 120 of the students, with 73.3% showing improvement. Pre-post testing includes all social studies courses taken by students during their enrollment in PLC and may include courses taken during the 2012 and 2013 school years.

Of the 231 students enrolled in PLC, 126 took at least one course in social studies. Students averaged social studies class grades of 80.1 and earned an average of 0.801 credits in that subject area. Carrollton City students posted an average grade of 79.4 with .535 credits earned, Floyd County students posted an average grade of 81.9 with average 1.2 credits earned and Richmond County students 79.5 with 0.762 credits earned. Pre-post testing was possible with 54 of the Carrollton City students, 39 of the Floyd students and 31 of the Richmond County students, with 70.4%, 81.1% and 69.0% showing improvement, respectively.

**Table 15: Descriptive Statistics for Social Studies by Site**

Performance Learning Center	Number of Student Enrolled in and Completing Social Studies Courses	Average in Social Studies	Average Credits Earned 1st Semester	Number with Pre-Post Comparison	Percent of Students Improved	Pre-Average	Post - Average
All Sites	126	80.1	.801	120	73.3%	73.5	80.7
Carrollton City	56	79.4	.535	54	70.4%	73.0	79.0
Floyd	37	81.9	1.20	37	81.1%	75.7	83.8
Richmond	34	79.5	.762	29	69.0%	71.5	79.8

Table 16 enumerates improvement across all PLCs and by individual PLC in the discipline of social studies. Mean difference testing compares program PLC social studies averages to performance before entry into the PLC. On average, students in the PLC improved their social studies average to 80.7 from 73.5 prior to PLC, a gain of 7.225 points on average in social studies. The greatest change in social studies was at Richmond County PLC, with a mean difference of 8.3 points. Improvement in social studies is significant at the  $p < 0.0001$  level across all sites and improvement in social studies was significant at each of the individual PLC sites.

**Table 16: Paired T-Test Results for Social Studies**

Site	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean Differences (Post – Pre)	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
2013 RT3 PLC Sites	7.22	14.34	1.31	4.63	9.81	5.516	119	.000
Carrollton City	6.05	16.75	2.279	1.48	10.62	2.656	53	.010
Floyd County PLC	8.09	10.16	1.670	4.702	11.476	4.844	36	.000
Richmond County PLC	8.3	14.34	2.66	2.83	13.74	3.113	28	.004

**Mathematics.** Table 17 shows descriptive statistics for mathematics across all PLCs and by individual PLC sites. Included are the number of students enrolled in and completing mathematics courses, average, average number of credits earned, number with pre/post comparison for means difference testing, the percent of students who demonstrated improvement in mathematics compared to pre-PLC performance and the average pre- and post- subject area grades. Pre-post testing was possible with 97 of the students, with 72.2% showing improvement. Pre-post testing includes all mathematics courses taken by students during their enrollment in PLC and may include courses taken during the 2012 and 2013 school years.

Of the 231 students enrolled in PLC, 114 took at least one course in mathematics. Students averaged mathematics class grades of 78.9 and earned 0.874 credits in that subject area during the first semester. Carrollton City students posted an average grade of 77.3 with 0.75 credits earned, Floyd County students posted an average grade of 83.2 with average 1.097 credit earned and Richmond County students 74.03 with an average of 0.714 credit earned. Pre-post testing was possible with 55 of the Carrollton City, 31 of the Floyd students and 11 of the Richmond County Students, with 69.1%, 80.6% and 63.6% showing improvement, respectively.

**Table 17: Descriptive Statistics for Mathematics by Site**

Performance Learning Center	Number of Student Enrolled in and Completing	Average in Mathematics	Average Credits Earned 1st Semester	Number with Pre-Post Comparison	Percent of Students Improved	Pre-Average	Post - Average
All Sites	114	78.9	.874	97	72.2%	73.4	79.5
Carrollton City	56	77.3	.750	55	69.1%	72.5	77.6
Floyd	41	83.2	1.097	31	80.6%	75.5	84.7
Richmond	17	74.03	.714	11	63.6%	71.6	74.3

Table 18 enumerates improvement across both PLCs and by individual PLC in the discipline of mathematics. Mean difference testing compares program year PLC math averages to performance before entry into the PLC. On average, students in the PLC improved their math average to 79.5 from 73.4 prior to PLC, a gain of 6.16 points on average in math. Floyd County posted the greatest gains at 9.23. Improvement in math is significant at the  $p < 0.0001$  across all PLCs and at Carrollton City and Floyd County PLCs. Improvement at Richmond County was not statistically significant.

**Table 18: Paired T-Test Results for Mathematics**

Site	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean Differences (Post – Pre)	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
2013 RT3 PLC Sites	6.16	11.60	1.18	3.82	8.50	5.232	119	.000
Carrollton City	5.12	9.79	1.32	2.48	7.77	3.882	54	.000
Floyd County PLC	9.23	13.28	2.39	4.36	14.10	3.871	30	.001
Richmond County PLC	2.7	14.04	4.23	-6.7	12.13	.638	10	.538

**Science.** Table 19 shows descriptive statistics for science across all PLCs and by individual PLC sites. Included are the number of students enrolled in and completing science courses, average in science, average number of credits earned in science during first semester, number with pre/post comparison for means difference testing, the percent of students who demonstrated improvement compared to pre-PLC performance and the average pre- and post- subject area grades. Pre-post testing was possible with 112 of the students, with 63.4% showing improvement. Pre-post testing includes all science courses taken by students during their enrollment in PLC and may include courses taken during the 2012 and 2013 school years.

Of the 231 students enrolled in PLC, 131 took at least one course in science. Students averaged science class grades of 78.7 and earned 0.827 credits in that subject area. Carrollton City students posted an average of 76.1 with 0.563 credits earned, Floyd County students posted an average grade of 83.4 with average 1.2 credits earned and Richmond County students 79.5 with 0.8 credits earned. Pre-post testing was possible with 55 of the Carrollton City students, 35 of the Floyd students and 22 of the Richmond County Students, with 50.9%, 85.7% and 59.1% showing improvement, respectively.

**Table 19: Descriptive Statistics for Science by Site**

Performance Learning Center	Number of Student Enrolled in and Completing Science Courses	Average in Science	Average Credits Earned 1st Semester	Number with Pre-Post Comparison	Percent of Students Improved	Pre-Average	Post - Average
All Sites	131	78.7	.827	112	63.4%	74.1	78.8
Carrollton City	56	76.1	.563	55	50.9%	73.6	76.3
Floyd	47	83.4	1.20	35	85.7%	73.9	84.5
Richmond	34	79.5	.824	22	59.1%	75.6	76.1

Table 20 enumerates improvement across all PLCs and by individual PLC in the discipline of science. Mean difference testing compares program PLC science averages to performance before entry into the PLC. On average, students in the PLC improved their science average to 78.8 from 74.1 prior to PLC, an average gain of 4.75 points on average in science. Improvement in science is significant at the  $p < 0.001$  overall and for Floyd County. The levels of improvement in science at Carrollton City and Richmond County were not statistically significant.

**Table 20: Paired T-Test Results for Science**

Site	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean Differences (Post – Pre)	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
2013 RT3 PLC Sites	4.75	13.73	1.30	2.175	7.316	3.658	111	.000
Carrollton City	2.76	15.81	2.13	-1.517	7.033	1.293	54	.201
Floyd County PLC	10.56	12.01	2.03	6.439	14.687	5.05	34	.000
Richmond County PLC	.46	5.830	1.24	-2.126	3.044	.369	21	.716

**Elective Courses.** Table 21 shows descriptive statistics for electives across all PLCs and by individual PLC sites. Included are the number of students enrolled in and completing elective courses, average in elective courses, and average number of elective course credits earned during the first semester.

Of the 231 students enrolled in PLC, 116 took and completed at least one elective course. Students averaged elective class grades of 82.64 and earned an average of 1.76 credits on average in elective courses. Carrollton County students posted an average of 82.89 and earned an average of 1.47 credits in electives, Floyd County students posted an average grade of 87.17 with average 2.39 credits earned and Richmond County students 76.59 with 0.964 credits earned.

**Table 21: Descriptive Statistics for Electives by Site**

Performance Learning Center	Number of Student Enrolled in and completing Elective Courses	Average in Electives	Average Credits Earned 1st Semester
All Sites	116	82.64	1.76
Carrollton City	57	82.89	1.47
Floyd	45	87.17	2.39
Richmond	14	76.59	.964

**Student Survey Results.** At the end of the year at PLC or as students exit the PLC throughout the year, students are asked to complete a survey to gain their impressions of the PLC environment and how they feel about themselves at the PLC. A total of 18 of the 60 students who exited during the first semester were surveyed across the three PLC sites: 4 at Carrollton City, 4 at Floyd County, and 10 at Richmond County. The results of the surveys received are presented on the pages that follow.

**Grade Levels of PLC Student Respondents.** Below is a chart of the number of respondents based on grade level. Overall, the majority of the surveys completed by Floyd County students were graduating seniors. Richmond PLC’s surveys were completed by three 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> graders, two 12<sup>th</sup> graders and 2 graduating seniors. Carrollton City had one 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> grader who completed the survey, along with two graduating seniors. Overall, 44% of respondents were graduating seniors.

**Table 22: First Semester Student Surveys: Grade Level**

Grade Level	Carrollton City	Floyd	Richmond	All Sites
8th	25%	0%	0%	6%
9th	25%	0%	30%	22%
10th	0%	0%	30%	17%
11th	0%	0%	0%	0%
12th	0%	0%	20%	11%
12th - Graduating	50%	100%	20%	44%
<b>Number of cases</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>18</b>

**Post-Secondary Plans.** Table 23 displays the percent of graduating seniors who indicated that they plan to continue their education by attending college, technical college or military. All graduating seniors indicated that they did plan to continue their educations. Table 24 indicates whether students were accepted into a post-secondary program at the time of graduation. While all of the graduating students indicated that they plan to continue their education, none of respondents had actually been accepted into a post-secondary program at the time of the survey.

**Table 23: First Semester Student Surveys: Plans upon graduation**

Do you have plans to continue your education by attending college, technical college, or the military?	Carrollton City	Floyd	Richmond	All Sites
Yes	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
No	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
Number of cases	2	4	2	8

**Table 24: First Semester Student Surveys: Acceptance to Post-Secondary Options**

Have you already been accepted into college, technical college, or through the military?	Carrollton City	Floyd	Richmond	All Sites
Yes	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%
No	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number of cases	2	4	2	8

**Pursuing Post-Secondary Options.** Table 25 below depicts what post-secondary options the graduating students indicated that they plan to pursue. Students are given the option of selecting any options that they plan to pursue, such as attending both 2 and 4-year colleges. Overall, 50% of students indicated they plan to obtain an associate’s degree, 38% of students plan to attend 4-year college, 50% plan to attend 2-year college and 13% indicated that they plan to attend a Technical College-Diploma Program.

**Table 25: First Semester Student Surveys: Planned Post-Secondary Options**

Which post-secondary option(s) do you plan to pursue?	Carrollton City	Floyd	Richmond	All Sites
4-yr college	0%	25%	100%	38%
2-yr college	100%	50%	0%	50%
Technical college-Associate's Degree	100%	50%	0%	50%
Technical college-Diploma Program	0%	25%	0%	13%
Military	0%	0%	0%	0%
Number of cases	2	4	2	8

**Paying for Post-Secondary Education.** Table 26 presents graduate plans to pay for their post-secondary education. Overall, it does appear that most of graduates do have clear plans as to how they will pay for education. At Carrollton City PLC, all of the graduating seniors indicated that they have submitted FAFSA applications. At Floyd County PLC, 75% plan to use the HOPE Scholarship to pay for their education, 50% HOPE Grants, 75% relying on their parents/guardians will help with financial costs and 50% intending to work to pay for post-secondary education. At Richmond County PLC, one student indicated that they will use HOPE Scholarship, while another has submitted a FAFSA application. Across all sites, HOPE Scholarships/ HOPE Grants are the most common sources of funding for post-secondary education, followed by FAFSA and parent assistance (38% each) and financing through work (25%).

**Table 26: First Semester Student Surveys: Plans to Pay for Post-Secondary Education**

How do you plan to pay for your post-secondary education?	Carrollton City	Floyd	Richmond	All Sites
HOPE Scholarship	0%	75%	50%	50%
HOPE Grant	0%	50%	0%	25%
Submitted FAFSA application	100%	0%	50%	38%
Private Loan	0%	0%	0%	0%
Parent/Guardian Financial Assistance	0%	75%	0%	38%
Military	0%	0%	0%	0%
Work	0%	50%	0%	25%
Other	0%	0%	0%	0%
Number of cases	2	4	2	8

### Student Survey Questions for All Students

Tables 27 and 28 below show how respondents feel they have changed since being a student at the PLC. Eighty-nine percent of students across both sites indicated that they “Agree Somewhat” or “Strongly Agree” with the statement that their grades have improved since being at the PLC. Of the individual sites, students at Floyd County PLC were most likely to indicate that they “Strongly Agree” that they have improved their grades.

With respect to improvement in attendance overall, responses varied greatly, with 56% indicating that they had improved their attendance and 44% indicating that they did not improve. Students at Carrollton City and Richmond County PLCs were most likely to indicate that they had improved their attendance since entering PLC.

Nearly all (89%) of the students indicated that they are more focused on school work at the PLC, with just 2 students (one each from Floyd and Richmond County PLCs) disagreeing with the statement.

With respect to wanting to graduate from high school, 89% of students across all schools agreed they want to graduate from high school.

**Table 27: First Semester Student Surveys: Changes in Student since starting PLC**

Since Starting at the PLC:	Site	Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree	Number of Cases
My grades have improved.	All Sites	11%	0%	56%	33%	18
	Carrollton City	0%	0%	50%	50%	4
	Floyd	25%	0%	0%	75%	4
	Richmond	10%	0%	80%	10%	10
I have improved my school attendance	All Sites	6%	38%	19%	38%	16
	Carrollton City	0%	33%	0%	67%	3
	Floyd	33%	33%	0%	33%	3
	Richmond	0%	40%	30%	30%	10
I am more focused on my school work.	All Sites	6%	6%	22%	67%	18
	Carrollton City	0%	0%	25%	75%	4
	Floyd	25%	0%	0%	75%	4
	Richmond	0%	10%	30%	60%	10
I want to graduate from high school	All Sites	6%	6%	11%	78%	18
	Carrollton City	0%	25%	0%	75%	4
	Floyd	25%	0%	0%	75%	4
	Richmond	0%	0%	20%	80%	10

Table 28 provides student responses to the statement that they “get into less trouble” since attending PLC. Across all PLCs 23% of students indicated that their behavior had not been a problem, and 71% indicated that they have improved their behavior and get in less trouble since they entered the PLC. Seventy-five percent of student respondents from Carrollton City and Floyd County indicated they improved their behavior, followed by Richmond County at 66% improving.

**Table 28: First Semester Student Surveys: Improvement in Behavior**

Since Starting at the PLC:	Site	Not Applicable, Never in Trouble	Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree	Number of Cases
I get into less trouble.	All Sites	23%	0%	6%	12%	59%	17
	Carrollton City	25%	0%	0%	0%	75%	4
	Floyd	25%	0%	0%	0%	75%	4
	Richmond	23%	0%	11%	22%	44%	9

Tables 29 and 30 summarize student responses to questions concerning the environment at PLC. A goal of the PLC is to create a supportive and caring environment in which students can excel. Across all sites, 95% of PLC students “Agreed Somewhat” or “Strongly Agreed” that at the PLC the teachers and staff care about them. Overall, only one student at Richmond County PLC responded that they did not feel that the staff and teachers care about them.

Since students who come to PLC have been unsuccessful within the traditional school environment, it is the hope of the program that students will come to know that they can be successful as students. For all

sites, 94% of students chose “Agree Somewhat” or “Strongly Agree” to the survey statement “I know that I can be academically successful.” Only one student from Floyd County PLC indicated that they did not feel they could be successful in the PLC environment.

As part of the PLC Roadmap to Success, students at the PLC are actively encouraged to plan for their futures. Students in the PLC establish goals for their futures and are given assistance in developing plans to achieve those goals. Under “I have developed new goals for my future,” 78% of all respondents indicated that they had developed goals for the future. At the individual PLC sites, the majority (75% or more) at each PLC indicated that they had developed future goals since coming to PLC.

It is important for students to feel accomplished and have confidence as a good student in order to succeed in the classroom. Eighty-nine percent of students from all three PLCs agreed to “I am a good student” and “I am able to complete more school work.”

**Table 29: First Semester Student Surveys: PLC Environment**

<b>At the PLC:</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree Somewhat</b>	<b>Agree Somewhat</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Number of Cases</b>
<b>The teachers and staff care about me.</b>	<b>All Sites</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>18</b>
	Carrollton City	0%	0%	50%	50%	4
	Floyd	0%	0%	25%	75%	4
	Richmond	0%	10%	40%	50%	10
<b>I know that I can be academically successful.</b>	<b>All Sites</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>18</b>
	Carrollton City	0%	0%	50%	50%	4
	Floyd	25%	0%	0%	75%	4
	Richmond	0%	0%	20%	80%	10
<b>I have developed new goals for my future.</b>	<b>All Sites</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>18</b>
	Carrollton City	0%	25%	0%	75%	4
	Floyd	25%	0%	0%	75%	4
	Richmond	0%	20%	10%	70%	10
<b>I am a good student.</b>	<b>All Sites</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>18</b>
	Carrollton City	0%	0%	25%	75%	4
	Floyd	25%	0%	0%	75%	4
	Richmond	0%	10%	30%	60%	10
<b>I am able to complete more school work.</b>	<b>All Sites</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>18</b>
	Carrollton City	0%	0%	50%	50%	4
	Floyd	25%	0%	0%	75%	4
	Richmond	0%	10%	40%	50%	10

**The Classroom Environment at the PLC Encourages Learning.** A classroom environment conducive to learning is important for a student to be successful in school, and 70% of students “Agreed” or “Strongly Agreed” that the classroom environment at the PLC encourages learning. Only one student from Floyd County PLC disagreed.

**Table 30: First Semester Student Surveys: Classroom Environment**

The classroom environment at the PLC encourages learning.	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Number of Cases
All Sites	6%	0%	24%	29%	41%	17
Carrollton City	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	3
Floyd	25%	0%	0%	0%	75%	4
Richmond	0%	0%	40%	20%	40%	10

**How safe do you feel at the Performance Learning Center.** A safe place to learn and grow is extremely important for all students. Table 31 below provides responses to safety in the PLC. Across all PLCs, 83% of students indicated that they feel safe at the PLC. No student at any site indicated that they do not feel at all safe at the PLC.

**Table 31: First Semester Student Surveys: Safety**

How safe do you feel at the Performance Learning Center?	Carrollton City	Floyd	Richmond	All Sites
Not Safe at All	0%	0%	0%	0%
Somewhat Safe	33%	25%	10%	18%
Mostly Safe	33%	25%	20%	24%
Very Safe	33%	50%	70%	59%
Number of cases	3	4	10	17

**Would you recommend the Performance Learning Center to other students.** In terms of recommending the PLC to other students, 94% of the students across all Performance Learning Centers would recommend it. Only one student from Floyd PLC would not recommend the school to others.

**Table 32: First Semester Student Surveys: Recommend the Program**

Would you recommend the Performance Learning Center to other students?	Carrollton City	Floyd	Richmond	All Sites
Yes	100%	100%	90%	94%
No	0%	0%	10%	6%
Number of cases	4	4	10	18

**Activities Experience for Career and College Readiness skills.** Table 33 provides responses to whether students experienced college and career readiness activities while attending PLC. Students indicated either “Yes,” “No,” or “Don’t Know” to whether or not the activities were provided to them. Across all sites, 50% or more of students had experienced the following college and career readiness skills: Conducting Career Exploration, Practicing Writing Admission Letters/Essay, Learning to Dress for Success, Developing Communication Skills, Completing Job Applications, Developing a List of References for Applications for Employment and Participating in Student Leadership, such as Morning Motivation planning. The responses are based on students attending just one semester, and it is expected that the end-of-the-year student surveys will indicate that most students will have been exposed to most of these skills.

**Table 33: First Semester Student Surveys: College and Career Readiness Skills**

During your time at the PLC, did you experience any of the following activities to develop your career and college readiness skills?												
Note: Top is the count of respondents, Bottom % is percentage of total respondents to the element.	Carrollton City			Floyd			Richmond			All Sites		
	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes	No	Don't know	Yes	No	Don't know
<b>Completing the Self-Assessment &amp; Career Interest Inventories</b>	2	1	1	2	0	2	4	2	4	8	3	7
	50%	25%	25%	50%	0%	50%	40%	20%	40%	44%	17%	39%
<b>Conduct Career Exploration</b>	2	1	1	2	0	2	5	2	3	9	3	6
	50%	25%	25%	50%	0%	50%	50%	20%	30%	50%	17%	33%
<b>College Tour(s)</b>	0	3	1	3	0	1	5	4	1	8	7	3
	0%	75%	25%	75%	0%	25%	50%	40%	10%	44%	39%	17%
<b>Completing College Applications</b>	2	1	1	1	1	2	5	4	1	8	6	4
	50%	25%	25%	25%	25%	50%	50%	40%	10%	44%	33%	22%
<b>Practice Writing Admission Letters/Essay</b>	0	3	1	3	0	1	7	2	1	10	5	3
	0%	75%	25%	75%	0%	25%	70%	20%	10%	56%	28%	17%
<b>Researching Financing College</b>	2	1	1	2	1	1	4	5	1	8	7	3
	50%	25%	25%	50%	25%	25%	40%	50%	10%	44%	39%	17%
<b>Complete the FAFSA</b>	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	5	4	4	7	7
	50%	25%	25%	25%	25%	50%	10%	50%	40%	22%	39%	39%
<b>Write a Resume</b>	0	3	1	4	0	0	3	6	1	7	9	2
	0%	75%	25%	100%	0%	0%	30%	60%	10%	39%	50%	11%
<b>Practice Job Interviewing</b>	0	3	1	3	0	1	5	4	1	8	7	3
	0%	75%	25%	75%	0%	25%	50%	40%	10%	44%	39%	17%
<b>Learn to Dress for Success</b>	2	1	1	4	0	0	9	0	1	15	1	2
	50%	25%	25%	100%	0%	0%	90%	0%	10%	83%	6%	11%
<b>Develop Communication Skills</b>	2	0	2	3	0	1	8	1	1	13	1	4
	50%	0%	50%	75%	0%	25%	80%	10%	10%	72%	6%	22%
<b>Complete Job Applications</b>	2	1	1	4	0	0	5	4	1	11	5	2
	50%	25%	25%	100%	0%	0%	50%	40%	10%	61%	28%	11%
<b>Develop a List of References for Applications for Employment</b>	2	1	1	4	0	0	5	4	1	11	5	2
	50%	25%	25%	100%	0%	0%	50%	40%	10%	61%	28%	11%
<b>Participate in Student Leadership, such as Morning Motivation planning</b>	0	3	1	3	1	0	7	2	1	10	6	2
	0%	75%	25%	75%	25%	0%	70%	20%	10%	56%	33%	11%

Across all of the PLC sites, Floyd County PLC had the most consistent college and career readiness support, with 50% or more of respondents indicating that they had experienced 12 of the 14 skill areas.

## **Conclusions**

All of the Race to the Top PLCs are progressing largely as expected according to the PLC developmental timeline. In its first year, Carrollton City PLC has introduced the first middle school students into the PLC and has maintained close ties with the traditional school, allowing students to return for individual courses and extracurricular activities. We will see how this impacts the model. Floyd County PLC has continued to build on a strong start and continues to innovate in student advisement and monitoring. Richmond County PLC, after a difficult first year due to absence of an academic coordinator, has made great strides in implementing the model under the leadership of the new AC.

In the first half of the year, 12 students graduated through the three Race to the Top PLCs. Student performance indicates that students at the PLCs are performing much better within this environment.

There are some elements of the model continue to be challenges including recruitment and placement of mentors. Sites are making efforts to implement the Common Core into the PLC curriculum and CIS of Georgia is commencing work to assist in these efforts. CIS of Georgia will continue to work with these sites to support full implementation of the model.

**APPENDIX A: Summer Institute 2012 Evaluations – Summary Tables**

ACROSS ALL SESSIONS OFFERED					
<b>Relevant</b>			<b>Quality Info</b>		
	Number of responses	Percent Responses		Number of Responses	Percent Responses
Disagree Somewhat	4	0.9%	Fair	7	1.6%
Agree Somewhat	60	13.8%	Good	76	17.5%
Strongly Agree	372	85.3%	Excellent	352	80.9%
Total	436	100.0%	Total	435	100.0%
<b>Apply</b>			<b>Trainer</b>		
	Number of Responses	Percent Responses		Number of Responses	Percent Responses
Strongly Disagree	1	0.2%	Fair	5	1.2%
Disagree Somewhat	1	0.2%	Good	66	15.2%
Agree Somewhat	78	17.9%	Excellent	363	83.6%
Strongly Agree	355	81.6%	Total	434	100.0%
Total	435	100.0%			
<b>Overall</b>					
	Number of Responses	Percent Responses			
Fair	10	2.3%			
Good	73	16.8%			
Excellent	351	80.1%			
Total	434	100.0%			

**Session Ratings – Relevance of Session to Job**

Session Name	Session content was relevant to my job.							
	Disagree Somewhat		Agree Somewhat		Strongly Agree		Total	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Attitude Science	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	11	100.00%	11	100.00%
Breakfast Keynote: Bill Milliken, Co-Founder and Vice Chairman of Communities in Schools	0	0.00%	4	6.90%	54	93.10%	58	100.00%
Capstone	0	0.00%	5	33.30%	10	66.70%	15	100.00%
CIS Site Coordinators: Reframing Out Work to Include Student Engagement and Principles	0	0.00%	3	12.00%	22	88.00%	25	100.00%
College Career Readiness: Charting for Success	0	0.00%	6	22.20%	21	77.80%	27	100.00%
College/Career Readiness Track: Creating Pathways of Access and Success for Underrepresented Students	0	0.00%	1	9.10%	10	90.90%	11	100.00%
College/Career Readiness Track: Just Dual It!	1	11.10%	0	0.00%	8	88.90%	9	100.00%
Instructional Day: Using PLC Curriculum Resources to Design Your Courses and Integrating Project-Based Learning	0	0.00%	3	21.40%	11	78.60%	14	100.00%
Intake Process Interviewing Potential Students	1	4.50%	3	13.60%	18	81.80%	22	100.00%
Keynote - Practical Classroom Strategies	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	23	100.00%	23	100.00%
Keynote: Personal Learning Networks	2	6.10%	8	24.20%	23	69.70%	33	100.00%
Life Skills through Morning Motivation	0	0.00%	1	5.90%	16	94.10%	17	100.00%
Lions, Otters, Beavers, Retrievers...Oh My!	0	0.00%	1	7.10%	13	92.90%	14	100.00%
MATH Learning Facilitators: Math CCGPS Implementation Workshop	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	4	100.00%	4	100.00%
PLC Coordinators and CIS Executive Directors: Reshaping the Way We Lead	0	0.00%	2	10.00%	18	90.00%	20	100.00%
PLC Enhancement/Expansion Opportunity Track: ACT's College Readiness Solutions	0	0.00%	2	20.00%	8	80.00%	10	100.00%
PLC Enhancement/Expansion Opportunity Track: Apex Learning	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	100.00%	2	100.00%
PLC Enhancement/Expansion Opportunity Track: Classroom, Inc.'s Virtual Internship	0	0.00%	6	66.70%	3	33.30%	9	100.00%
PLC Learning Facilitators: Using LDC to Make the CCGPS Transition Easier	0	0.00%	4	50.00%	4	50.00%	8	100.00%
PLC School Leadership Creative Scheduling and PLC Data Reporting	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	7	100.00%	7	100.00%
Round Robin for Academic Coordinators	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	6	100.00%	6	100.00%
Round Robin for Executive Directors	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2	100.00%	2	100.00%
Round Robin for Mathematics Learning Facilitators	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	6	100.00%	6	100.00%
Round Robin for Science Learning Facilitators	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	5	100.00%	5	100.00%
Round Robin for Site Coordinators	0	0.00%	3	33.30%	6	66.70%	9	100.00%
Round Robin for Social Studies Learning Facilitators	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	7	100.00%	7	100.00%
Senior Project Video	0	0.00%	4	16.70%	20	83.30%	24	100.00%
The Power of Peace Project	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	7	100.00%	7	100.00%
Welcome - CIS PLC from the Beginning	0	0.00%	3	17.60%	14	82.40%	17	100.00%
Who Am I Online - Creating your 21st Century Internet Presence	0	0.00%	1	7.10%	13	92.90%	14	100.00%

**Session Ratings – This session provided me with knowledge/skills I will be able to apply at my school site.**

Session Name	Apply									
	Strongly Disagree		Disagree Somewhat		Agree Somewhat		Strongly Agree		Total	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Attitude Science	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	11	100.0%	11	100.0%
Breakfast Keynote: Bill Milliken, Co-Founder and Vice Chairman of Communities in Schools	0	0	0	0	6	10.3%	52	89.7%	58	100.0%
Capstone	0	0	0	0	6	40.0%	9	60.0%	15	100.0%
CIS Site Coordinators: Reframing Out Work to Include Student Engagement and Principles	0	0	0	0	3	12.0%	22	88.0%	25	100.0%
College Career Readiness: Charting for Success	0	0	0	0	6	22.2%	21	77.8%	27	100.0%
College/Career Readiness Track: Creating Pathways of Access and Success for Underrepresented Students	0	0	0	0	2	18.2%	9	81.8%	11	100.0%
College/Career Readiness Track: Just Dual It!	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	9	100.0%	9	100.0%
Instructional Day: Using PLC Curriculum Resources to Design Your Courses and Integrating Project-Based Learning	0	0	0	0	4	28.6%	10	71.4%	14	100.0%
Intake Process Interviewing Potential Students	0	0	0	0	4	18.2%	18	81.8%	22	100.0%
Keynote - Practical Classroom Strategies	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	23	100.0%	23	100.0%
Keynote: Personal Learning Networks	0	0	1	3.0%	16	48.5%	16	48.5%	33	100.0%
Life Skills through Morning Motivation	0	0	0	0	2	11.8%	15	88.2%	17	100.0%
Lions, Otters, Beavers, Retrievers...Oh My!	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	14	100.0%	14	100.0%
MATH Learning Facilitators: Math CCGPS Implementation Workshop	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%
PLC Coordinators and CIS Executive Directors: Reshaping the Way We Lead	0	0	0	0	5	25.0%	15	75.0%	20	100.0%
PLC Enhancement/Expansion Opportunity Track: ACT's College Readiness Solutions	0	0	0	0	1	10.0%	9	90.0%	10	100.0%
PLC Enhancement/Expansion Opportunity Track: Apex Learning	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
PLC Enhancement/Expansion Opportunity Track: Classroom, Inc.'s Virtual Internship	0	0	0	0	5	55.6%	4	44.4%	9	100.0%
PLC Learning Facilitators: Using LDC to Make the CCGPS Transition Easier	1	12.5%	0	0	5	62.5%	2	25.0%	8	100.0%
PLC School Leadership Creative Scheduling and PLC Data Reporting	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	7	100.0%	7	100.0%
Round Robin for Academic Coordinators	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	6	100.0%	6	100.0%
Round Robin for Executive Directors	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
Round Robin for Mathematics Learning Facilitators	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	6	100.0%	6	100.0%
Round Robin for Science Learning Facilitators	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	5	100.0%	5	100.0%
Round Robin for Site Coordinators	0	0	0	0	3	33.3%	6	66.7%	9	100.0%
Round Robin for Social Studies Learning Facilitators	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	7	100.0%	7	100.0%
Senior Project Video	0	0	0	0	3	12.5%	21	87.5%	24	100.0%
The Power of Peace Project	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%	6	100.0%	6	100.0%
Welcome - CIS PLC from the Beginning	0	0	0	0	5	29.4%	12	70.6%	17	100.0%
Who Am I Online - Creating your 21st Century Internet Presence	0	0	0	0	2	14.3%	12	85.7%	14	100.0%

**Session Ratings – How would you rate the quality of the information presented?**

Session Name	Quality Info									
	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent		Total	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Attitude Science	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%	11	100.0%
Breakfast Keynote: Bill Milliken, Co-Founder and Vice Chairman of Communities in Schools	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	8.6%	53	91.4%	58	100.0%
Capstone	0	0.0%	1	6.7%	4	26.7%	10	66.6%	15	100.0%
CIS Site Coordinators: Reframing Out Work to Include Student Engagement and Principles	0	0.0%	1	4.2%	2	8.3%	21	87.5%	24	100.0%
College Career Readiness: Charting for Success	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	22.2%	21	77.8%	27	100.0%
College/Career Readiness Track: Creating Pathways of Access and Success for Underrepresented Students	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	9	81.8%	11	100.0%
College/Career Readiness Track: Just Dual It!	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	100.0%	9	100.0%
Instructional Day: Using PLC Curriculum Resources to Design Your Courses and Integrating Project-Based Learning	0	0.0%	1	7.1%	3	21.4%	10	71.5%	14	100.0%
Intake Process Interviewing Potential Students	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	22.7%	17	77.3%	22	100.0%
Keynote - Practical Classroom Strategies	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	23	100.0%	23	100.0%
Keynote: Personal Learning Networks	0	0.0%	3	9.1%	9	27.3%	21	63.6%	33	100.0%
Life Skills through Morning Motivation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	23.5%	13	76.5%	17	100.0%
Lions, Otters, Beavers, Retrievers...Oh My!	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	7.1%	13	92.9%	14	100.0%
MATH Learning Facilitators: Math CCGPS Implementation Workshop	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%
PLC Coordinators and CIS Executive Directors: Reshaping the Way We Lead	0	0.0%	1	5.0%	5	25.0%	14	70.0%	20	100.0%
PLC Enhancement/Expansion Opportunity Track: ACT's College Readiness Solutions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	30.0%	7	70.0%	10	100.0%
PLC Enhancement/Expansion Opportunity Track: Apex Learning	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
PLC Enhancement/Expansion Opportunity Track: Classroom, Inc.'s Virtual Internship	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	55.6%	4	44.4%	9	100.0%
PLC Learning Facilitators: Using LDC to Make the CCGPS Transition Easier	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	75.0%	2	25.0%	8	100.0%
PLC School Leadership Creative Scheduling and PLC Data Reporting	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%	7	100.0%
Round Robin for Academic Coordinators	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	33.3%	4	66.7%	6	100.0%
Round Robin for Executive Directors	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
Round Robin for Mathematics Learning Facilitators	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	5	83.3%	6	100.0%
Round Robin for Science Learning Facilitators	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	4	80.0%	5	100.0%
Round Robin for Site Coordinators	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	33.3%	6	66.7%	9	100.0%
Round Robin for Social Studies Learning Facilitators	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%	7	100.0%
Senior Project Video	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	20.8%	19	79.2%	24	100.0%
The Power of Peace Project	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%	7	100.0%
Welcome - CIS PLC from the Beginning	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	11.8%	15	88.2%	17	100.0%
Who Am I Online - Creating your 21st Century Internet Presence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	14.3%	12	85.7%	14	100.0%

### Session Ratings – How would you rate the presentation skills of the trainer?

Session Name	Trainer									
	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent		Total	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Attitude Science	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%	11	100.0%
Breakfast Keynote: Bill Milliken, Co-Founder and Vice Chairman of Communities in Schools	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	6.9%	54	93.1%	58	100.0%
Capstone	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	6	40.0%	9	60.0%	15	100.0%
CIS Site Coordinators: Reframing Out Work to Include Student Engagement and Principles	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	16.0%	21	84.0%	25	100.0%
College Career Readiness: Charting for Success	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	14.8%	23	85.2%	27	100.0%
College/Career Readiness Track: Creating Pathways of Access and Success for Underrepresented Students	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	9	81.8%	11	100.0%
College/Career Readiness Track: Just Dual It!	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	100.0%	9	100.0%
Instructional Day: Using PLC Curriculum Resources to Design Your Courses and Integrating Project-Based Learning	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	21.4%	11	78.6%	14	100.0%
Intake Process Interviewing Potential Students	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	18.2%	18	81.8%	22	100.0%
Keynote - Practical Classroom Strategies	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	23	100.0%	23	100.0%
Keynote: Personal Learning Networks	0	0.0%	3	9.1%	8	24.2%	22	66.7%	33	100.0%
Life Skills through Morning Motivation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	11.8%	15	88.2%	17	100.0%
Lions, Otters, Beavers, Retrievers...Oh My!	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	7.1%	13	92.9%	14	100.0%
MATH Learning Facilitators: Math CCGPS Implementation Workshop	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%
PLC Coordinators and CIS Executive Directors: Reshaping the Way We Lead	0	0.0%	1	5.3%	5	26.3%	13	68.4%	19	100.0%
PLC Enhancement/Expansion Opportunity Track: ACT's College Readiness Solutions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	20.0%	8	80.0%	10	100.0%
PLC Enhancement/Expansion Opportunity Track: Apex Learning	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
PLC Enhancement/Expansion Opportunity Track: Classroom, Inc.'s Virtual Internship	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	33.3%	6	66.7%	9	100.0%
PLC Learning Facilitators: Using LDC to Make the CCGPS Transition Easier	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	62.5%	3	37.5%	8	100.0%
PLC School Leadership Creative Scheduling and PLC Data Reporting	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%	7	100.0%
Round Robin for Academic Coordinators	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	1	16.7%	4	66.6%	6	100.0%
Round Robin for Executive Directors	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
Round Robin for Mathematics Learning Facilitators	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	5	83.3%	6	100.0%
Round Robin for Science Learning Facilitators	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	4	80.0%	5	100.0%
Round Robin for Site Coordinators	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	22.2%	7	77.8%	9	100.0%
Round Robin for Social Studies Learning Facilitators	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	6	85.7%	7	100.0%
Senior Project Video	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	16.7%	20	83.3%	24	100.0%
The Power of Peace Project	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%	7	100.0%
Welcome - CIS PLC from the Beginning	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	12.5%	14	87.5%	16	100.0%
Who Am I Online - Creating your 21st Century Internet Presence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	7.1%	13	92.9%	14	100.0%

## Session Ratings – OVERALL RATINGS

Session Name	Overall by Sessions									
	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent		Total	
	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %	Count	Row N %
Attitude Science	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	11	100.0%	11	100.0%
Breakfast Keynote: Bill Milliken, Co-Founder and Vice Chairman of Communities in Schools	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	8.6%	53	91.4%	58	100.0%
Capstone	0	0.0%	1	6.7%	5	33.3%	9	60.0%	15	100.0%
CIS Site Coordinators: Reframing Out Work to Include Student Engagement and Principles	0	0.0%	1	4.0%	4	16.0%	20	80.0%	25	100.0%
College Career Readiness: Charting for Success	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	25.9%	20	74.1%	27	100.0%
College/Career Readiness Track: Creating Pathways of Access and Success for Underrepresented Students	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	18.2%	9	81.8%	11	100.0%
College/Career Readiness Track: Just Dual It!	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	9	100.0%	9	100.0%
Instructional Day: Using PLC Curriculum Resources to Design Your Courses and Integrating Project-Based Learning	0	0.0%	1	7.1%	3	21.4%	10	71.5%	14	100.0%
Intake Process Interviewing Potential Students	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	22.7%	17	77.3%	22	100.0%
Keynote - Practical Classroom Strategies	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	23	100.0%	23	100.0%
Keynote: Personal Learning Networks	0	0.0%	5	15.1%	7	21.2%	21	63.7%	33	100.0%
Life Skills through Morning Motivation	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	17.6%	14	82.4%	17	100.0%
Lions, Otters, Beavers, Retrievers...Oh My!	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	7.1%	13	92.9%	14	100.0%
Implementation Workshop	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	4	100.0%	4	100.0%
PLC Coordinators and CIS Executive Directors: Reshaping the Way We Lead	0	0.0%	1	5.3%	4	21.0%	14	73.7%	19	100.0%
PLC Enhancement/Expansion Opportunity Track: ACT's College Readiness Solutions	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	20.0%	8	80.0%	10	100.0%
PLC Enhancement/Expansion Opportunity Track: Apex Learning	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
PLC Enhancement/Expansion Opportunity Track: Classroom, Inc.'s Virtual Internship	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	5	55.6%	4	44.4%	9	100.0%
PLC Learning Facilitators: Using LDC to Make the CCGPS Transition Easier	0	0.0%	1	12.5%	6	75.0%	1	12.5%	8	100.0%
PLC Data Reporting	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%	7	100.0%
Round Robin for Academic Coordinators	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	5	83.3%	6	100.0%
Round Robin for Executive Directors	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	100.0%	2	100.0%
Round Robin for Mathematics Learning Facilitators	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	16.7%	5	83.3%	6	100.0%
Round Robin for Science Learning Facilitators	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	20.0%	4	80.0%	5	100.0%
Round Robin for Site Coordinators	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	33.3%	6	66.7%	9	100.0%
Round Robin for Social Studies Learning Facilitators	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	14.3%	6	85.7%	7	100.0%
Senior Project Video	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	12.5%	21	87.5%	24	100.0%
The Power of Peace Project	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	100.0%	7	100.0%
Welcome - CIS PLC from the Beginning	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	12.5%	14	87.5%	16	100.0%
Who Am I Online - Creating your 21st Century Internet Presence	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	2	14.3%	12	85.7%	14	100.0%