Communities In Schools of Georgia

End of the Year Summative Report

on Race to the Top

Performance Learning Centers

FY2014

Communities In Schools of Georgia

Submitted September 30th, 2014

End of the Year Summative Report on Race to the Top Performance Learning Centers FY2014

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Executive Summary provides information on three Performance Learning Centers (PLCs) developed by Communities In Schools of Georgia as part of the Georgia Department of Education's Race to the Top grant. The three Race to the Top PLCs are located within the Richmond County, Floyd County and Carrollton City school districts.

This 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 2013-14 year and student results during the 2013-14 school year.

Performance Learning Center Development

Developed in 2002 by CIS of Georgia, Performance Learning Centers (PLCs) have been validated by independent research to be effective in helping school districts to improve their graduation rates and reduce their dropout rates. PLCs are nontraditional learning environments for high school students who are not succeeding in traditional schools. Students work at their own pace, completing coursework online with the support of learning facilitators (LFs) provided by the district. PLCs employ the Communities In Schools model with each PLC having with a CIS site coordinator (SC) provided by the local CIS affiliate who provides students with the additional supports they need to be successful. Academic coordinators (ACs) lead the Performance Learning Centers.

Communities In Schools of Georgia provided support to the PLCs in implementation of the PLC model. This includes development and implementation of all PLC components including: Project-Based Learning, Academic Service Learning, Senior Projects, Individual Development Plans, Career Discovery, Dual enrollment/Post-secondary options, Morning Motivation, Tutorials, Charting for Success Advisory Lessons, Incentives, College Preparation, Mentors and Parent/Guardian Involvement.

Throughout the course of the grant, CIS of Georgia provided formal training opportunities and ongoing technical support for PLC development through the field support and evaluation departments. Formal training included PLC staff orientations, summer training institutes, PLC roundtable meetings and a PLC "roll call" webinar series. Each training was designed to assist PLC staff in implementation of the model.

Progress in Program Implementation. The RT3 PLC were assessed throughout the course of the grant for their progress in implementing each component of the PLC model according to a developmental rubric. Below are the highlights and challenge areas of development for each of the RT3 PLCs:

- **Carrollton City Performance Learning Center**
  - Carrollton City Performance Learning Center opened in August of 2012 and maintained the same staff throughout their 2 years of grant participation. The PLC is the first in the state to also serve middle school students.
  - **Areas of Strength** – Areas of strength for Carrollton City PLC are creative scheduling, student attendance, documentation, incentive program mentoring, incentive program, academic service learning, project-based learning and parent engagement.
    - **Program Highlights.** Carrollton City PLC utilized laptops to expand enrollment up to an additional 15 students. Their CIS site coordinator developed a relationship with a group called "College Girls Rock" from the University of West Georgia to mentor young women and encourage them toward post-secondary education. Carrollton City PLC has consistently had the strongest data collection and documentation of the 3 RT3 PLCs. The PLC was ahead of schedule in development of service learning projects and project-based learning was in place ahead of schedule.

- **Challenge Areas** – Challenge areas for Carrollton City PLC include curriculum, project-based learning forms, morning motivation, and student advisory.
    - **Areas in Need of Development.** Carrollton City PLC was slow in developing syllabuses that incorporate pacing guides, and project-based learning was not documented in the recommended forms. Carrollton City PLC lacks common space needed for large groups, which hampered conducting morning motivation. Advisory did take place, but the PLC lacked full student notebooks and individual development plans.

- **Floyd County Performance Learning Center**
  - Floyd County PLC opened in August of 2011 at the Floyd County Education Center.
  - The PLC relocated to the Floyd County College and Career Academy in August of 2013 (year 3 of the grant) with completely new staff.
  - **Areas of Strength** – Areas of strength for Floyd County PLC are the enrollment and recruitment process, differentiated instruction and small group instruction, senior projects, student advisory, capstone/job shadowing, incentive program, and mentoring.
    - **Program Highlights.** Floyd County PLC fully developed a student recruitment plan and interview process at the new location with a waiting list of students. The PLC operated with two highly qualified teachers using differentiated learning and small group instruction was implemented ahead of schedule. The PLC was ahead of schedule on senior projects, with all graduating seniors participating. The PLC developed relationships with technical colleges that provided student advisory supports and capstone experiences for PLC students. The technical college is across the street and students could take part in dual enrollment. Floyd County PLC developed a strong incentive program to encourage students. The move to their new location resulted in increased mentoring as the PLC is better located for volunteer access.
  - **Challenge Areas** – Challenge areas for Floyd County PLC include curriculum forms, morning motivation, and parent engagement.
    - **Areas in Need of Development.** As a new PLC site with new staff, course syllabuses with pacing guides were not fully developed. Floyd County PLC lacks common space needed for large groups, which hampered conducting morning motivation. Parent involvement activities were in the emerging stage.

- **Richmond County Performance Learning Center**
  - Richmond County PLC opened in August of 2011, but was without an academic coordinator most of the first year due to illness. A new academic coordinator was hired at the start of their second year and staffing remained stable through end of the grant.
  - **Areas of Strength** – Areas of strength for Richmond County PLC are the enrollment and recruitment process, documentation, curriculum, academic service learning, morning motivation, student advisory, incentive program, and parent engagement.
    - **Program Highlights.** Richmond County PLC fully implemented the interview process for students. They developed a division of labor for data collection and checking of data entry resulting in improved data quality. The PLC aligned curriculum with the Common Core Standards and further refined these standards for PLC. Richmond County PLC provided multiple service learning options for students. The PLC was innovative in implementation of morning motivation and developed homeroom "tribes" that worked together on projects. Richmond County implemented a strong advisory program with homeroom teachers taking the lead, an admissions advisory and development of graduation forms that students used to keep track of their progress.
  - **Challenge Areas** – Challenge areas for Richmond County PLC include senior projects, college tours, career pathways, and mentoring.
    - **Areas in Need of Development.** Richmond County PLC was slow in fully implementing senior projects as credit is not offered and students are resistant to participate. The CIS site coordinator failed to develop the partnerships necessary for internships and mentoring, with transportation being a contributing factor.

Student Outcomes 2014

PLC Staff collected student progress data at each of the RT3 PLCs. Below are overviews of the academic outcomes for Performance Learning Center students.

- **Carrollton City Performance Learning Center**
  - **Students Enrolled 2014:** 80 students – 74 high school and 6 middle school students
  - **Number of Graduates Since Start:** 28 total **-** 23 in 2014 and 5 in 2013
  - **Middle School Promotion:** All middle school PLC students were promoted to the next grade
  - **Academic Performance 2014**
    - Average of 7.21 credits earned per student during the year
    - 71.6% of students showing academic improvement overall
    - Statistically significant improvement in overall average, language arts, math, social studies and science
- **Floyd County Performance Learning Center**
  - **Students Enrolled 2014:** 81 students
  - **Number of Graduates Since Start:** 96 total - 45 in 2014, 30 in 2013 and 21 in 2012
  - **Academic Performance 2014**
    - Average of 4.4 credits earned per student during the year
    - 54.7% of students showing academic improvement overall
    - Statistically significant improvement in overall average, and social studies
- **Richmond County Performance Learning Center**
  - **Students Enrolled 2014:** 114 students
  - **Number of Graduates Since Start:** 79 total - 31 in 2014, 29 in 2013 and 19 in 2012
    - Average of 5.66 credits earned per student during the year
    - 88.3% of students showing academic improvement overall
    - Statistically significant improvement in overall average, language arts, math, social studies and science

Lessons Learned

One of the lesson learned with the RT3 PLCs was the importance of staffing, particularly in the position of the PLC academic coordinator (AC). The Richmond PLC lost its AC in the first months of operations due to illness and a new AC was not placed until Year 2. Absence in this key leadership role did hamper progress during the first year, but much progress was made once a new AC was hired.

Where a PLC is located can impact the implementation of some program components. Carrollton City and Floyd County at its new location had much greater access to college and career resources and volunteers such as mentors with their proximity to universities and technical colleges. Transportation challenges in Richmond County and at the first location of the Floyd County PLC limited volunteer involvement and access to certain resources at these sites.

Sustainability

Performance Learning Centers generally operate with small staff, including the academic coordinator, 2 to 5 learning facilitators, an administrative assistant and a Communities In Schools site coordinator. Some PLC sites may have a counselor, but that is not common. When CIS of Georgia first started PLCs, the majority were started as small stand alone schools which was more costly. Each of the Race to the Top PLCs are located on campuses with other programs, which we hope will help with efficiency and keep the cost of sustaining the programs lower.

All of the Race to the Top Performance Learning Centers are still in operation for the 2014-15 school year. At the start of the new school year, Carrollton City PLC had enrollment of 67 students, Floyd County 50 students and Richmond County 105 students.

End of the Year Summative Report
on Race to the Top
Performance Learning Centers
FY2014

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 (PLCs) as part of the State's Race to the Top grant. Communities In Schools of Georgia contracted with the following agencies to fulfill the contract: CIS of Carrollton City/Carroll County, Carrollton City Schools, CIS of Augusta/Richmond County, the Richmond County School System, Rome/Floyd CIS and the Floyd County School System. Richmond County Performance Learning Center opened in August of 2011. The Floyd County PLC opened in August of 2011 at the Floyd County Education Center and relocated to the Floyd County College and Career Academy in August of 2013. The Carrollton City Performance Learning Center opened in August of 2012.

This end of the year report provides information on the support and services CIS of Georgia provided to these three communities in developing their Performance Learning Centers, detail on their progress in implementing the model during the 2013-14 year, and the results for the students they served during the 2013-14 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 provided training and technical support to lead the local school districts and local Communities In Schools staff through the process of developing their Performance Learning Centers. The RT3 PLC Team for the grant was comprised of the CIS of Georgia director of field support, a field support curriculum & training coordinator, two field support coordinators, a field support program administrator, the director of evaluation and technology, one evaluation specialist and a data collection specialist. Each RT3 PLC was assigned a field support coordinator and an evaluation staff member who were their first contacts for ongoing support in the areas of program development and evaluation/data collection respectively. Reimbursement requests from the sites were processed by the field support program administrator. Formal training was provided throughout the year, in person and via webinar. Technical support and monitoring of program development took place through site visits, conference calls, email, and telephone contacts as needed.

Communities In Schools of Georgia required that PLC personnel receive and maintain adequate training and/or certification. All PLC staff were 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 was necessary for each PLC staff member to attend a multi-day PLC Summer Institute and participate in PLC Roundtables for academic coordinators and services

coordinators twice each year. These formal trainings were supplemented with webinars and conference calls conducted throughout the school year.

CIS of Georgia field support coordinators and other RT3 Team staff conducted 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.
- 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 provided 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 provided advice on the implementation of instructional and non-academic program components of the PLC model and served as a link to the district's central office, PLC network and CIS evaluation department.

Formal Training Opportunities Provided to RT3 PLCs During 2013-14

CIS Summer Institute 2013. PLC staff received intensive training at the CIS Summer Institute on July 17-18. The theme was "Making the Shift: Common Core for the PLC Classroom". Learning Facilitators from all three RT3 PLCs joined with those from other PLCs around the state in hands-on, active participation workshops which featured information and resources to help PLC staff to incorporate the Common Core Standards effectively. All participants were taught how to capitalize on the opportunity the Common Core shifts provide and gained new ideas for improving instruction in the PLC's blended learning environment. Separate workshops were held for literacy and math PLC learning facilitators designed by the PLC Curriculum Teams.

For ELA, Science, Social Studies and CTAE facilitators the first day focused on the big shifts involved in the Common Core Standards and featured online resources to help facilitators work towards those shifts. The PLC Curriculum Teams presented new units built in Module Creator to provide a sample framework for implementing the Common Core Literacy Standards. On the second day, Dr. Mary Lynn Huie, Literacy Trainer, oriented participants to the Literacy Design Collaborative and registered them on Module Creator to create rich projects in the PLC.

Math participants were oriented to the PLC Curriculum Resources wiki that the PLC Curriculum Team started, and shown how to add electronic resources (such as off-line assignments from jump drives) to the wiki, along with other techniques for increasing students' math skills.

Orientation for New Floyd County PLC Staff. A half-day orientation for new staff in the Floyd County PLC was held on August 2nd, 2013 before school started. Heather Garrett and Leslie Myles provided an overview to the PLC model with staff at the new PLC location at the College and Career Academy. Training covered the components of the PLC model, including providing the PLC manual and resources to assist the new PLC staff with implementing senior projects, service learning projects and college readiness.

MAP Pilot Trainings. CIS of Georgia launched a pilot of the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment in the first half of the 2013-14 school year. The MAP test could potentially replace the Pearson/NovaNET's Basic Achievement Skills Inventory (BASI) that assesses prospective PLC students' math and reading ability. Perhaps more importantly, MAP is now linked to E2020/Edguinuity coursework designed to remediate weaknesses. With this linkage, Individual Learning Plans are automatically generated using the MAP score information and can be assigned to a student with a click of the mouse. These plans contain lessons and quizzes to meet the student's skill deficits that reach into content from lower grades.

The first workshop, MAP administration training, was held on July 19, 2013 and facilitated by an expert from NWEA. The training prepared 24 PLC staff from four affiliates to:

- Develop and implement a plan to administer the MAP test
- Practice administering the test to students
- Communicate the purpose of the test to students and parents
- Assign the associated E2020/Edgenuity Individualized Learning Plans

The second workshop, Stepping Stones to Using Data, trained teachers and administrators (school and district level) to maximize the value of the data provided by the MAP assessments. Again led by expert from NWEA, the all-day workshop took place on October 1, 2013 and taught participants how to access, interpret, and apply data to inform instruction and monitor student academic growth. Six staff from three affiliates attended, and received resources to share workshop concepts with others within their schools and district.

The third MAP workshop, entitled "Climbing the Data Ladder", was held on March 7th, 2014. The training was a final hands-on workshop regarding the MAP test, focused on modifying instructional strategies and/or curriculum materials to meet students where they are (differentiation) and move them one or two levels up each year. In this workshop, attendees learned to use Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) results to support the instructional needs of all students. The workshop focused on basic concepts of differentiation, managing differentiation in the classrooms, designing instructional ladders and assessing student progress.

PLC Roundtables. CIS of Georgia held a PLC sustainability roundtable on September 17, 2013. The conference call was an opportunity to discuss sustainability issues, challenges, and prospective program innovations so CIS staff and PLC participants can create long- and short-term action plans. The action plans describe strategies to:

- Offer students Career Pathways
- Meet College & Career Readiness standards
- Maximize school district scores on the Career Readiness Performance Index

- Advocate and promote positive PLC results to garner additional tangible and intangible support from partners

Eleven PLC staff and five CIS of Georgia staff participated in the call.

A PLC Winter Roundtable was held on March 6th, 2014 for newer PLC sites. The Roundtable was entitled "Learning from Each Other" and was developed as a structured conversation around program implementation and innovative ideas for overcoming barriers to issues/challenges of developing a new Performance Learning Center. In attendance were representatives from Race To The Top PLCs as well as staff from the two new PLCs in Dougherty and Baldwin counties.

The roundtable included brainstorming sessions where attendees shared their ideas around the following topics:

- Authentic Learning, Teaching & Performance Assessment
- High Tech: online curriculum system & supplemental resources
- High Touch: individualized/hand-on/small-group instruction and supports that build on relationships to stretch students towards rigor
- Personalized/Positive School Culture
- Shared Leadership & Responsibility = Self-Managed Performance Track
- Supportive Partnerships = District/Community Engagement
- Future Focus = Post-Graduation Preparation

The CIS of Georgia Director of Evaluation shared the Developmental Rubric for Implementation of PLC Components with the participants, discussing expectations for program implementation for PLCs. The afternoon was spent discussing challenges and ways to address them. The roundtable ended with a PLC Elevator Speech Competition which allowed participants to practice explaining the PLC to other high school staff, parents, potential students and others.

PLC "Role Calls". CIS of Georgia developed a new series of webinars that were held in April of 2014 for PLC staff called PLC "Role Calls". The Role Call webinars allowed people in the PLC network in similar roles with similar responsibilities to share what's working and ask for suggestions about what isn't working at their sites and for their students. The objective of these webinars was to provide a forum to foster experimentation based on the knowledge base of the network, but also to build collegiality so that participants might be comfortable reaching out to each other individually or perhaps even partner together on projects or common goals. Four separate sessions were held - one for PLC site coordinators, one for math learning facilitators, one for language arts learning facilitators and one with science and social studies learning facilitators.

PLC Summer Training 2014. CIS of Georgia provided a Performance Learning Center Summer training July 15th - 17th in Atlanta. The theme of the training was "*Connecting with students, Learning from each*

other, Measuring success". The first day of the training was for new PLC staff and provided an overview to the Performance Learning Center Model. Areas covered included:

- PLC Operations
- Student Intake and Interviewing Potential Students
- Instructional Day:
  - PLC Curriculum Resources
  - Syllabi and Pacing Guides
  - Integrating Project Based Learning and Academic Service Learning
- Student Advisory and College Readiness
- Capstone
- Morning Motivation

The second and third days of the training were for all PLC staff. Day Two was focused on providing best practices and helping PLC staff to develop stronger connections within the network. Sessions included:

- How PLCs can help increase district CCRPI - presented by Linda Massenburg of GaDOE
- Practical Classroom Strategies for Creating a Positive School Climate - Ron Walker
- Group Discussions by Role at PLC
- Edgenuity Update

Day Three was focused on practical solutions for challenges and barriers within PLCs. Sessions included:

- Leadership that Creates a Responsive, Flexible Learning Environment to Speed Student Achievement
- Roundtables by Participant Role in the PLC
- At-Risk to College Ready - Christal Reynolds, presenter

Floyd County PLC Transition for 2013-14 School Year

Floyd County PLC underwent a significant transition at the end of the 2012-13 school year, with the district decision to close the original location of the PLC due to the district's budget deficit and reopen the PLC in the 2013-14 school year at the College and Career Academy (CCA) campus.

All of the existing teachers and administrators at the original PLC location were reassigned and the PLC reopened in August of 2014 at the CCA campus with new school system staff. At the end of October, the CIS site coordinator for Floyd County PLC left for maternity leave and made the decision not to return to work. As such, the PLC had completely new staff for the majority of the 2013-14 school year, in addition to a new location.

At the CCA, the PLC is housed in two large classrooms for the PLC with seats for 35 full-time students. The PLC is led by Alyson Lansdell and has two full-time highly qualified teachers who each support two subject areas - Jessica Rich (business and electives) and Carolyn Rowland (math and language

arts. Social studies and science courses are supported by three part time teachers, Steve McGraw and Clint Decker who teach social studies and Cindy Stinson who teaches science. Science is available every day during one block and Social studies is provided every other day during the 1st and 2nd blocks and daily during 3rd and 4th blocks. The PLC has been able to increase capacity by allowing students to flow over into the Spice Lab, where teacher Zelda Buford supports math and Plato. Melody Noyes joined as the new CIS site coordinator early in the second semester. At this new location, PLC students have access to career training within the Academy and from the Georgia Northwest Technical College which is located across the street from the CCA.

The transition went smoothly and despite the small size, the PLC served nearly the same number of students that it did in the former location during the year and graduated more students in 2013-14.

PLC Program Development

The RT3 field support and evaluation members worked together with Jerry Randolph of Georgia DOE in 2011 to create a rubric for PLC program implementation, establishing a developmental timeline for implementation of the components of the PLC model and aligning them with the Alternative Education Standards.

For each component, expectations are set for the level of proficiency during each semester of the first year, as well as for years 2 and 3 of PLC implementation. The PLC developmental rubric was first used in site visits from the CIS of Georgia Evaluation team in January of 2012, and reviews were conducted by the evaluation team each year of the Race to the Top grant. During the 2013-14 school year, Richmond County PLC was reviewed relative to the standards for Year 3 of implementation and Carrollton City PLC relative to Year 2 of implementation. The Floyd County PLC was compared relative to standards for Year 1 of implementation, given that the Floyd County PLC restarted the 2013-14 school year in new location with completely new staff.

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.

CODING	
PL = Planning	No expectations element should be in place; evidence of active planning to implement and development of needed resources should be evident and available
NE = Not Evident	Element should be in place, but no evidence of implementation or development of needed documents and/or resources
EM = Emerging	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
PR = Proficient	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
EX = Exemplary	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
NA = Not Applicable	Element is not applicable to or required during the particular time period of development. Standard may have been replaced by a different element in subsequent years.

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. Development of the enrollment and recruitment process generally is the responsibility of the PLC academic coordinator (AC) and/or the CIS site coordinator (SC).

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

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2		YEAR 3	
	End of 1st Semester	Floyd County	End of 1st Year	Start of 2nd Year	Carrollton City	Start of 3rd Year	Richmond County
	Expected	3/4/2014	Expected	Expected	3/3/2014	Expected	2/24/2014
ENROLLMENT/RECRUITMENT PROCESS							
PLC Orientation for all new students	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	PR	PR/EX	PR
Established Enrollment Plan	EM	PR/EX	PR	PR/EX	PR	PR/EX	PR/EX
Waiting list to fill open seats in PLC	NA	PR/EX	PR	PR/EX	PR	PR/EX	PR
75-100 students enrolled - If multi-program site - what constitutes PLC student?	NA	PR	PR	PR/EX	PR	PR/EX	PR/EX
Creative scheduling utilized to open more PLC seats	NA	EM	EM	PR/EX	PR/EX	PR/EX	PR/EX

Carrollton City. Carrollton City developed its enrollment and recruitment according to schedule, and was proficient in providing orientation to students. Carrollton PLC offers parent orientation at the end of the year and a parent night. The PLC conducts outreach for recruitment. During orientation, staff and parent go over the student handbook.

They have a go-to counselor and a graduation coach at the traditional school who helps recruit students for the PLC. Outreach is also conducted based on data pulled of students missing credits and those whose life circumstances, such as pregnancy, might make the program a good fit for the students. In addition to these more formal avenues of recruitment, PLC students have begun recruiting other students they believe might benefit from the PLC.

Creative Scheduling is in place, with the school utilizing additional technology to allow for enrollment of up to 15 additional students. PLC was at full enrollment (70) at the time of review.

Floyd County. The enrollment and recruitment process at the new Floyd County PLC was ahead of schedule with respect to recruitment and enrollment for a new PLC. The staff maintained and capitalized on relationships from the base high schools. This included:

- Speaking at faculty meetings to explain what the PLC is and who it is designed to serve at the beginning of the year to help alleviate confusion in the district and improve recruitment of appropriate students;
- The academic coordinator and CIS site coordinator personally conducting interviews of all student applicants on-site at their base high schools to make sure student applicants understood the program and that the program was a good fit for their needs.

In addition to traditional applicants, counselors often contacted the PLC if they had students with special circumstances such as transfer students from out of state who would not earn credit in the traditional school environment and other students who could benefit from the program. With only 2 teachers and classrooms with overflow into the SPICE lab, the PLC was only able to accept about half of the applicants

and maintained a waitlist. The PLC allowed students to accelerate by working at home but students had be in class to take exams (all except the medically homebound).

Richmond County. Richmond County PLC made tremendous progress in enrollment and recruitment during the 2013-14 school year. The site fully implemented the application and interview process resulting in reduced turnover among students. The PLC had a wait list for students hoping to enter PLC.

Richmond PLC was able to open further room for students by having an evening program with a group of teachers who served during one evening each a week and the virtual evening program was available for the rest of the week. The PLC had extended learning time Monday, Wednesday and Thursdays until 3 and the evening program at 6:30 pm on Tuesdays to provide students with additional learning time.

Student orientation was held every 9 weeks. All students went through the orientation each 9 weeks as Academic Coordinator Natalie Bracey indicated that students often forgot policies in that span of time.

Attendance. Table 1b below provides the summary of assessments for the three Race to the Top PLCs in the program area of student attendance. Attendance policies and review of attendance are generally the responsibility of the PLC academic coordinator (AC) and/or the CIS site coordinator (SC).

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

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2		YEAR 3	
	End of 1st Semester	Floyd County	End of 1st Year	Start of 2nd Year	Carrollton City	Start of 3rd Year	Richmond County
	Expected	3/4/2014	Expected	Expected	3/3/2014	Expected	2/24/2014
ATTENDANCE							
Attendance policy for absences and tardiness	PR	PR	PR/EX	PR/EX	PR	PR/EX	PR
All students made aware of attendance policy and sign form during orientation	PR	PR	PR/EX	PR/EX	PR	PR/EX	PR
Review attendance records to offer placement options for students in violation of attendance policy (EOY Intent Form)	EM	EM	PR	PR/EX	PR	PR/EX	PR
Review attendance policy to determine if it has been effective and revise as needed prior to start of school year.	NA	PL	PR	PR/EX	PR	PR/EX	PR

Commonality Across PLCs. All of the PLCs had attendance policies, frequently adopting those of their district in general, and students were made aware of the policies. Enforcement of the policies was somewhat lax at all of the sites and students with attendance issues were dealt with on a case by case basis at all of the PLCs, given the challenges each of the students face. The AC in Floyd County indicated that if they released a student, the student would have no chance of earning credit for the year, so as long as they are making some progress academically, they allowed them to stay in the program. The flexibility allowed PLCs to be a good environment for teen parents and students who had to work to help support their families.

Carrollton City. Carrollton City did not have tremendous problems with attendance in the district overall and the PLC followed the same trend. They did send home notes to parents and students signed the

student handbook to ensure they were aware of the policies. Carrollton also provided periodic attendance incentives to help maintain good attendance.

Floyd County. The Floyd County PLC added incentives for students with perfect attendance, providing those who attended every day with gift certificates for pizza and featuring the students on their website. They were lenient with students who had poor attendance and did take special circumstances into account. Non-attending students were allowed to continue for the year but would not be allowed to return next year if they did not improve in this area.

Richmond County. Attendance was an on-going challenge at the Richmond County PLC. Transportation options for students were poor, which made the situation worse. However, during the 2013-14 school year, attendance improved considerably and the attendance policy was enforced more often. Students could be placed on inactive status if they were non-attending and they were not allowed to come to the building while inactive. All calls were documented and made by teachers, and the site coordinator Regina Reid. Next steps for non-attendance included letters and home visits. If a student is inactivated twice, the student will be unenrolled. PLC does offer the evening program for those who are inactivated.

Documentation. All of the PLCs were found to be proficient or exemplary in their documentation of students.

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

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2		YEAR 3	
	End of 1st Semester	Floyd County	End of 1st Year	Start of 2nd Year	Carrollton City	Start of 3rd Year	Richmond County
	Expected	3/4/2014	Expected	Expected	3/3/2014	Expected	2/24/2014
DOCUMENTATION							
All student Pre-PLC information entered into CISDM	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	EX	PR/EX	PR/EX
All current student demographics and case record entered in CISDM	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	EX	PR/EX	PR/EX
Classes entered for each student	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	EX	PR/EX	PR/EX
Intake information on all current students	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	EX	PR/EX	PR/EX
Weekly Reports for every week/days school is in session	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	EX	PR/EX	PR/EX
Level 1 and Level 2 services entered for active students	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	EX	PR/EX	PR
Keep current all attendance and grade information for active	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	EX	PR/EX	PR/EX
Record of all students exiting the program/EOY status entered	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	EX	PR/EX	PR/EX
PLC Student Survey administered to students as they leave or at EOY	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	EX	PR/EX	PR/EX

Carrollton City. Carrollton City was quick to develop proficiency in data collection and the quality of data collection continued into the 2013-14 school year. The PLC administrative assistant, Wanda Todd, and the CIS site coordinator, Shae Holland, shared data entry tasks. The administrative assistant maintained the student academic data, while the site coordinator maintained all student intake and service data and was responsible for having students complete exit surveys. The two coordinated information using googledocs. Data monitoring showed that the site is functioning well on data collection.

Floyd County. The CIS site coordinator was responsible for all student data entry at the Floyd County PLC. The new site coordinator set up new mechanisms and procedures to ensure that she would have

the data she needs. With the gap in staffing of the SC position, some data collection fell behind and the CIS ED and new SC worked diligently to get all elements entered for the year's reporting.

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 was primarily responsible for data entry at their site. During the 2013-14 school year, the administrative assistant shared the data collection duties. The site functioned well in the area of data collection, with clear protocols for collection and entry of all data. The URL for the PLC student surveys was posted prominently in the office to help to ensure that they would have full participation.

Curriculum. Table 1d below provides a summary of assessments for the three Race to the Top PLCs in the program area of curriculum. Implementation is the responsibility of the PLC learning facilitators (LFs) under the guidance of the PLC academic coordinator (AC).

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

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2		YEAR 3	
	End of 1st Semester	Floyd County	End of 1st Year	Start of 2nd Year	Carrollton City	Start of 3rd Year	Richmond County
	Expected	3/4/2014	Expected	Expected	3/3/2014	Expected	2/24/2014
CURRICULUM							
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	EM	PR	PR/EX	EM	PR/EX	PR
All learning facilitators exhibit consistency in methods of differentiated instruction that includes various learning styles, scaffolding for lower level students and acceleration	PL	PR	EM	PR	EM/PR	PR/EX	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	EM	EM	PR	Not Observed	PR/EX	PR
LFs should continue to use the technology and updated resources to enhance their curriculum	NA	PR	PL	EM/PR	EM/PR	PR/EX	PR

Carrollton City. Carrollton City PLC used a hybrid model, utilizing the Edgenuity online curriculum program and supplemented by moving students back and forth to the traditional school for some courses, with buses provided to move the students back and forth. By the second year of operations, Carrollton City PLC learning facilitators developed syllabi for all courses and were working with Richmond PLC sharing information on the use of the online curriculum. They worked on aligning some coursework with the Common Core curriculum and they made changes based on the Common Core Standards. Carrollton City PLC incorporated some project based learning, but are not where they wanted to be.

Promethian boards were used in the classroom. Edgenuity was being customized to include the standards, but they were struggling somewhat with the customization. The AC did learn how to

customize to meet the basic standards for each of the courses and teachers were allowed to add in additional elements for those who could meet more challenging work.

Floyd County. Floyd County PLC operated with 2 highly qualified teachers who facilitated two subject areas each. Since the site was new for the 2013-14 school year, with the teachers being new to PLC, they did not have sufficient time to develop all syllabi for all courses with pacing guides, but they did implement differentiated instruction ahead of schedule for a new site. They conducted weekly reviews with each of the students who are provided with a transcript that they were responsible for updating, allowing the students to know where they stood with respect to coursework needed toward graduation.

Some students were in other areas of the CCA and take courses there. Students were allowed to work on tutorials at home, but were required to school to take tests unless they were homebound. This allowed students to move faster. There was not much group work – it was very individualized to the needs of the students. Students did help one another.

Richmond County. The PLC used Edgenuity for the second year and the district aligned the online curriculum with the Common Core Standards. This worked well for the site, placing them on target in implementation of the Common Core Standards and the PLC further refined the curriculum into 30 power standards.

Learning facilitators developed syllabi with individualized pacing for each student. Students were provided with final due dates for completion of courses. Each teacher started the day with group instruction based on EOCT elements, providing students with extra supports for the tests.

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. Implementation of project based learning is the responsibility of the PLC learning facilitators (LFs) under the guidance of the PLC academic coordinator (AC).

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

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2		YEAR 3	
	End of 1st Semester	Floyd County	End of 1st Year	Start of 2nd Year	Carrollton City	Start of 3rd Year	Richmond County
	Expected	3/4/2014	Expected	Expected	3/3/2014	Expected	2/24/2014
PROJECT-BASED LEARNING (PBL)							
Projects are aligned to standards and assigned by start of 2nd semester	PL	PL	EM	EM/PR	PR	NA	NA
Projects are documented in a PBL Planning form	NA	PL	EM	EM	PL	PR/EX	PL
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	EM	EM	EM/PR	EM/PR	PR/EX	EM/PR
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	NA	NA	NA	PR	EM/PR	PR/EX	EM/PR

Carrollton City. Carrollton City PLC began to implement project based learning at 8th grade and high school levels. At the time of the 2012-2013 assessment, learning facilitators at the site had just received training in the PBL tools available within Edgenuity. During the 2013-14 school year, learning facilitators incorporated more project based learning into courses so students would be challenged based on their ability. Project-based learning was not fully incorporated into the course syllabi, but this was in the planning stages.

Floyd County. Since Floyd County PLC relocated and had a new staff, they did not have sufficient time to develop all syllabi and projects for the 2013-14 school year. Students did participate in some project-based learning, but this was not fully formalized.

Richmond County. Richmond County PLC implemented project-based learning primarily led by Dr. Pennamon, the CTAE teacher and Mr. Pontoo, the social studies teacher. Projects within CTAE were individualized to the students and were focused on career. Since these were individualized, projects were not documented within the PBL planning form. Dr. Pennamon and Mr. Pontoo participated in the PLC CCGPS curriculum team/workshop last year and presented at the PLC Summer Institute. Dr. Pennamon's project was selected by the presenter Mary Lynn Huie to be submitted for "jurying" to be included on the exemplar list of modules from around the county.

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. Academic service learning projects are generally led by the PLC learning facilitators and may be supported by the CIS site coordinator.

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

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2		YEAR 3	
	End of 1st Semester	Floyd County	End of 1st Year	Start of 2nd Year	Carrollton City	Start of 3rd Year	Richmond County
	Expected	3/4/2014	Expected	Expected	3/3/2014	Expected	2/24/2014
ACADEMIC SERVICE LEARNING (ASL)							
Staff implements at least one academic service learning project	PL	PL	PR	PR/EX	PR	PR/EX	PR
The PLC offers 2 or more academic service learning opportunities with all students participating in at least one project	NA	NA	NA	EM	EM	PR	PR
The PLC has offers 3 or more academic service learning opportunities with all students participating in at least one project	NA	NA	NA	NA	PL	EM	PR
SENIOR PROJECTS							
The Senior Project should be developed and implemented, whereby complete all four parts of the Senior Projects	PL	PR/EX	EM	PR	EM/PR	PR	EM/PR

Carrollton City. Carrollton City PLC started academic service learning during the 2013-14 school year and implemented senior projects. They connected service learning with writing components. They did not have a large number of service learning projects for students to participate in. Senior projects were in the emerging to proficient stage. The Carrollton ELA teacher, Mrs. Gamble, assessed and led senior

projects as part of senior English. The CIS site coordinator helped the students with the senior project planning and worked with them on timelines. The PLC had difficulty in getting students interested in the senior project, as they did not receive separate credit for it. It was suggested that they incorporate this component into other coursework.

Floyd County. Floyd County PLC did not have sufficient time to develop service learning projects with the move to the new location and a new site coordinator, but they were planning for this component. For a new site, the PLC was well ahead of schedule on implementation of the senior projects, with this element fully implemented. Ms. Rowland, the English teacher, oversaw senior projects with students writing a paper and making a presentation before all of the staff. Students were encouraged to select a topic they were passionate about.

Richmond County. Richmond County PLC continued to implement academic service learning throughout the grant. They provided a number of service learning options, but not all students participated. The PLC had 4 service learning projects including voter registration, a blood drive, a garden project and breast cancer awareness. Senior projects were in the emerging to proficient stage. The staff worked to tie senior projects to project-based learning and academic service learning, however they had difficulty getting student buy-in since they did not get additional credit for the projects. They plan to have students work on senior projects commencing in their junior year, incorporating it as part of 11th grade literature in coming years.

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. Coordination of morning motivation may be assigned to any PLC or CIS staff member.

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

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2		YEAR 3	
	End of 1st Semester	Floyd County	End of 1st Year	Start of 2nd Year	Carrollton City	Start of 3rd Year	Richmond County
	Expected	3/4/2014	Expected	Expected	3/3/2014	Expected	2/24/2014
MORNING MOTIVATION							
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	PL	NA	PR	PR	PR	PR/EX
Students take more responsibility for leading with teacher approval	NA	NA	PR	PR	EM	PR/EX	PR/EX
Two or more student-led sessions per week	NA	NA	PL	PR/EX	PL	PR/EX	EM/PR

Carrollton City. Carrollton City PLC lacks a large central space to conduct large scale Morning Motivation. However, they implemented morning motivation in 2013-14 as daily announcements. A teacher and a student led Morning Motivation each day, with teachers rotating responsibility. Teachers were in

charge of the planning and they included an inspirational quote, news, announcements and student recognition.

Floyd County. Floyd County PLC did not implement Morning Motivation – there is no large physical location to gather all of the students together. They worked on individual student motivation and provided incentives.

Richmond County. Richmond County PLC implemented Morning Motivation within homerooms and had a weekly whole-group Morning Motivation. Each homeroom was designated as a tribe and they worked on projects together and motivation. The tribes gave the students a feeling of inclusion and goals to work toward as a team. The halls were decorated with tribe artwork, progress toward course completion and motivational elements. At the whole-group Morning Motivation sessions held on Wednesdays, the tribes were awarded house points for their progress. Learning facilitators led morning motivation, but they incorporated more student-led elements this year.

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. Student advisory is usually the responsibility of the PLC learning facilitators, but PLC academic coordinators, CIS site coordinators and school counselors may also assist in this area.

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

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2		YEAR 3	
	End of 1st Semester	Floyd County	End of 1st Year	Start of 2nd Year	Carrollton City	Start of 3rd Year	Richmond County
	Expected	3/4/2014	Expected	Expected	3/3/2014	Expected	2/24/2014
ADVISORY/CHARTING FOR SUCCESS							
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	EX	PR	PR	EM	PR	PR/EX
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	EX	PR	PR/EX	EM/PR	PR/EX	PR/EX

Carrollton City. Carrollton City PLC learning facilitators conducted advisement once monthly, with all students assigned to a particular learning facilitator by grade level. For 8th grade students, the CIS site coordinator conducted advisement. Dress For Success took place every Thursday and advisement included FAFSA and SAT assistance. The SC ensured that all student are GAcollege411 registered and charting their pathway for the next year. The SC maintained student folders, but they did not have full student notebooks and IDPs. These elements were emerging for 2013-14.

Floyd County. Floyd County PLC was very innovative in working with the local technical colleges within their advisement. Lisa DiPrima, career counselor from Georgia Northwestern Technical College, worked with the students on career planning, dual enrollment opportunities and provided COMPASS testing. Mr. Wheelis, a student doing practicum work at Georgia Highlands also provided supports to students in planning. Staff shared other components of advisory both academic and non-academic. Students maintained a graduation form with the courses they completed to encourage them to take responsibility for knowing what they needed to complete to graduate and keep them focused on making progress

toward graduation. The new CIS site coordinator focused on college and career readiness and developed notebooks for each of the students.

Richmond County. Richmond County PLC fully implemented advisory. The homeroom teachers were the primary advisors for students and the PLC also had an admissions advisor. The academic coordinator (AC) developed a graduation requirements form, encouraging students to take ownership for their path to graduation. When students completed a course, they entered it into their notebooks, Ms. Reid and Ms. Robinson had to sign off before a student could enroll in a new class. The CIS site coordinator was in charge of Charting for Success and provided opportunities such as college fairs and visits to technical college for students. All of the seniors now had GAcollege411 accounts that they updated regularly. Parents were given a copy of the course progress sheets at parent conferences.

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. Coordination of career capstone and job shadowing opportunities is generally the responsibility of the CIS site coordinator while dual enrollment is coordinated by the individual(s) conducting student advisories.

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

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2		YEAR 3	
	End of 1st Semester	Floyd County	End of 1st Year	Start of 2nd Year	Carrollton City	Start of 3rd Year	Richmond County
	Expected	3/4/2014	Expected	Expected	3/3/2014	Expected	2/24/2014
CAREER CAPSTONE/ JOB SHADOWING							
Site Coordinator coordinates with the technical college to set up Compass testing for graduating seniors	EM	EX	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR
Site Coordinator and Academic Coordinator establish a partnership with the technical college to get students dually enrolled	EM	EX	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	PR/EX	PR	PR	PR	PR	EM
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	PR	PR	PR	PL	PR	EM
Site Coordinator schedule group college tours, career/college day, job shadowing experiences with local businesses (hospitals, etc)	EM	PR	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	NA	EX	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR
Starting Year 2, 1st semester - Advisors identify new students on track to graduate and interested in dual enrollment. Work towards enrolling them by start of **2nd semester**	NA	PR	PL	PR	PR	PR	PR

Carrollton City. Carrollton City PLC made much progress in implementing career capstone in 2013-14. Students completed COMPASS testing with the help of West Georgia Technical College. The test was free for the first time, they were charged $15 for each element that requires a retake, which was a challenge. Some students did participate in dual enrollment at West Georgia Technical College, but transportation was been a barrier. They met pathways requirements by working in conjunction with the

high school. The AC is seeking to cover all pathways fully within the PLC in the future. One student participated in an internship and they hope to do job shadowing in the future in conjunction with senior projects. College visits took place led by the PLC, and students also had access to participate in those offered by the traditional school. Tours were paid for by RT3, and they are looking for donor support to continue these in the future.

Floyd County. Floyd County PLC provided many opportunities for Career Capstone and was ahead of schedule for a new site. Their partnership with Georgia Northwestern Technical College and Georgia Highlands provided students with additional resources for testing and advisement. Students were given the option to participate in internships as the 4th class in their career pathway, but many were not electing to participate as they wanted to complete their degree quicker and many needed to work. Lisa DiPrima from Georgia Northwestern conducted the Compass testing, and any student interested in dual enrollment was tested. The PLC had several student participating in dual enrollment. They had partnerships that do not use up Hope grant funds, removing that barrier to dual enrollment. Many community partners and college representatives visited and spoke with students over the course of the year.

Richmond County. Richmond County PLC had a relationship with Augusta Technical College, which provided testing for students in September. They had partnership for dual enrollment, and one student participated. Plant Vogtle provided guest speakers to the PLC, but they did not have many partnerships for internships. They hope to build these partnerships and there are a number of businesses within the area that they could potentially partner with, eliminating transportation as a barrier to implementation. The site coordinator arranged college and technical college tours for students.

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. Generally the CIS site coordinator is responsible for coordinating incentive programs, including the development of partnerships for donations and incentives.

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

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2		YEAR 3	
	End of 1st Semester	Floyd County	End of 1st Year	Start of 2nd Year	Carrollton City	Start of 3rd Year	Richmond County
	Expected	3/4/2014	Expected	Expected	3/3/2014	Expected	2/24/2014
INCENTIVE PROGRAM							
Establish and maintain school-wide incentive program for:	EM	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR
* Attendance	EM	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR
* Academic Achievement	EM	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR
* Good Citizenship (participating in various activities)	EM	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR
*Conduct	EM	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR
Work with local businesses to build upon established partnerships for donations, awards and incentives	EM	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR

Carrollton City. Carrollton City PLC performed well in developing incentive programs. They developed relationships with Papa John's, Chick-Fil-A, Taco Bell and Subway. Incentives included food coupons and gift cards. They implemented a "Caught in the act" bucket, a behavior incentive program in which

students selected prizes for good behavior. They had a "Tacos for Grads" incentive program with Taco Bell. A Student of the Month program was implemented.

Floyd County. Floyd County PLC had a well-established incentive program. Students were recognized for perfect attendance with coupons for pizza. The PLC focused on recognition of student accomplishments –students with perfect attendance and graduates were both featured in pictures on the school's website (http://floydcca.sharpschool.net/p_l_c). Graduates were celebrated, receiving a certificate and a graduation cupcake customized with the name of the graduate.

Richmond County. Richmond County PLC grew its incentive program for students during the 2013-14 school year. They had an awards ceremony during the first semester at the Kroc Center and students received items such as tablets, movie tickets and gift cards. Teachers had small incentives such as snacks while CIS handled getting bigger incentive items. Graduates received a medal and a certificate. They had another awards ceremony in the spring at the Snelling (Goodwill) Center. They maintained visibility of student progress through pictures of students in graduation caps in the AC's office. Student pictures were posted on the wall and their pictures were moved up with each credit they earned.

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. The CIS site coordinator is responsible for implementation of a mentoring program within the PLCs.

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

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2		YEAR 3	
	End of 1st Semester	Floyd County	End of 1st Year	Start of 2nd Year	Carrollton City	Start of 3rd Year	Richmond County
	Expected	3/4/2014	Expected	Expected	3/3/2014	Expected	2/24/2014
MENTOR PROGRAM							
Actively recruiting, screening and training mentors	PL	PR	EM	PR	PR	PR	EM
Students are matched with mentors, either individually or in groups of 3-5 students	PL	PR	EM	PR	PR	PR	EM

Carrollton City. Carrollton City PLC did successfully implemented its mentor program by the end of the grant. A few retired West Georgia College professors provided group mentoring. The SC Shae Holland conducted the mentor training including mandated reporting using the Georgia Power mentoring curriculum provided by CIS of Georgia. They recruited a group called "College Girls Rock" from West Georgia which included 6-7 mentors who worked to motivate and inspire young women to seek post-secondary education in order to achieve higher levels of success. Mentor training provided by the site coordinator included potential topics for mentor-mentee discussions such as technology, drunk driving, cyber-bullying, sexting, and how to dress, among others.

Floyd County. Floyd County PLC had a difficult time implementing a mentor program at its original site, due to the remote location. With the move to the new location, some mentoring did take place. They had 2 students with mentors through CIS – the mentors worked with the students within traditional schools and moved with the students to the PLC. The affiliate continued to work with industries near the new location to pull in additional mentors. Some of the teachers at the technical college functioned in a mentor capacity and the teachers served as mentors for the students. The new SC was working on develop a volunteer database.

Richmond County. Richmond County PLC had ongoing difficulties attracting mentors. They only had one mentor and one mentored student during the year.

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. All PLC and CIS staff are responsible for parent engagement.

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

	YEAR 1			YEAR 2		YEAR 3	
	End of 1st Semester	Floyd County	End of 1st Year	Start of 2nd Year	Carrollton City	Start of 3rd Year	Richmond County
	Expected	3/4/2014	Expected	Expected	3/3/2014	Expected	2/24/2014
PARENTAL ENGAGEMENT							
At least 95% of parents are contacted **quarterly** via telephone, email, newsletter, home visits and/or visit the PLC for conferences	PR	EM	PR	PR	PR/EX	PR	PR
At least two PLC-provided workshops or other special events are offered per semester with documented outreach to help ensure participation	PL	PL	PR	PR	PR	PR	PR/EX

Carrollton City. Carrollton City PLC had regular outreach to parents throughout the year. The CIS site coordinator would call parents if students did not show up for school and the AC and learning facilitators provided regular updates to parents. The PLC maintained a googledocs log for parent contacts. They provided a Christmas parent luncheon paid for by local businesses. The Site Coordinator developed an e-newsletter to inform parents. They also used the traditional school newsletter for parent outreach, including an item about the PLC in the newsletters. A FAFSA help session workshop and an awards banquet were held to further connect with parents.

Floyd County. With the move to the new site, Floyd County PLC had many areas to develop and parent programming was given lower priority, but they planned to develop this area in the future. The PLC did send reports of progress home to parents. The SC did make contacts with parents if students are missing classes.

Richmond County. Richmond County PLC performed well in engaging parents, with Ms. Worthy, the science teacher, heading up this area. They called parents as needed and held an open house on September 10th. They held had a number of parent engagement activities including PLC orientation, FAFSA support, and student progress. They have a website and newsletter for parent outreach. Conferences with parents took place on an as needed basis.

YEAR 3 STUDENT SERVICES AND OUTCOMES

This section of the report provides information on the students served at each of the Race to The Top PLC during the 2014 school year. Descriptive information on the student populations at each of the PLCs is provided, including demographics (gender, race/ethnicity, grade levels and age composition), student risk factors, and average daily attendance. Also presented is information on student services and parent involvement activities at the PLCs. Student outcomes, including end of the year status, academic performance, and student survey responses are presented in the last section of the report.

Student Data Collection at Performance Learning Centers

Staff at each of the PLCs 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 was monitored throughout the RT3 grant in the areas of academic performance, attendance, behavior, promotion/ graduation and plans for the future. The three main data collection tools were used for collecting data on the student experience at the 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 provides 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 County PLC, the CIS site coordinator was primarily responsible for entering information on the PLC student experience into CISDM. The Richmond County PLC, which started in the 2011-12 school year, and the Carrollton City PLC, which started in the 2012-13 school year, adopted patterns in which data entry tasks were shared between the site coordinators and administrative assistants. Each PLC collected and entered 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 coordinators also tracked 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 2013-14. Challenges were encountered with data collection at the Richmond County PLC during their first year operations, and they worked hard to improve quality and made great strides during their second year of operations. During 2013-14, they have improved further, with data collection shared between the administrative assistant who entered intake and academic information,

and the site coordinator who entered student services and assisted with entry of academic information. Overall, the data quality at Richmond PLC greatly improved each year of the program.

Data collection at the Carrollton City was exemplary from the program's inception, with data entry shared by the site coordinator and the administrative assistant. The team worked well on data entry, with protocols in place to ensure that all required data elements were entered.

At Floyd County PLC, data collection was the responsibility of the site coordinator. During the 2013-14 school year, the PLC had a change in staffing for the site coordinator position. The original site coordinator left the program at the end of October on maternity leave and did not return, which presented some challenges, with data collection shared by the CIS executive director and another CIS staff member until a new site coordinator was hired. Melody Noyes joined the PLC as the new site coordinator in February and developed better processes for collecting outcome data at the site, however, some monthly data was missing for the site.

Student Enrollment at the Race to The Top PLCs

The four tables that follow (Table 2, 2A, 2B and 2C) detail the month-to-month enrollment overall and at each of the three Race to the Top Performance Learning Centers during the 2013-14 school year, providing a snapshot of the number of students added and exited each month, active enrollment during each month and total enrolled year to date. Also included are year to date averages to provide an overview to the changes in enrollment during the year. In all, 275 students were enrolled at the three Performance Learning Center locations over the 2014 school year, with Carrollton City PLC serving a total of 80 students, Floyd County PLC serving a total of 81 students and Richmond County serving 114 students. On average, 171.2 students were actively enrolled per month at the PLCs, with an average of 20.3 new students entering each month and 23.5 students exiting each month.

During the year, the most common reason for exiting the program was graduating, with a total of 99 graduates across the 3 Race to the Top PLCs. For further details student exits at each of the PLCs, see Tables 8a and 8b.

Table 2: Enrollment Across all PLCS 2014

RT3 PERFORMANCE LEARNING CENTERS 2014	Month											
STUDENT ENROLLMENT	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	YTD	YTD TYPE
# of Students Enrolled At the End of Previous Month	72	179	196	188	178	155	146	153	127	120	151.4	Average
# of Students Added During the Month	114	22	15	1	1	20	18	7	2	3	20.3	Average
# of Students Exited During the Month	7	5	23	11	24	29	11	33	9	83	23.5	Average
# Enrolled at End of the Month	179	196	188	178	155	146	153	127	120	40	148.2	Average
Total Students Active During Month	186	201	211	189	179	175	164	160	129	123	171.7	Average
Total Enrolled Year To Date	186	208	223	224	225	245	263	270	272	275	275.0	Total

Carrollton City PLC Enrollment. At Carrollton City PLC, 80 students were enrolled over the course of the year, an increase over the previous year total. Thirty-two students enrolled at the end of the 2012-13 school year returned to the PLC program after the summer, a retention rate of 75% in the program. On average, 64 students per month were actively enrolled monthly at the PLC, with an average of 7.2 student exiting each month. Carrollton City PLC added an average of 4.8 new students per month.

The most common reason for exit from Carrollton City PLC in 2014 was graduating, with 23 Carrollton City students receiving their diplomas through the PLC.

Table 2C: Enrollment at Carrollton City PLC 2014

SITE: Carrollton City PLC	Month											
STUDENT ENROLLMENT	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	YTD	YTD TYPE
# of Students Enrolled At the End of Previous Month	32	71	70	71	69	70	56	53	51	51	59.4	Average
# of Students Added During the Month	40	3	1	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4.8	Average
# of Students Exited During the Month	1	4	0	2	0	17	3	2	0	43	7.2	Average
# Enrolled at End of the Month	71	70	71	69	70	56	53	51	51	8	57.0	Average
Total Students Active During Month	72	74	71	71	70	73	56	53	51	51	64.2	Average
Total Enrolled Year To Date	72	75	76	76	77	80	80	80	80	80	80.0	Total

Floyd County PLC Enrollment. At Floyd County PLC, 81 students were enrolled over the course of the 2013-14 school year. Although the PLC had a smaller capacity than in the previous years, recruitment was very successful and the enrollment at the new location nearly matched enrollment the previous year. Twelve students enrolled at the end of the 2012-13 school year returned to the PLC program after the summer, a retention rate of 52% in the program. On average, 46.6 students per month were actively enrolled at the PLC, with an average of 6.1 students exiting each month. Floyd PLC added students each month as students exited, bringing on an average of 6.9 new students each month.

The most common reason for exiting the Floyd County PLC was as a graduate, with 45 students (55.6% of total enrollment) receiving their diplomas through the PLC.

Table 2B: Enrollment at Floyd County PLC 2014

SITE: Floyd County PLC	Month											
STUDENT ENROLLMENT	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	YTD	YTD TYPE
# of Students Enrolled At the End of Previous Month	12	48	48	46	44	40	39	43	42	35	39.7	Average
# of Students Added During the Month	40	0	4	1	0	4	11	5	2	2	6.9	Average
# of Students Exited During the Month	4	0	6	3	4	5	7	6	9	17	6.1	Average
# Enrolled at End of the Month	48	48	46	44	40	39	43	42	35	20	40.5	Average
Total Students Active During Month	52	48	52	47	44	44	50	48	44	37	46.6	Average
Total Enrolled Year To Date	52	52	56	57	57	61	72	77	79	81	81.0	Total

Richmond County PLC Enrollment. At Richmond County PLC, 114 students were enrolled over the course of the 2013-14 school year, a decrease from the previous year as the PLC moved to a single session per day. Twenty-eight students enrolled at the end of the 2012-13 school year returned to the PLC after the summer, a retention rate of 75.6% of students. On average, 60.9 students per month were actively enrolled at the PLC, with an average of 10.2 students exiting each month. Richmond County PLC also added students each month as students exited, bringing on an average of 8.6 new students each month.

The most common reason for exit at the Richmond County PLC was as a dropout, with 40 students leaving the PLC. Most of the dropouts left during the first semester, as the PLC implemented the full recruitment process. Overall, 31 students (27.2% of enrollment) left the PLC as graduates.

Table 2C: Enrollment at Richmond County PLC 2014

SITE: Richmond County PLC	Month											
STUDENT ENROLLMENT	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	YTD	YTD TYPE
# of Students Enrolled At the End of Previous Month	28	60	78	71	65	45	51	57	34	34	52.3	Average
# of Students Added During the Month	34	19	10	0	0	13	7	2	0	1	8.6	Average
# of Students Exited During the Month	2	1	17	6	20	7	1	25	0	23	10.2	Average
# Enrolled at End of the Month	60	78	71	65	45	51	57	34	34	12	50.7	Average
Total Students Active During Month	62	79	88	71	65	58	58	59	34	35	60.9	Average
Total Enrolled Year To Date	62	81	91	91	91	104	111	113	113	114	114.0	Total

Student Demographics

During the 2013-14 school year, 275 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, 3A, 3B, 3C).

Ethnicity and Gender. The student population served across the three PLCs during the 2014 school year was ethnically diverse, with 49.5% of students being African American, 3.6% Hispanic, 5.5% multi-racial, 0.4% Native American and 40.7% 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 was primarily white (86.4%).

As to gender, more females were enrolled overall (55.3%) than males (44.7%). This is the reverse of the trend of the 2012-13 school year. Overall, African American females had the largest enrollment across all PLCs (26.2%), followed by African American males (23.3%), white females (22.2%) and white males (18.5%).

Student Grade Level. Freshmen comprised 11.6% of PLC students, with 17.1% being sophomores, 29.1% being juniors, and 40.0% classified as seniors during the year. The Carrollton City PLC also served 8th graders, who constituted 2.2% of PLC enrolled students.

Table 3: Student Demographics at All PLCs 2014

TOTAL 2014 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	1	0	0	**1**
		0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.4%**
	Black or African American	5	19	20	45	47	**136**
		1.8%	6.9%	7.3%	16.4%	17.1%	**49.5%**
	Hispanic	0	2	1	2	5	**10**
		0.0%	0.7%	0.4%	0.7%	1.8%	**3.6%**
	Multi-Racial	0	1	2	9	3	**15**
		0.0%	0.4%	0.7%	3.3%	1.1%	**5.5%**
	Native American	0	0	0	1	0	**1**
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	**0.4%**
	White	1	10	23	23	55	**112**
		0.4%	3.6%	8.4%	8.4%	20.0%	**40.7%**
	Total	**6**	**32**	**47**	**80**	**110**	**275**
		2.2%	**11.6%**	**17.1%**	**29.1%**	**40.0%**	**100.0%**
Female	Black or African American	2	11	13	21	25	**72**
		0.7%	4.0%	4.7%	7.6%	9.1%	**26.2%**
	Hispanic	0	2	0	2	3	**7**
		0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	1.1%	**2.5%**
	Multi-Racial	0	1	2	6	2	**11**
		0.0%	0.4%	0.7%	2.2%	0.7%	**4.0%**
	Native American	0	0	0	1	0	**1**
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	**0.4%**
	White	0	2	14	16	29	**61**
		0.0%	0.7%	5.1%	5.8%	10.5%	**22.2%**
	Female Total	**2**	**16**	**29**	**46**	**59**	**152**
		0.7%	**5.8%**	**10.5%**	**16.7%**	**21.5%**	**55.3%**
Male	Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	1	0	0	**1**
		0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.4%**
	Black or African American	3	8	7	24	22	**64**
		1.1%	2.9%	2.5%	8.7%	8.0%	**23.3%**
	Hispanic	0	0	1	0	2	**3**
		0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.7%	**1.1%**
	Multi-Racial	0	0	0	3	1	**4**
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.4%	**1.5%**
	White	1	8	9	7	26	**51**
		0.4%	2.9%	3.3%	2.5%	9.5%	**18.5%**
	Male Total	**4**	**16**	**18**	**34**	**51**	**123**
		1.5%	**5.8%**	**6.5%**	**12.4%**	**18.5%**	**44.7%**

Carrollton City PLC Student Ethnicity, Gender and Grade Level

Ethnicity and Gender. The student population served by Carrollton City PLC during the 2014 school year was ethnically diverse, with 55.0% of students being African American, 3.8% Hispanic, 13.8% multi-racial and 26.3% white. Compared to the district ethnic distribution, African American students were over-represented at nearly double the district population (30.5% African American in district), and white students constituted slightly over half the percentage attending in the district overall (45.2%).

As to gender, more females were enrolled at Carrollton City PLC overall (61.3%) than males (38.8%). Overall, African American females had the largest enrollment (35.0%), followed by African American males (20.0%), white males (15.0%) and white and multi-racial females (11.3%).

Student Grade Level. The Carrollton City PLC served students from 8th grade to 12th grade. Eighth grade students constituted 7.5% of PLC enrolled students, with 18.8% being freshmen, 25.0% being sophomores, 23.8% being juniors, and 25.0% classified as seniors during the year.

Table 3A: Student Demographics at Carrollton City PLC 2014

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	9	11	9	10	**44**
		6.3%	11.3%	13.8%	11.3%	12.5%	**55.0%**
	Hispanic	0	1	0	0	2	**3**
		0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	**3.8%**
	Multi-Racial	0	1	1	7	2	**11**
		0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	8.8%	2.5%	**13.8%**
	White	1	4	7	3	6	**21**
		1.3%	5.0%	8.8%	3.8%	7.5%	**26.3%**
	Total	**6**	**15**	**20**	**19**	**20**	**80**
		7.5%	**18.8%**	**25.0%**	**23.8%**	**25.0%**	**100.0%**
Female	Black or African American	2	5	9	6	6	**28**
		2.5%	6.3%	11.3%	7.5%	7.5%	**35.0%**
	Hispanic	0	1	0	0	2	**3**
		0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	**3.8%**
	Multi-Racial	0	1	2	5	1	**9**
		0.0%	1.3%	2.5%	6.3%	1.3%	**11.3%**
	White	0	1	3	2	3	**9**
		0.0%	1.3%	3.8%	2.5%	3.8%	**11.3%**
	Female Total	**2**	**8**	**14**	**13**	**12**	**49**
		2.5%	**10.0%**	**17.5%**	**16.3%**	**15.0%**	**61.3%**
Male	Black or African American	3	4	2	3	4	**16**
		3.8%	5.0%	2.5%	3.8%	5.0%	**20.0%**
	Multi-Racial	0	0	0	2	1	**3**
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	1.3%	**3.8%**
	Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
	White	1	3	4	1	3	**12**
		1.3%	3.8%	5.0%	1.3%	3.8%	**15.0%**
	Male Total	**4**	**7**	**6**	**6**	**8**	**31**
		5.0%	**8.8%**	**7.5%**	**7.5%**	**10.0%**	**38.8%**

Floyd County PLC Student Ethnicity, Gender and Grade Level

Ethnicity and Gender. The student population served by Floyd County PLC during the 2014 school year was largely white at 86.4% of the population, 7.4% African American, 4.9% Hispanic, and 1.2% multi-racial. While the district student population was comprised mostly of white students (81.5%), white students were represented at Floyd PLC at a rate higher than the district average.

As to gender, more females were enrolled at Floyd County PLC overall (60.5%) than males (39.5%). Overall, white females had the largest enrollment (53.1%), followed by white males (33.3%), and African American females (4.9%).

Student Grade Level. Freshmen comprised 4.9% of Floyd County PLC students during the year, with 12.3% being sophomores, 23.5% being juniors, and 59.3% classified as seniors. Of the three RT3 PLCs, Floyd County had the largest percentage of seniors among their enrollment.

Table 3B: Student Demographics at Floyd County PLC 2014

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	0	1	1	4	**6**
		0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	4.9%	**7.4%**
	Hispanic	0	1	2	1	**4**
		0.0%	1.2%	2.5%	1.2%	**4.9%**
	Multi-Racial	0	0	1	0	**1**
		0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	**1.2%**
	White	4	8	15	43	**70**
		4.9%	9.9%	18.5%	53.1%	**86.4%**
	Total	**4**	**10**	**19**	**48**	**81**
		4.9%	**12.3%**	**23.5%**	**59.3%**	**100.0%**
Female	Black or African American	0	0	1	3	**4**
		0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	3.7%	**4.9%**
	Hispanic	0	0	2	0	**2**
		0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	**2.5%**
	Multi-Racial	0	0	0	0	**0**
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.0%**
	White	1	6	10	26	**43**
		1.2%	7.4%	12.3%	32.1%	**53.1%**
	Female Total	**1**	**6**	**13**	**29**	**49**
		1.2%	**7.4%**	**16.0%**	**35.8%**	**60.5%**
Male	Black or African American	0	1	0	1	**2**
		0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	**2.5%**
	Multi-Racial	0	0	1	0	**1**
		0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	**1.2%**
	Hispanic	0	1	0	1	**2**
		0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	**2.5%**
	White	3	2	5	17	**27**
		3.7%	2.5%	6.2%	21.0%	**33.3%**
	Male Total	**3**	**4**	**6**	**19**	**32**
		3.7%	**4.9%**	**7.4%**	**23.5%**	**39.5%**

Richmond County PLC Student Ethnicity, Gender and Grade Level

Ethnicity and Gender. The student population served by Richmond County PLC during the 2014 school year was largely African American, with 75.4% of students being African American, 18.4% white, 2.6% Hispanic, 1.8% Multi-racial and 0.9% Native American and Asian/Pacific Islanders. The Richmond County PLC ethnic and racial composition was closest to the district averages, with African American students represented at a rate slightly higher than the district average (72.7% African American) and white students being very slightly under-represented relative to the district population (19%).

As to gender, The Richmond County PLC was the only one with more males enrolled overall (52.6%) than females (47.4%). Overall, African American males had the largest enrollment (40.4%), followed by African American females (35.1%), and white males (10.5%). White females made up 7.9% of the students, followed by female Hispanic students and female multi-racial students, each constituting 1.8% of the student population.

Student Grade Level. Freshmen comprised 10.0% of Richmond County PLC students, with 14.4% being sophomores, 35.6% being juniors, and 40% classified as seniors.

Table 3C: Student Demographics at Richmond County PLC 2014

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	1	0	0	**1**
		0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.9%**
	Black or African American	10	8	35	33	**86**
		8.8%	7.0%	30.7%	28.9%	**75.4%**
	Hispanic	1	0	0	2	**3**
		0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	**2.6%**
	Multi-Racial	0	0	1	1	**2**
		0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	**1.8%**
	Native American	0	0	1	0	**1**
		0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	**0.9%**
	White	2	8	5	6	**21**
		1.8%	7.0%	4.4%	5.3%	**18.4%**
	Total	**13**	**17**	**42**	**42**	**114**
		11.4%	**14.9%**	**36.8%**	**36.8%**	**100.0%**
Female	Black or African American	6	4	14	16	**40**
		5.3%	3.5%	12.3%	14.0%	**35.1%**
	Hispanic	1	0	0	1	**2**
		0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	**1.8%**
	Multi-Racial	0	0	1	1	**2**
		0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	**1.8%**
	Native American	0	0	1	0	**1**
		0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	**0.9%**
	White	0	5	4	0	**9**
		0.0%	4.4%	3.5%	0.0%	**7.9%**
	Female Total	**7**	**9**	**20**	**18**	**54**
		6.1%	**7.9%**	**17.5%**	**15.8%**	**47.4%**
Male	Asian or Pacific Islander	0	1	0	0	**1**
		0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	**0.9%**
	Black or African American	4	4	21	17	**46**
		3.5%	3.5%	18.4%	14.9%	**40.4%**
	Hispanic	0	0	0	1	**1**
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	**0.9%**
	White	2	3	1	6	**12**
		1.8%	2.6%	0.9%	5.3%	**10.5%**
	Male Total	**6**	**8**	**22**	**24**	**60**
		5.3%	**7.0%**	**19.3%**	**21.1%**	**52.6%**

Age of Student Population

The tables on the page that follows (Table 4, 4A, 4B, 4C) present age of the student population overall and at each PLC at the start of the 2013-14 school year, showing the minimum, maximum and average age of PLC students by grade level relative to the expected maximum age if a student were on track for on-time graduation. For the high school level students, the average age figures indicate student populations that were behind for on-time graduation, so for many, the self-paced learning environment at Performance Learning Centers was a final chance for 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, 0.9 years older than expected, juniors 0.6 years older and seniors 0.1 years older on average.

The maximum ages for the grade levels indicate that some of the students were as much as 4.2 years over the maximum expected age for their grade level. For ninth graders, the highest age reported was 18.6, for sophomores the highest age was 19.4, for juniors 21.2 and 21.7 for seniors. Across all grade levels, African American students tended to be older, with African American males being the oldest group on average in grades 10 through 12.

Table 4: Student Age by Grade Level, Gender and Ethnicity - All PLCs 2014

2014 RT3 PLCs																Student Grade Level, Gender and Ethnicity
Age at Beginning of the Year		9th Grade			10th Grade			11th Grade			12th Grade			Total		
	Expected Maximum Age	15			16			17			18					
Gender	Ethnicity	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum
Female	Black or African American	16.1	14.1	18.5	16.5	15.2	18.7	17.9	16.4	21.2	18.4	15.1	21.0	17.4	13.9	21.2
	Hispanic	16.8	15.0	18.6	NA	NA	NA	16.9	16.9	16.9	18.3	17.6	19.5	17.6	15.0	19.5
	Multi-Racial	14.1	14.1	14.1	16.4	15.0	17.9	16.8	16.2	17.4	18.1	17.6	18.5	16.7	14.1	18.5
	Native American	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	19.3	19.3	19.3	NA	NA	NA	19.3	19.3	19.3
	White	14.1	14.0	14.2	16.9	15.7	18.8	16.8	16.0	18.3	17.5	15.9	18.7	17.1	14.0	18.8
	Total Females	15.8	14.0	18.6	16.7	15.0	18.8	17.4	16.0	21.2	17.9	15.1	21.0	17.3	13.9	21.2
Male	Asian or Pacific Islander	NA	NA	NA	17.4	17.4	17.4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	17.4	17.4	17.4
	Black or African American	16.8	15.0	17.9	17.5	15.5	19.4	18.1	15.9	19.6	18.9	16.9	21.7	17.9	12.9	21.7
	Hispanic	NA	NA	NA	17.5	17.5	17.5	NA	NA	NA	18.1	18.1	18.1	17.8	17.5	18.1
	Multi-Racial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18.2	17.9	18.5	17.5	17.5	17.5	18.0	17.5	18.5
	White	15.5	14.0	17.1	16.7	15.8	18.5	17.3	16.7	18.1	18.0	16.8	20.0	17.2	13.8	20.0
	Total Males	16.2	14.0	17.9	17.1	15.5	19.4	18.0	15.9	19.6	18.4	16.8	21.7	17.7	12.9	21.7
Total	Asian or Pacific Islander	NA	NA	NA	17.4	17.4	17.4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	17.4	17.4	17.4
	Black or African American	16.4	14.1	18.5	16.9	15.2	19.4	18.0	15.9	21.2	18.6	15.1	21.7	17.7	12.9	21.7
	Hispanic	16.8	15.0	18.6	17.5	17.5	17.5	16.9	16.9	16.9	18.3	17.6	19.5	17.6	15.0	19.5
	Multi-Racial	14.1	14.1	14.1	16.4	15.0	17.9	17.2	16.2	18.5	17.9	17.5	18.5	17.0	14.1	18.5
	Native American	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	19.3	19.3	19.3	NA	NA	NA	19.3	19.3	19.3
	White	15.1	14.0	17.1	16.8	15.7	18.8	17.0	16.0	18.3	17.7	15.9	20.0	17.1	13.8	20.0
	Total	16.0	14.0	18.6	16.9	15.0	19.4	17.6	15.9	21.2	18.1	15.1	21.7	17.4	12.9	21.7

Age of Carrollton City PLC Student Population. On average, students at Carrollton City PLC did not have as wide a gap in age compared with expectations. Freshmen were on average 0.1 years older than the expected maximum age, sophomores 0.2 years older, juniors 0.1 years older and seniors 0.4 years younger than the expected maximum age.

The maximum ages for the grade levels indicate that some of the students were as much as 2.9 years over the maximum expected age for their grade level. For ninth graders, the highest age reported was 17.9, for sophomores the highest age was 17.9, for juniors 18.9 and 19.1 for seniors.

Table 4A: Student Age by Grade Level, Gender and Ethnicity - Carrollton City PLC 2014

SITE: Carrollton City PLC																Student Grade Level, Gender and Ethnicity
Age at Beginning of the Year		9th Grade			10th Grade			11th Grade			12th Grade			Total		
	Expected Maximum Age	15			16			17			18					
Gender	Ethnicity	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum
Female	Black or African American	15.0	14.1	16.3	16.2	15.2	17.3	17.3	16.4	18.9	17.4	15.1	19.1	16.3	13.9	19.1
	Hispanic	15.0	15.0	15.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	17.7	17.6	17.8	16.8	15.0	17.8
	Multi-Racial	14.1	14.1	14.1	16.4	15.0	17.9	16.6	16.2	17.4	17.6	17.6	17.6	16.4	14.1	17.9
	White	14.2	14.2	14.2	15.9	15.7	16.1	16.5	16.2	16.8	17.6	17.0	18.7	16.4	14.2	18.7
	Total Females	14.8	14.1	16.3	16.2	15.0	17.9	16.9	16.2	18.9	17.5	15.1	19.1	16.4	13.9	19.1
Male	Black or African American	16.0	15.0	17.9	15.9	15.5	16.3	17.0	16.3	17.6	17.9	17.5	18.3	16.3	12.9	18.3
	Multi-Racial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18.0	17.9	18.2	17.5	17.5	17.5	17.9	17.5	18.2
	White	14.5	14.0	14.7	16.4	15.8	17.1	18.1	18.1	18.1	17.4	17.3	17.4	16.1	13.8	18.1
	Total Males	15.4	14.0	17.9	16.2	15.5	17.1	17.5	16.3	18.2	17.6	17.3	18.3	16.3	12.9	18.3
Total	Black or African American	15.5	14.1	17.9	16.1	15.2	17.3	17.2	16.3	18.9	17.6	15.1	19.1	16.3	12.9	19.1
	Hispanic	15.0	15.0	15.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	17.7	17.6	17.8	16.8	15.0	17.8
	Multi-Racial	14.1	14.1	14.1	16.4	15.0	17.9	17.0	16.2	18.2	17.6	17.5	17.6	16.8	14.1	18.2
	White	14.4	14.0	14.7	16.2	15.7	17.1	17.0	16.2	18.1	17.5	17.0	18.7	16.2	13.8	18.7
	Total	15.1	14.0	17.9	16.2	15.0	17.9	17.1	16.2	18.9	17.6	15.1	19.1	16.4	12.9	19.1

Age of Floyd County PLC Student Population. Students at Floyd County PLC also did not have as wide a gap in age compared with expectations. Freshmen were on average 0.2 years younger than the maximum expected age, sophomores 0.5 years older than the maximum expected age, juniors 0.1 year younger than the maximum and seniors 0.4 years younger than the expected maximum age at entry.

The maximum ages for the grade levels indicate that some of the students were as much as 2 years over the maximum expected age for their grade level. For freshmen the highest age was 15.6, sophomores the highest age was 17.5, for juniors 18.5 and 20.0 for seniors.

Table 4B: Student Age by Grade Level, Gender and Ethnicity - Floyd County PLC 2014

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 Maximum Age	15			16			17			18					
Gender	Ethnicity	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum
Female	Black or African American	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18.0	18.0	18.0	18.2	17.5	19.2	18.2	17.5	19.2
	Hispanic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	16.9	16.9	16.9	NA	NA	NA	16.9	16.9	16.9
	White	14.0	14.0	14.0	16.4	15.9	17.3	16.4	16.0	17.1	17.5	15.9	18.6	17.0	14.0	18.6
	Total Females	14.0	14.0	14.0	16.4	15.9	17.3	16.6	16.0	18.0	17.6	15.9	19.2	17.1	14.0	19.2
Male	Black or African American	NA	NA	NA	16.0	16.0	16.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	16.0	16.0	16.0
	Hispanic	NA	NA	NA	17.5	17.5	17.5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	17.5	17.5	17.5
	Multi-Racial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18.5	18.5	18.5	NA	NA	NA	18.5	18.5	18.5
	White	15.6	15.6	15.6	16.3	16.1	16.5	17.1	16.7	17.9	17.7	16.8	20.0	17.4	15.6	20.0
	Total Males	15.6	15.6	15.6	16.5	16.0	17.5	17.3	16.7	18.5	17.7	16.8	20.0	17.4	15.6	20.0
Total	Black or African American	NA	NA	NA	16.0	16.0	16.0	18.0	18.0	18.0	18.2	17.5	19.2	17.7	16.0	19.2
	Hispanic	NA	NA	NA	17.5	17.5	17.5	16.9	16.9	16.9	NA	NA	NA	17.2	16.9	17.5
	Multi-Racial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18.5	18.5	18.5	NA	NA	NA	18.5	18.5	18.5
	White	14.8	14.0	15.6	16.4	15.9	17.3	16.7	16.0	17.9	17.6	15.9	20.0	17.2	14.0	20.0
	Total	14.8	14.0	15.6	16.5	15.9	17.5	16.9	16.0	18.5	17.6	15.9	20.0	17.2	14.0	20.0

Age of Richmond County PLC Student Population. Of the three Race to the Top PLCs, Richmond County PLC students were by far much farther behind in grade level for their age. Freshmen were on average 2.3 years older than expected, with a maximum age of 18.6, sophomores were 1.8 years older with a maximum age of 19.4, juniors 1.2 years older with a maximum age of 21.2 and seniors 0.9 years older with a maximum age of 21.7. The high age of the Richmond students may account, in part, for higher number of dropouts at the site.

Table 4C: Student Age by Grade Level, Gender and Ethnicity - Richmond County PLC 2014

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 Maximum Age	15			16			17			18					
Gender	Ethnicity	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Minimum	Maximum
Female	Black or African American	17.0	16.3	18.5	17.3	16.2	18.7	18.1	17.0	21.2	18.8	16.6	21.0	18.1	16.2	21.2
	Hispanic	18.6	18.6	18.6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	19.5	19.5	19.5	19.1	18.6	19.5
	Multi-Racial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	17.3	17.3	17.3	18.5	18.5	18.5	17.9	17.3	18.5
	Native American	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	19.3	19.3	19.3	NA	NA	NA	19.3	19.3	19.3
	White	NA	NA	NA	17.9	16.7	18.8	17.9	17.3	18.3	NA	NA	NA	17.9	16.7	18.8
	Total Females	17.3	16.3	18.6	17.6	16.2	18.8	18.1	17.0	21.2	18.8	16.6	21.0	18.1	16.2	21.2
Male	Asian or Pacific Islander	NA	NA	NA	17.4	17.4	17.4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	17.4	17.4	17.4
	Black or African American	17.6	17.3	17.9	18.7	18.0	19.4	18.3	15.9	19.6	19.1	16.9	21.7	18.6	15.9	21.7
	Hispanic	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18.1	18.1	18.1	18.1	18.1	18.1
	White	16.9	16.7	17.1	17.4	16.5	18.5	17.9	17.9	17.9	18.8	17.3	19.8	18.1	16.5	19.8
	Total Males	17.3	16.7	17.9	18.0	16.5	19.4	18.3	15.9	19.6	19.0	16.9	21.7	18.4	15.9	21.7
Total	Asian or Pacific Islander	NA	NA	NA	17.4	17.4	17.4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	17.4	17.4	17.4
	Black or African American	17.3	16.3	18.5	18.0	16.2	19.4	18.2	15.9	21.2	19.0	16.6	21.7	18.4	15.9	21.7
	Hispanic	18.6	18.6	18.6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	18.8	18.1	19.5	18.7	18.1	19.5
	Multi-Racial	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	17.3	17.3	17.3	18.5	18.5	18.5	17.9	17.3	18.5
	Native American	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	19.3	19.3	19.3	NA	NA	NA	19.3	19.3	19.3
	White	16.9	16.7	17.1	17.7	16.5	18.8	17.9	17.3	18.3	18.8	17.3	19.8	18.0	16.5	19.8
	Total	17.3	16.3	18.6	17.8	16.2	19.4	18.2	15.9	21.2	18.9	16.6	21.7	18.3	15.9	21.7

Risk Factors for Race to the Top PLC Students

The tables (Table 5, 5A, 5B, 5C) that follow enumerate the risk factors that students came to PLC with during the 2013-14 school year, broken down by race and ethnicity, with percent of total student population indicated for each risk factor. The risk factors that are included in the CIS student data collection system are factors or conditions that have been identified in dropout research to significantly increase the likelihood of students dropping out of school. These risk factors are enumerated in *Dropout Risk Factors and Exemplary Programs: A Technical Report* which was developed and published by the National Dropout Prevention Center at Clemson University and Communities In Schools, Inc. in 2007. The dropout 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 school records to determine presence of proven dropout risk factors as part of the individual student plan. During the interviews, the CIS site coordinators and other staff may discuss student aspirations and goals for their future, their past history in school, family life and peer relationships. Further information may be provided through discussions with students and parents at school or during home visits to the family.

The majority of the risk factors are self-explanatory, with site coordinators utilizing the definitions provided in *Dropout Risk Factors and Exemplary Programs: A Technical Report,* as guides for establishing

presence of risk factors. Academic, attendance and school behavior risk factors are drawn from student transcripts and school staff reports of challenges. Formal scales or testing are generally not utilized in identifying most other issues, but instead are based on student or family self-report taken during interviews and home visits. Below are descriptions of some of the risk factors.

- *Family disruption:* Family changes including divorce, marriage, a family move or frequently moving, illness or death, incarceration of a parent, and parents or other adults coming into or leaving the household.
- *Low Socioeconomic status:* This is generally identified through free or reduced price lunch status, however, CIS site coordinators may also identify through students requesting CIS basic needs services that indicate economic hardship such as assistance with food, clothing, school supplies, housing, utility fees, and eyeglasses.
- *Low Educational Expectations (Student or Family)* – Student/Family member expresses indifference toward school completion/views completion as unimportant.
- *Parental Educational Levels* – Parent(s) or guardian have not completed high school.
- *Commitment to School* – May be determined in multiple ways such as student expressing poor attitudes toward school ("do not like/care"), indicating a lack of importance of success and educational aspirations, or by behavior such as skipping school.
- *Academic Performance* – Poor academic performance may be identified by a variety of factors such as failing one or more classes, not meeting standards on standardized testing, not completing coursework or homework satisfactorily.
- *Poor Attendance* - Excessive number of absences (10 or more excused or unexcused) and/or tardiness.
- *Low Parent/Guardian contact with school* – school personnel reports of lack of contact from parents or guardians about their child's academic progress or problems, academic program, or behavior problems, parents or guardians failing to attend conferences with teachers or counselors.

For all students, the most prevalent family risk factors shown on Table 5 were students not living with both natural parents (31.6%), low socio-economic status (22.9%), low educational expectations (21.5%), family disruption (12.0%) and parents with low education levels (8.0%).

For student risk factors, overage for grade (36%), poor academic performance (34.9%), low commitment to school (32.7%), and retained in grade (29.8%) were most common, followed by lack of effort (20.7%) and poor attendance (18.9%). Adult obligations such as teen parenting (5.5%) and pregnancy (1.1%) were a smaller but an extremely high-risk group. Overall, the number and percent of PLC students with parenting obligations nearly doubled over the previous year.

Table 5: Risk Factors - All PLCs 2014

2014 Race To The Top PLC Students																				Student Risk Factors by Race and Gender
Number & Percent of Students with Risk Factor		Ethnicity and Gender																		
		Asian or Pacific Islander			Black or African American			Hispanic			Multi-Racial			Native American			White			Grand Total
Risk Factor Type	Risk Factor	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	
Family	Family disruption	0	0	0	5	4	9	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	23	33
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	1.5%	3.3%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.7%	3.6%	8.4%	12.0%
	High family mobility	0	0	0	4	2	6	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	10
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.7%	2.2%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.7%	1.1%	3.6%
	Lack of family conversations about school	0	0	0	4	3	7	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	6	11	20
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	1.1%	2.5%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	2.2%	4.0%	7.3%
	Large number of siblings	0	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	1.1%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%
	Low educational expectations	0	0	0	9	15	24	2	1	3	2	3	5	0	0	0	14	13	27	59
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	5.5%	8.7%	0.7%	0.4%	1.1%	0.7%	1.1%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.1%	4.7%	9.8%	21.5%
	Low parent/guardian contact with school	0	0	0	6	5	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	5	17
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	1.8%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.7%	1.8%	6.2%
	Low socioeconomic status	0	0	0	17	12	29	2	1	3	2	1	3	0	0	0	15	13	28	63
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.2%	4.4%	10.5%	0.7%	0.4%	1.1%	0.7%	0.4%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.5%	4.7%	10.2%	22.9%
	Not living with both natural parents	0	1	1	29	29	58	1	0	1	4	2	6	1	0	1	8	12	20	87
		0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	10.5%	10.5%	21.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	1.5%	0.7%	2.2%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	2.9%	4.4%	7.3%	31.6%
	Parents with low education levels	0	0	0	6	3	9	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	10	22
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	1.1%	3.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.7%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	2.5%	3.6%	8.0%
	Sibling has dropped out of school	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	1.1%
Family Risk Factors Total		0	1	1	81	77	158	7	5	12	11	7	18	1	0	1	62	66	128	318
Student	Aggressive behavior	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	6
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.7%	1.1%	2.2%
	Emotional disturbance	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	9
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.7%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.4%	1.5%	3.3%
	Excessive after school work hours	0	0	0	3	2	5	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	8
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.7%	1.8%	0.4%	0.4%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	2.9%
	Excessive social activity out of school	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	5
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.7%	1.8%
	High risk behavior (e.g., alcohol, drugs, etc.)	0	0	0	1	5	6	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	4	0	4	12
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	1.8%	2.2%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	1.5%	4.4%
	High risk peer group (e.g., gangs)	0	0	0	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	8
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	1.5%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.7%	2.9%
	Lack of effort	0	0	0	9	11	20	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	17	18	35	57
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	4.0%	7.3%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.2%	6.5%	12.7%	20.7%
	Learning disability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%
	Low commitment to school	0	0	0	17	24	41	2	1	3	1	2	3	0	0	0	20	23	43	90
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.2%	8.7%	14.9%	0.7%	0.4%	1.1%	0.4%	0.7%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.3%	8.4%	15.6%	32.7%
	Low educational expectations	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	9	12	17
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	1.1%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	3.3%	4.4%	6.2%
	Misbehavior	0	0	0	3	6	9	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	4	4	8	19
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	2.2%	3.3%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	1.5%	2.9%	6.9%
	No extracurricular activity	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5	6
		0.0%	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%	1.8%	0.0%	1.8%	2.2%
	Other	0	0	0	39	42	81	3	0	3	11	2	13	1	0	1	19	18	37	135
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.2%	15.3%	29.5%	1.1%	0.0%	1.1%	4.0%	0.7%	4.7%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	6.9%	6.5%	13.5%	49.1%
	Over age for grade	0	0	0	32	34	66	1	2	3	4	1	5	1	0	1	8	16	24	99
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.6%	12.4%	24.0%	0.4%	0.7%	1.1%	1.5%	0.4%	1.8%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	2.9%	5.8%	8.7%	36.0%
	Poor academic performance	0	0	0	26	19	45	0	2	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	23	25	48	96
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.5%	6.9%	16.4%	0.0%	0.7%	0.7%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.4%	9.1%	17.5%	34.9%
	Poor attendance	0	1	1	7	12	19	2	0	2	1	2	3	0	0	0	19	8	27	52
		0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	2.5%	4.4%	6.9%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	0.4%	0.7%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.9%	2.9%	9.8%	18.9%
	Pregnancy	0	0	0	4	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	3	8
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%	1.1%	2.9%
	Retained in grade	0	1	1	23	34	57	2	1	3	3	0	3	1	0	1	6	11	17	82
		0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	8.4%	12.4%	20.7%	0.7%	0.4%	1.1%	1.1%	0.0%	1.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	2.2%	4.0%	6.2%	29.8%
	Teenage Parent	0	0	0	9	3	12	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	15
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.3%	1.1%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.0%	0.4%	5.5%
Student Risk Factors Total		0	2	2	178	206	384	11	11	22	24	13	37	3	0	3	137	140	277	725
All Risk Factors Total		0	3	3	259	283	542	18	16	34	35	20	55	4	0	4	199	206	405	1043

Risk Factors for Carrollton City PLC Students. The table below displays student and family risk factors for students during the 2013-14 school year at Carrollton City PLC. The most common family risk factors at that site were students not living with both natural parents (31.3%), followed by low educational expectations (21.3%), low socioeconomic status (18.8%) and parents with low education levels at of 10% of students. The most common student risk factors were low commitment to school (23.8%), overage for grade (21.3%) and poor academic performance (17.5%). Ten percent of the student population were pregnant or teens with children.

Table 5A: Risk Factors - Carrollton City PLC 2014

SITE: Carollton City PLC		Student Risk Factors by Race and Gender												
Number & Percent of Students with Risk Factor		Ethnicity and Gender												
		Black or African American			Hispanic			Multi-Racial			White			Grand Total
Risk Factor Type	Risk Factor	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	
Family	Family disruption	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
	Lack of family conversations about school	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5
		2.5%	2.5%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	6.3%
	Low educational expectations	7	4	11	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	2	2	17
		8.8%	5.0%	13.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	2.5%	5.0%	0.0%	2.5%	2.5%	21.3%
	Low parent/guardian contact with school	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
	Low socioeconomic status	6	4	10	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	3	3	15
		7.5%	5.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	3.8%	3.8%	18.8%
	Not living with both natural parents	11	4	15	0	0	0	4	2	6	1	3	4	25
		13.8%	5.0%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%	2.5%	7.5%	1.3%	3.8%	5.0%	31.3%
	Parents with low education levels	3	3	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	8
		3.8%	3.8%	7.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	10.0%
	Sibling has dropped out of school	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
Family Risk Factors Total		28	18	46	0	0	0	11	5	16	1	10	11	73
Student	Aggressive behavior	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
	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%	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%
	Excessive after school work hours	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4
		1.3%	1.3%	2.5%	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	5.0%
	Excessive social activity out of school	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
	Lack of effort	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	5
		1.3%	2.5%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	2.5%	6.3%
	Low commitment to school	8	7	15	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	2	2	19
		10.0%	8.8%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	2.5%	0.0%	2.5%	2.5%	23.8%
	Low educational expectations	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	2
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	2.5%
	Misbehavior	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		1.3%	1.3%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%
	No extracurricular activity	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		1.3%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%
	Other	20	12	32	2	0	2	9	2	11	5	9	14	59
		25.0%	15.0%	40.0%	2.5%	0.0%	2.5%	11.3%	2.5%	13.8%	6.3%	11.3%	17.5%	73.8%
	Over age for grade	5	4	9	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	5	5	17
		6.3%	5.0%	11.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	1.3%	3.8%	0.0%	6.3%	6.3%	21.3%
	Poor academic performance	9	5	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
		11.3%	6.3%	17.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.5%
	Poor attendance	2	1	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	2	7
		2.5%	1.3%	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	2.5%	1.3%	1.3%	2.5%	8.8%
	Pregnancy	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	4
		2.5%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%	5.0%
	Retained in grade	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	4
		1.3%	1.3%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	1.3%	1.3%	5.0%
	Teenage Parent	1	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	4
		1.3%	1.3%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%
Student Risk Factors Total		52	37	89	3	0	3	17	6	23	9	21	30	145
All Risk Factors Total		80	55	135	3	0	3	28	11	39	10	31	41	218

Risk Factors for Floyd PLC Students. The table below displays student and family risk factors for students at Floyd PLC during the 2013-14 school year. The most common family risk factors were low educational expectations (37.0%), low socioeconomic status at 35.8% of students, and family disruption (25.9%). Poor academic performance was the most common student risk factor at 54.3%, followed by lack of effort (39.5%), low commitment to school (37%), poor attendance (29.6%), overage for grade (19.8%) and low educational expectations (14.8%).

Table 5B: Risk Factors - Floyd PLC 2014

SITE: Floyd County PLC 2014														
Number & Percent of Students with Risk Factor		Ethnicity and Gender												
		Black or African American			Hispanic			Multi-Racial			White			Grand Total
Risk Factor Type	Risk Factor	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	
Family	Family disruption	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	12	7	19	21
		0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	14.8%	8.6%	23.5%	25.9%
	High family mobility	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	3
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	2.5%	3.7%
	Lack of family conversations about	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	5	10	12
		1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.2%	6.2%	12.3%	14.8%
	Low educational expectations	0	1	1	2	1	3	0	1	1	14	11	25	30
		0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	2.5%	1.2%	3.7%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	17.3%	13.6%	30.9%	37.0%
	Low parent/guardian contact with school	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	2.5%	4.9%	4.9%
	Low socioeconomic status	0	1	1	2	1	3	0	1	1	14	10	24	29
		0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	2.5%	1.2%	3.7%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	17.3%	12.3%	29.6%	35.8%
	Not living with both natural parents	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	9	11
		2.5%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.2%	4.9%	11.1%	13.6%
	Parents with low education levels	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	3	6	9	11
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	7.4%	11.1%	13.6%
Family Risk Factors Total		3	3	6	6	5	11	0	2	2	56	46	102	121
Student	Aggressive behavior	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3	4
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%	2.5%	3.7%	4.9%
	Emotional disturbance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3	4
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	2.5%	1.2%	3.7%	4.9%
	Excessive after school work hours	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%
	Excessive social activity out of school	0	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%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	2.5%	2.5%
	High risk behavior (e.g., alcohol, drugs, etc.)	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	4	0	4	7
		0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	4.9%	0.0%	4.9%	8.6%
	High risk peer group (e.g., gangs)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
	Lack of effort	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	16	12	28	32
		2.5%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	19.8%	14.8%	34.6%	39.5%
	Learning disability	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	1.2%
	Low commitment to school	1	1	2	1	3	4	1	3	4	8	15	23	30
		1.2%	1.2%	2.5%	1.2%	3.7%	4.9%	1.2%	3.7%	4.9%	9.9%	18.5%	28.4%	37.0%
	Low educational expectations	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	8	11	12
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	9.9%	13.6%	14.8%
	Misbehavior	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	4	3	7	9
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	4.9%	3.7%	8.6%	11.1%
	No extracurricular activity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5	5
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.2%	0.0%	6.2%	6.2%
	Other	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	8	9
		0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.4%	2.5%	9.9%	11.1%
	Over age for grade	2	0	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	5	7	12	16
		2.5%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	2.5%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.2%	8.6%	14.8%	19.8%
	Poor academic performance	3	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	19	21	40	44
		3.7%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	23.5%	25.9%	49.4%	54.3%
	Poor attendance	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	14	7	21	24
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	1.2%	1.2%	17.3%	8.6%	25.9%	29.6%
	Pregnancy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	0.0%	2.5%	2.5%
	Retained in grade	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	7
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	6.2%	8.6%	8.6%
Student Risk Factors Total		8	3	11	4	9	13	0	7	7	102	86	188	219
All Risk Factors Total		11	6	17	10	14	24	0	9	9	158	132	290	340

Risk Factors for Richmond PLC Students. The table below displays student and family risk factors for students at Richmond PLC during the school year. The most common family risk factors were not living with both natural parents at 41.4% of students, low socioeconomic status and low educational expectations at 16.7% and low parent/guardian contact with the school (10.5%). For student risk factors, retained in grade (62.3%) and overage for grade (57.9%) were most common, followed by poor academic performance (33.3%), low commitment to school (28.1%), poor attendance (18.4%) and lack of effort (17.5%). Teenage parents made up 9.6% of the student population.

Table 5C: Risk Factors - Richmond PLC 2014

SITE: Richmond County PLC 2014		Student Risk Factors by Race and Gender																		
Number & Percent of Students with Risk Factor																				
		Asian or Pacific Islander			Black or African American			Hispanic			Multi-Racial			Native American			White			Grand Total
Risk Factor Type	Risk Factor	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	F	M	Total	
Family	Family disruption	0	0	0	5	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	11
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	1.8%	6.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	2.6%	3.5%	9.6%
	High family mobility	0	0	0	4	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	7
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%	1.8%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	6.1%
	Lack of family conversations about school	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	0.9%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%
	Large number of siblings	0	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	2.6%	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%
	Low educational expectations	0	0	0	2	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	8.8%	10.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%
	Low parent/guardian contact with school	0	0	0	6	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	12
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	4.4%	9.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	10.5%
	Low socioeconomic status	0	0	0	11	7	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	19
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.6%	6.1%	15.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	16.7%
	Not living with both natural parents	0	1	1	16	25	41	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	5	7	51
		0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	14.0%	21.9%	36.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	1.8%	4.4%	6.1%	44.7%
	Parents with low education levels	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%
	Sibling has dropped out of school	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	1.8%
Family Risk Factors Total		0	1	1	50	56	106	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	10	15	124
Student	Aggressive behavior	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%
	Emotional disturbance	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	1.8%	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%
	Excessive after school work hours	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	0.9%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%
	Excessive social activity out of school	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
	High risk behavior (e.g., alcohol, drugs, etc.)	0	0	0	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	3.5%	4.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%
	High risk peer group (e.g., gangs)	0	0	0	2	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	7
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	3.5%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	6.1%
	Lack of effort	0	0	0	6	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	20
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	7.9%	13.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	4.4%	17.5%
	Low commitment to school	0	0	0	8	16	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	32
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%	14.0%	21.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	5.3%	7.0%	28.1%
	Low educational expectations	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%
	Misbehavior	0	0	0	2	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	8
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	4.4%	6.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	7.0%
	Other	0	0	0	19	29	48	1	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	1	8	7	15	67
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	25.4%	42.1%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	1.8%	0.0%	1.8%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	7.0%	6.1%	13.2%	58.8%
	Over age for grade	0	0	0	25	30	55	1	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	1	3	4	7	66
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	21.9%	26.3%	48.2%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	1.8%	0.0%	1.8%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	2.6%	3.5%	6.1%	57.9%
	Poor academic performance	0	0	0	14	14	28	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	8	38
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.3%	12.3%	24.6%	0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%	3.5%	7.0%	33.3%
	Poor attendance	0	1	1	5	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	21
		0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	4.4%	9.6%	14.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.5%	0.0%	3.5%	18.4%
	Pregnancy	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%
	Retained in grade	0	1	1	22	33	55	2	1	3	2	0	2	1	0	1	4	5	9	71
		0.0%	0.9%	0.9%	19.3%	28.9%	48.2%	1.8%	0.9%	2.6%	1.8%	0.0%	1.8%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	3.5%	4.4%	7.9%	62.3%
	Teenage Parent	0	0	0	8	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	11
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%	1.8%	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%	0.9%	9.6%
Student Risk Factors Total		0	2	2	118	166	284	4	2	6	7	0	7	3	0	3	26	33	59	361
All Risk Factors Total		0	3	3	168	222	390	5	2	7	7	0	7	4	0	4	31	43	74	485

PLC Student Daily Attendance

Table 6 below shows the average student daily attendance at each PLC for each month of the school year. Due to changes in staffing at the Floyd County PLC, monthly data was missing for the period from February through the end of the year. The YTD figure presented for Floyd PLC is based on student attendance records. 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 Floyd County PLC was highest among the three Race to the Top PLCs at 93.4% daily attendance (based on the months for which data were available), followed by Carrollton City, with an average monthly attendance rate of 88.3%. Attendance at Richmond County PLC was the lowest of the 3 PLCs at 75.6% attendance per month; however, this reflected a significant improvement in attendance compared to the previous year when the site had 60.1% student attendance.

Table 6: Daily Attendance All PLCs 2014

SITE: Carrollton City PLC	Month											
Attendance	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	YTD	YTD TYPE
Average Daily Attendance	91.6%	90.5%	89.0%	86.8%	86.4%	85.3%	90.9%	88.9%	90.4%	82.7%	88.3%	Average
Attendance	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13						YTD	YTD TYPE
SITE: Floyd County PLC	Month											
Attendance	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	YTD	YTD TYPE
Average Daily Attendance	92.7%	90.7%	86.4%	79.8%	81.2%	89.8%	NR*	NR*	NR*	NR*	93.4%	Average
SITE: Richmond County PLC	Month											
Attendance	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	YTD	YTD TYPE
Average Daily Attendance	82.4%	75.9%	80.6%	87.7%	69.1%	72.6%	69.4%	92.2%	68.9%	56.8%	75.6%	Average

NR* indicates not reported.

Community and Parent Involvement, and College and Career Readiness

The tables (Tables 7, 7A, 7B and 7C) 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 during the 2013-14 school year.

According to our developmental timeline, mentoring is a service that is expected to be in the planning and emerging stages during the first year, and is not expected to be fully implemented until the third year of the program. Mentoring, however, was not a strong area for any of the RT3 PLCs. Carrollton City PLC was the most successful of the three PLCs at implementing mentoring. With the move to its new location Floyd County PLC at the start of the 2014 school year, the PLC was better able to attract mentors and there were a few students who were mentored during the course of the year. Richmond County PLC reported just one student being mentored during the year.

Tutoring services did take place, with an average of 35.3 students matched with tutors each month. Carrollton City was able to recruit tutors, with an average of 11.9 students being tutored per month.

With the absence of a site coordinator for much of the first semester, the Floyd County PLC did not report any tutorial activity during the first half of the year, but tutoring activity increased substantially with the addition of the new site coordinator. Overall, an average of 23.4 students in Floyd County were tutored per month. Richmond did not report any tutoring throughout the year, however, their schedule allows for extended learning time each afternoon where students can receive one-on-one assistance from the learning facilitators.

Parent involvement is very much encouraged at the PLC. Across all PLCs, 1,348 parent phone contacts and 80 parent conferences were held over the course of the year. Parents are encouraged to visit the PLCs and 232 parents did visit during the year. The Carrollton City and Richmond County site coordinators also conducted some home visits during the year.

With respect to College and Career Readiness, an average of 104.7 students per month participated in Charting for Success lessons during the year. PLCs reported a total of 82 students applying to post-secondary study as part of the program and 18 completed the FAFSA.

Table 7: Community and Parent Involvement and College/Career Readiness at All PLCs 2014

2014 RT3 PLCs	Month											
Community Involvement	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	YTD	YTD TYPE
# of Students in need of a mentor	30	70	71	58	12	70	70	80	80	70	61.1	Average
Total Students Matched with a Mentor	0	15	15	13	13	9	5	0	0	0	7.0	Average
# of Students Mentored During the Month	0	10	10	2	2	7	8	10	4	10	6.3	Average
# of Students Tutored	15	2	2	1	0	48	62	61	108	54	35.3	Average
# of students matched with a tutor (among active students)	30	30	30	1	8	8	0	0	0	0	10.7	Average
# of students in need of a tutor	67	70	71	30	9	8	11	8	60	20	35.4	Average
Parent Involvement	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	YTD	YTD TYPE
# of Home Visits	1	1	10	0	2	1	1	2	2	2	22	Total
# Parent Phone Contacts	62	171	116	201	147	139	135	148	117	112	1348	Total
# of Parent Conferences	5	6	13	12	7	2	4	12	10	9	80	Total
# of Parents Visiting PLC	56	30	12	14	31	12	6	13	8	50	232	Total
College and Career Readiness	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	YTD	YTD TYPE
# of Students Participating in Charting for Success Lesson	51	120	142	124	43	122	120	118	108	99	104.7	Average
# of Students Applying to Postsecondary Study	0	24	14	24	2	6	3	3	3	3	82	Total
# of Students Accepted to Post-Secondary Study	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	4	Total
# of Students Completing FAFSA	0	4	4	0	0	1	0	2	2	5	18	Total

Table 7A: Community and Parent Involvement and College/Career Readiness - Carrollton City PLC 2014

SITE: Carrollton City PLC	Month											
Community Involvement	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	YTD	YTD TYPE
# of Students in need of a mentor	30	70	71	58	10	10	20	30	30	20	34.9	Average
Total Students Matched with a Mentor	0	15	15	13	13	6	5	0	0	0	6.7	Average
# of Students Mentored During the Month	0	10	10	2	2	4	7	9	4	10	5.8	Average
# of Students Tutored	15	2	2	1	0	8	8	8	60	15	11.9	Average
# of students matched with a tutor(among active students)	30	30	30	1	8	8	0	0	0	0	10.7	Average
# of students in need of a tutor	67	70	71	30	8	8	8	8	60	20	35	Average
Parent Involvement	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	YTD	YTD TYPE
# of Home Visits	1	1	1	0	2	1	0	1	1	1	9	Total
# Parent Phone Contacts	62	99	50	119	74	70	63	76	45	40	698	Total
# of Parent Conferences	2	5	8	8	1	1	0	8	6	5	44	Total
# of Parents Visiting PLC	53	5	5	11	31	2	1	8	3	45	164	Total
College and Career Readiness	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	YTD	YTD TYPE
# of Students Participating in Charting for Success Lesson	51	70	71	71	10	74	76	65	60	60	60.8	Average
# of Students Applying to Postsecondary Study	0	0	0	8	2	2	3	3	3	3	24	Total
# of Students Accepted to Post-Secondary Study	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3	Total
# of Students Completing FAFSA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	9	Total

Table 7B: Community and Parent Involvement and College/Career Readiness - Floyd PLC 2014

SITE: Floyd County PLC	Month											
Community Involvement	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	YTD	YTD TYPE
# of Students in need of a mentor	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	Average
Total Students Matched with a Mentor	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0.2	Average
# of Students Mentored During the Month	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0.2	Average
# of Students Tutored	0	0	0	0	0	40	54	53	48	39	23.4	Average
# of students matched with a tutor(among active students)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Average
# of students in need of a tutor	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0.4	Average
Parent Involvement	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	YTD	YTD TYPE
# of Home Visits	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total
# Parent Phone Contacts	0	15	12	12	13	19	12	12	12	12	119	Total
# of Parent Conferences	3	1	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	10	Total
# of Parents Visiting PLC	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	Total
College and Career Readiness	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	YTD	YTD TYPE
# of Students Participating in Charting for Success Lesson	0	30	39	37	33	34	38	53	48	39	35.1	Average
# of Students Applying to Postsecondary Study	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	Total
# of Students Accepted to Post-Secondary Study	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total
# of Students Completing FAFSA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Total

Table 7C: Community and Parent Involvement and College/Career Readiness - Richmond PLC 2014

SITE: Richmond County PLC	Month											
Community Involvement	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	YTD	YTD TYPE
# of Students in need of a mentor	0	0	0	0	0	60	50	50	50	50	26.0	Average
Total Students Matched with a Mentor	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0.1	Average
# of Students Mentored During the Month	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0.3	Average
# of Students Tutored	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Average
# of students matched with a tutor(among active students)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	Average
# of students in need of a teacher	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Average
Parent Involvement	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-14	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	YTD	YTD TYPE
# of Home Visits	0	0	9	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	11	Total
# Parent Phone Contacts	0	57	54	70	60	50	60	60	60	60	411	Total
# of Parent Conferences	0	0	5	4	0	1	4	4	4	4	18	Total
# of Parents Visiting PLC	0	25	7	3	0	10	5	5	5	5	55	Total
College and Career Readiness	Aug-13	Sep-13	Oct-13	Nov-13	Dec-13	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	YTD	YTD TYPE
# of Students Participating in Charting for Success Lesson	0	20	32	16	0	14	6	0	0	0	11.0	Average
# of Students Applying to Postsecondary Study	0	24	10	16	0	4	0	0	0	0	54	Total
# of Students Accepted to Post-Secondary Study	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	Total
# of Students Completing FAFSA	0	4	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	Total

Student Exit Status

Tables 8A and 8B show status for students at each site for the 269 high school students taking part in the Race to the Top PLC program during 2013-14 school year. Table 8A provides summary figures and 8B more detailed information on the reasons the PLC students exited.

Among the 269 students, 99 (36.8%) achieved their high school diplomas, with Carrollton City PLC graduating 23 students, Floyd County PLC graduating 45 students and Richmond County graduating 31 students during the year. Thirty-seven of the graduates left with plans to continue their education through college, technical college or the military.

Just under 10 percent of students who attended the RT3 PLCs transferred out, either transferring back to their home school or out of the district. Fifty-one students (19%) left the PLCs as dropouts; the majority of these (40) were at the Richmond County PLC, which had a student population that was much older than at the other two sites.

Among the 93 students who stayed with the PLC program and did not graduate, the majority were promoted by the end of the school year. Only 5 percent of the Race to the Top students in 2014 were retained.

Table 8A: High School Student End of the Year Status 2013-14

	Carrollton City PLC		Floyd County PLC		Richmond County PLC		Total	
End of the Year Status	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Graduates	23	31.1%	45	55.6%	31	27.2%	99	36.8%
Dropouts	8	10.8%	3	3.7%	40	35.1%	51	19.0%
Transfers	6	8.1%	12	14.8%	8	7.0%	26	9.7%
Still In School	37	50.0%	21	25.9%	35	30.7%	93	34.6%
Total	**74**	**100.0%**	**81**	**100.0%**	**114**	**100.0%**	**269**	**100.0%**

Table 8B: High Student End of the Year Status Detail 2013-14

		Carrollton City PLC		Floyd County PLC		Richmond County PLC		Total	
End of the Year Status		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Graduates	Graduated to 4-yr College	4	5.4%	0	.0%	0	.0%	4	1.5%
	Graduated to 2-yr College	5	6.8%	12	14.8%	3	2.6%	20	7.4%
	Graduated Technical College	2	2.7%	9	11.1%	0	.0%	11	4.1%
	Graduated Military	1	1.4%	0	.0%	1	.9%	2	.7%
	Graduated Employment	2	2.7%	7	8.6%	1	.9%	10	3.7%
	Graduated (other)	9	12.2%	10	12.3%	23	20.2%	42	15.6%
	Graduated Plans Unknown	0	.0%	7	8.6%	3	2.6%	10	3.7%
Dropouts	Dropped Out	7	9.5%	3	3.7%	39	34.2%	49	18.2%
	GED	1	1.4%	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	.4%
	Expelled	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	.9%	1	.4%
Transfers	Transferred Out of System	4	5.4%	5	6.2%	1	.9%	10	3.7%
	Transferred to Home School	2	2.7%	7	8.6%	6	5.3%	15	5.6%
	Transferred to Other	0	.0%	0	.0%	1	.9%	1	.4%
Still In PLC	Promoted	36	48.6%	19	23.5%	24	21.1%	79	29.4%
	Retained	1	1.4%	2	2.5%	11	9.6%	14	5.2%
Total		**74**	**100.0%**	**81**	**100.0%**	**114**	**100.0%**	**269**	**100.0%**

Table 9 shows the total number of graduates for each PLC site during 2013-14 school year. Overall, 99 students graduated from the three RT3 PLCs during the year, with Carrollton City PLC having 23 graduates with 4 starting the year classified as juniors, Floyd County PLC graduating 45 with 4 starting the year classified as juniors and Richmond County PLC graduating 31 students with five starting the year classified as juniors.

Table 9: Number of Graduates 2013-14 School Year by PLC Site

	All Sites	Carrollton City	Floyd	Richmond
Number of Graduates	99	23	45	31

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. Sixteen of the 31

graduates from Richmond PLC during the 2013-14 school year were from four of the lowest performing schools in the state. Seven students officially graduated from Academy of Richmond County High School, which is classified as a focus school. Nine students graduated from high schools classified as Priority - School Improvement Grant sites - 4 from Glenn Hills, 2 from Lucy C. Laney High Schools, and 3 from T.W. Josey High School. None of the high schools in the Floyd County or Carrollton City school districts are classified as priority or focus schools.

Table 10: Graduates from Priority and Focus Schools – Richmond County PLC 2013-14

Richmond County Lowest Performing High Schools	Classification	Number of Graduates
Academy of Richmond County High School	Focus (Grad Rate)	7
Glenn Hills High School	Priority - SIG	4
Lucy C. Laney High School	Priority - SIG	2
T.W. Josey High School	Priority - SIG	3
Total Graduates from Priority or Focus High Schools		**16**

PLC High School Student 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 academic disciplines. In other cases, students were 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 presented are based on all classes each student took within each discipline. Elective courses are not included in analysis of academic improvement. For the purpose of maintaining consistency in reporting, the section that follows presents academic performance among high school students, excluding the middle school students enrolled at Carrollton City PLC.

Academic Average. Table 11 shows descriptive statistics for academic average (average of all academic courses taken – math, science, language arts and social studies) for high school students 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 the year, 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 208 of the students, with 69.5% showing improvement from their pre-PLC performance, increasing their average from 73.2 to 78.3 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 through 2014 school years.

Of the 269 high school students enrolled in PLC during 2014, 227 took and completed at least one course in an academic subject area during the year. Students completing courses generally earned 0.5 to 1 credit per course. Students averaged academic class grades of 79.8 and earned an average of 3.36

credits in academic subject areas during the year (Note: the majority of PLC students were not enrolled for the full year at the PLC). Sixty-eight Carrollton City PLC high school students posted an average of 80.3, with students earning an average of 4.01 credits in academic subject areas. The 77 Floyd County students taking and completing academic courses posted an average grade of 80.9 with 3.06 credits earned during 2014, and the 82 Richmond County students who completed academic courses posted an average grade of 78.4 with 2.98 academic course credits earned during 2014.

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 in Academic Subject Areas in 2014	Number with Pre-Post Comparison	Percent of Students Improved	Pre-Average	Post - Average
All Sites	227	79.8	3.36	208	72.6%	73.2	79.7
Carrollton City	68	80.3	4.10	67	71.6%	73.6	80.2
Floyd	77	80.9	3.06	64	54.7%	77.7	80.8
Richmond	82	78.4	2.98	77	88.3%	69.2	78.5

Pre-post testing was possible with 67 of the Carrollton City students, 64 of the Floyd students and 77 of the Richmond County Students, with 71.6%, 54.7% and 88.3% showing improvement, respectively. Overall, 72.6% of the 2014 RT3 PLC students improved their academic average.

Table 12 enumerates improvement across PLCs and by individual PLC in academic average (average of all academic courses taken). Mean difference testing compares PLC academic averages to performance before entry into the PLC. On average, students in the PLC improved their academic average to 79.7 from 73.2 prior to PLC, a gain of 6.5 points on average academically. The greatest change in academic average was at Richmond County PLC, with a mean difference of 9.4. Students at Floyd County PLC improved an average of 3.1 points and Carrollton City students improved 6.6 points on average. Improvement in academic average is significant at the $p<0.0001$ level overall and is significant for Carrollton City and Richmond County 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			
2014 RT3 PLC Sites	6.547	11.360	0.788	4.994	8.099	8.312	207	.000
Carrollton City	6.582	13.252	1.619	3.350	9.815	4.066	66	.000
Floyd County PLC	3.108	9.528	1.191	0.728	5.488	2.609	63	.011
Richmond County PLC	9.374	10.278	1.171	7.041	11.707	8.003	76	.000

Language Arts. Table 13 shows descriptive statistics for language arts for high school students across all PLCs and by individual PLC sites. Included are the number of students enrolled and completing in

language arts courses in 2014, average grade in language arts, average number of credits earned 2014, 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 161 of the students, with 73.30% showing improvement. Pre-post testing includes all language arts courses taken by students during their enrollment in PLC and may include courses taken from the 2012 to 2014 school years.

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 in Subject Area in 2014	Number with Pre-Post Comparison	Percent of Students Improved	Pre-Average	Post - Average
All Sites	185	81.7	1.04	161	73.3%	74.1	82.0
Carrollton City	67	84.1	.899	65	75.4%	78.2	84.0
Floyd	63	78.6	1.02	45	48.9%	75.9	78.6
Richmond	55	82.3	1.27	51	92.2%	67.3	82.3

Of the 269 high school students enrolled in PLC during 2014, 185 took and completed at least one course in language arts. Students averaged language arts class grades of 81.7 and students earned an average of 1.04 credits in that subject area during 2014. Carrollton City High School students posted an average of 84.1 in language arts with an average of 0.899 credits earned, Floyd County students posted an average grade of 78.6 with average 1.02 credits earned and Richmond County students 82.3 with 1.27 credits earned in 2014.

Pre-post testing was possible with 65 of the Carrollton City students, 45 of the Floyd students and 51 of the Richmond County Students, with 75.4%, 48.9% and 92.2% showing improvement, respectively.

Table 14 enumerates improvement across all PLCs and by individual PLC in the discipline of language arts. Mean difference testing compares language arts averages during PLC to performance before entry into the PLC.

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			
2014 RT3 PLC Sites	7.862	12.817	1.010	5.867	9.857	7.783	160	.000
Carrollton City	5.848	9.207	1.142	3.566	8.129	5.120	64	.000
Floyd County PLC	2.684	11.727	1.748	-0.839	6.207	1.536	44	.132
Richmond County PLC	14.998	14.657	2.052	10.876	19.120	7.308	50	.000

On average, high school students in the PLC improved their language arts average to 80.5 from 74.1 prior to PLC, a gain of 7.86 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 Richmond County PLC, with a mean difference of 15, followed by Carrollton City at 5.8. Improvement in language arts average is significant at the p<0.0001 level for the Richmond County and Carrollton City PLCs. Students at Floyd County PLC made modest gains (an average of 2.7 points gained), but overall improvement among students enrolled in 2014 was not statistically significant.

Social Studies. Table 15 shows descriptive statistics for social studies across all PLCs and by individual PLC sites. Included are the number of high school students enrolled in and completing social studies courses, average in social studies courses, average number of credits earned during 2014, 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 159 of the students, with 63.5% showing improvement. Pre-post testing includes all social studies courses taken by students during their enrollment in PLC and may include courses taken between the 2012 and 2014 school years.

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 in Subject Area 2014	Number with Pre-Post Comparison	Percent of Students Improved	Pre-Average	Post - Average
All Sites	190	80.3	1.01	159	63.5%	72.6	80.0
Carrollton City	67	78.3	.862	66	57.6%	71.0	78.3
Floyd	65	84.1	1.22	39	69.2%	78.5	84.8
Richmond	58	78.2	.943	54	66.7%	70.2	78.5

Of the 269 high school students enrolled in PLC during the 2014 school year, 190 took at least one course in social studies. Students averaged social studies class grades of 80.3 and earned an average of 1.01 credits in that subject area during 2014. Carrollton City students posted an average grade of 78.3 with 0.862 credits earned, Floyd County students posted an average grade of 84.1 with average 1.22 credits earned and Richmond County students 78.2 with 0.943 credits earned. Pre-post testing was possible with 66 of the Carrollton City students, 39 of the Floyd students and 54 of the Richmond County students, with 57.6%, 69.2% and 66.7% showing improvement, respectively.

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, high school students in the PLC improved their social studies average to 80 from 72.6 prior to PLC, a gain of 7.4 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<=0.01 level across all sites and improvement in social studies is significant at all of the RT3 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			
2014 RT3 PLC Sites	7.408	17.708	1.404	4.634	10.181	5.275	158	.000
Carrollton City	7.321	22.340	2.750	1.829	12.813	2.662	65	.010
Floyd County PLC	6.308	12.263	1.964	2.333	10.283	3.212	38	.003
Richmond County PLC	8.307	14.599	1.987	4.323	12.292	4.182	53	.000

Mathematics. Table 17 shows descriptive statistics for high school 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 during 2014, 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 139 of the students, with 64.0% showing improvement. Pre-post testing includes all mathematics courses taken by students during their enrollment in PLC and may include courses taken between the 2012 and 2014 school years.

Of the 269 high school students enrolled in PLC during the 2014 school year, 163 took at least one course in mathematics. Students averaged mathematics class grades of 79.5 and earned an average of 1.28 credits in that subject area during 2014. Carrollton City students posted an average grade of 80.2 with 1.33 credits earned, Floyd County students an average grade of 80.5 with average 0.968 credits earned and Richmond County students 77.2 with an average of 1.58 credits earned. Pre-post testing was possible with 6 of the Carrollton City, 39 of the Floyd students and 35 of the Richmond County Students, with 66.7%, 41.0% and 82.9% showing improvement, respectively.

Table 17: Descriptive Statistics for Mathematics by Site

Performance Learning Center	Number of Student Enrolled in and Completing Mathematics Courses	Average in Mathematics	Average Credits Earned in Subject Area in 2014	Number with Pre-Post Comparison	Percent of Students Improved	Pre-Average	Post - Average
All Sites	163	79.5	1.28	139	64.0%	73.5	79.4
Carrollton City	67	80.2	1.33	66	66.7%	73.6	80.2
Floyd	52	80.5	.968	39	41.0%	78.7	80.5
Richmond	44	77.2	1.577	35	82.9%	67.7	76.6

Table 18 enumerates improvement across all PLCs and by individual PLC in the discipline of mathematics. Mean difference testing compares program PLC math averages to performance before entry into the PLC. On average, students in the PLC improved their math average to 79.4 from 73.5 prior to PLC, a gain of 5.9 points on average in math. Richmond County posted the greatest gains at 8.9

points, followed by Carrollton City at 6.6 points and Floyd County at 1.8 points gained. Improvement in math is significant at the p<0.0001 across all PLC students and at the Richmond and Carrollton City PLCs.

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			
2014 RT3 PLC Sites	5.888	13.919	1.181	3.553	8.222	4.987	138	.000
Carrollton City	6.600	14.974	1.843	2.919	10.281	3.581	65	.001
Floyd County PLC	1.832	13.817	2.241	-2.710	6.373	.817	37	.419
Richmond County PLC	8.949	10.995	1.859	5.172	12.726	4.815	34	.000

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 2014, 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 143 of the students, with 63.6% showing improvement. Pre-post testing includes all science courses taken by students during their enrollment in PLC and may include courses taken between the 2012 and 2014 school years.

Of the 269 high school students enrolled in PLC during the 2014 school year, 175 took at least one course in science. Students averaged science class grades of 79.2 and earned 1.11 credits in that subject area during 2014. Carrollton City students posted an average of 79.2 with 1.08 credits earned, Floyd County students posted an average grade of 81.4 with average 1.01 credits earned and Richmond County students 77.1 with 1.27 credits earned. Pre-post testing was possible with 65 of the Carrollton City students, 33 of the Floyd students and 45 of the Richmond County Students, with 61.5%, 39.8% and 84.4% 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 in Subject Area in 2014	Number with Pre-Post Comparison	Percent of Students Improved	Pre-Average	Post - Average
All Sites	175	79.2	1.11	143	63.6%	72.2	79.1
Carrollton City	66	79.2	1.08	65	61.5%	71.4	79.1
Floyd	54	81.4	1.01	33	39.4%	79.4	81.4
Richmond	55	77.1	1.267	45	84.4%	68.1	77.2

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 79.1 from 72.2 prior to PLC, an average gain of 6.8 points on average in science. Improvement in science is significant at the $p<0.0001$ overall and was significant for Carrollton City (7.7 point gain) and Richmond County (9.1 point gain). Students in Floyd County on average improved by 2.0 points, however the gain is 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			
2014 RT3 PLC Sites	6.827	17.420	1.457	3.948	9.707	4.687	142	.000
Carrollton City	7.691	22.733	2.820	2.058	13.324	2.728	64	.008
Floyd County PLC	2.000	11.544	2.010	-2.093	6.093	.995	32	.327
Richmond County PLC	9.120	10.335	1.541	6.015	12.225	5.920	44	.000

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 electives courses, average in elective courses, and average number of elective course credits earned during the school year.

Of the 269 high school students enrolled in PLC during 2014, 158 took and completed at least one elective course. Students averaged elective class grades of 82.2 and earned an average of 1.73 credits on average in elective courses. Carrollton County students posted an average of 82.0 and earned an average of 2.41 credits in electives, Floyd County students posted an average grade of 85.4 with average 0.74 credits earned and Richmond County students 79.2 with 1.62 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
All Sites	158	82.2	1.73
Carrollton City	65	82.0	2.41
Floyd	47	85.4	0.74
Richmond	46	79.2	1.62

Average Grades and Credits Earned Across All Courses. Table 22 shows descriptive statistics for average course grades and credits earned by PLC high school across all PLCs and by individual PLC sites. Included in the table are the number of students enrolled in and completing courses during 2014 and during their overall time of enrollment at PLC between 2012 and 2014, average grade and credits across all courses completed at PLC, number completing courses during 2014, the average credits earned per student during 2014 and average credits earned per PLC student standardized to a full year enrollment period.

During the 2014, 227 students enrolled in and completed at least one course at PLC and 232 completed at least one course between 2012 and 2014. Average across all course grades was 80.2 and students completing courses averaged 4.4 credits earned during the 2014 school year. The amount of time students spend at PLC varies greatly, so credits earned has been standardized to full year enrollment, with students averaging just over 6 credits per year at the PLC.

Table 22: Descriptive Statistics for Average Grades and Credits Earned by Site

Performance Learning Center	Number of Student Enrolled in 2014 and completing Courses at PLC 2012-2014	Average Grade over All Courses Completed at PLC	Average Credits Earned Per PLC Student During Enrollment	Number of Student completing Courses at PLC 2014	Average Credits Earned 2014 Per PLC Student	Average Credits Earned 2014 Per PLC Student Standardized to Full Year Enrollment
All Sites	232	80.2	5.9	227	4.4	6.04
Carrollton City	70	80.8	8.7	69	6.4	7.21
Floyd	78	81.3	5.0	77	3.4	4.4
Richmond	84	78.3	4.4	81	3.7	5.66

The 69 students completing coursework at Carrollton City PLC in 2014 completed an average of 6.4 credits during 2014 (7.2 standardized), with average course grades of 80.2. The 77 Floyd County PLC students who completed coursework during 2014 earned an average of 3.4 credits (4.4 standardized) and had an average of 81.3. The 81 students who completed coursework at Richmond County PLC during 2014 earned an average of 3.7 credits (5.7 standardized) and had an average of 78.3 in the courses they completed.

PLC Middle School Student Academic Performance

Carrollton City PLC enrolled 6 eighth grade students in their PLC during the 2014 school year. Table 23 provides descriptive statistics on the academic performance of those students. On average, middle school students improved their academic average 10 points, increasing to 90.5 during PLC from 80.5 prior to entering the program. Middle school student improved in all subject area, with the exception of language arts while attending PLC.

All of the Carrollton City PLC middle school students were promoted at the end of the school year.

Table 23: Descriptive Statistics for Academic Performance Carrollton City PLC Middle School Students

PLC Middle School Students	Pre-PLC	During PLC	Average Change
Academic Average	80.5	90.5	10.0
Math	86.5	89.0	2.5
Language Arts	89.3	86.3	-3.0
Science	85.2	92.0	6.8
Social Studies	60.8	94.5	33.8

PLC Student Survey Results

At the end of the year at PLC or as students exit the PLC throughout the year, students were asked to complete a survey to gauge their impressions of the PLC environment and how they felt about themselves at the PLC. A total of 136 students who exited this year were surveyed across three PLC sites: 24 at Carrollton City PLC, 54 at Floyd County and 58 at Richmond County. The results of the surveys received from each of the counties 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. The majority of the surveys completed by Carrollton City, Floyd, and Richmond County students were graduating seniors. Overall, 47% of respondents were graduating seniors.

Table 22: End of the Year Student Surveys: Grade Level

Grade Level	Carrollton City	Floyd	Richmond	All Sites
9th	17%	2%	**3%**	**7%**
10th	33%	2%	**5%**	**13%**
11th	29%	7%	**22%**	**20%**
12th	4%	13%	**17%**	**11%**
12th -Graduating	13%	76%	**52%**	**47%**
Number of cases	24	54	**58**	**132**

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. Nearly all graduating seniors (94%) indicated that they did plan to continue their education. Table 24 indicates whether students were accepted into a post-secondary program at the time of graduation. While nearly all of the graduating students indicated that they plan to continue their education, only 5% of respondents had actually been accepted into a post-secondary program at the time of the survey.

Table 23: End of the Year 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%	88%	93%	**94%**
No	0%	12%	7%	**6%**
Number of cases	3	41	30	**74**

Table 24: End of the Year 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%	11%	4%	5%
No	100%	89%	96%	95%
Number of cases	3	36	28	67

Pursuing Post-Secondary Options. Table 25 below depicts what post-secondary options the graduating students indicated that they planned to pursue. Students were given the option of selecting all options that they plan to pursue, such as attending both 2 and 4-year colleges. In Carrollton City, Floyd and Richmond County, students had a range of plans. Overall, 28% indicated intent to attend a 4-year college, and 61% a two-year college. Over one-third indicated plans to enroll in an associate's degree or diploma program at a technical college. 8% of the students planned to join the military.

Table 25: End of the Year 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%	39%	46%	**28%**
2-yr college	**100%**	**56%**	**29%**	**61%**
Technical college-Associate's Degree	0%	22%	29%	**17%**
Technical college-Diploma Program	33%	17%	4%	**18%**
Military	0%	11%	14%	**8%**
Number of cases	3	36	14	**53**

Paying for Post-Secondary Education. Table 26 presents graduate plans to pay for their post-secondary education. Overall, it appears that some graduates had clear plans while others did not. Only 15% completed a FAFSA application for financial aid. At Floyd County PLC, 33% indicated they planned to use the HOPE Grants to pay for their education, 28% HOPE Scholarships, 33% planned to rely on their parents/guardians to help with financial costs and 42% intended to work. At Richmond County PLC, more than half of the students (57%) intended to work to help pay for further education, and 30% anticipated their parents/guardians would assist them financially. At Carrollton City PLC, a third of students planned to pay for college using the HOPE grant and another third planned to work to pay for their education. Across all sites, working was the most common anticipated funding source, followed by parent/guardian assistance, and HOPE Grants/HOPE Scholarships.

Table 26: End of the Year 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	33%	28%	21%	**28%**
Hope Grant	0%	33%	21%	**18%**
Submitted FAFSA application	0%	28%	18%	**15%**
Private Loan	0%	11%	11%	**7%**
Parent/Guardian Financial Assistance	0%	33%	39%	**24%**
Military	0%	17%	14%	**10%**
Work	33%	42%	57%	**44%**
Other	33%	6%	7%	**15%**
Number of cases	3	36	28	**67**

Student Survey Questions for All Students

Tables 27 and 28 below show how respondents felt they had changed since being a student at the PLC. Eighty-six percent of students across both sites indicated that they "Agree Somewhat" or "Strongly Agree" with the statement that their grades improved since being at the PLC. Of the individual sites, students at Carrollton City PLC were most likely to indicate that they "Strongly Agree" that they improved their grades.

With respect to improvement in attendance overall, 90% indicated that they had improved their attendance. Students at Floyd County PLC were most likely to indicate that they "Strongly Agree" they had improved their attendance since entering PLC.

A majority (93%) of the students indicated that they were more focused on school work at the PLC, with just ten students (three from Floyd County, six from Richmond County, and one from Carrollton City) disagreeing with the statement.

With respect to wanting to graduate from high school, 98% of students across all schools agreed they wanted to graduate from high school. All 22 students (100%) from Carrollton City PLC "Strongly Agree" that they wanted to graduate.

Table 27: End of the Year 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**	**7%**	**3%**	**34%**	**56%**	**133**
	Carrollton	5%	9%	27%	59%	22
	Floyd	7%	2%	35%	56%	54
	Richmond	9%	0%	38%	53%	57
I have improved my school attendance	**All Sites**	**5%**	**11%**	**34%**	**50%**	**101**
	Carrollton	0%	18%	36%	46%	22
	Floyd	9%	6%	28%	57%	53
	Richmond	7%	9%	38%	46%	56
I am more focused on my school work.	**All Sites**	**4%**	**3%**	**31%**	**62%**	**130**
	Carrollton	0%	5%	41%	54%	22
	Floyd	4%	2%	25%	69%	52
	Richmond	7%	3%	27%	63%	56
I want to graduate from high school	**All Sites**	**2%**	**0%**	**4%**	**94%**	**133**
	Carrollton	0%	0%	5%	95%	22
	Floyd	4%	0%	5%	91%	54
	Richmond	3%	0%	3%	93%	57

Table 28 provides student responses to the statement that they "get into less trouble" since attending PLC. Across all PLCs 19% of students indicated that their behavior had not been a problem, and 75% indicated that they improved their behavior and got into less trouble since they entered the PLC.

Table 28: End of the Year 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**	**19%**	**7%**	**0%**	**19%**	**56%**	**27**
	Carrollton	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**	**33%**	**55%**	**22**
	Floyd	18%	9%	0%	18%	55%	11
	Richmond	19%	6%	0%	19%	56%	16

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, 89% of PLC students "Agreed Somewhat" or "Strongly Agreed" that at the PLC the teachers and staff cared about them. Three students (two from Floyd County PLC and one from Richmond County PLC) did not feel this way.

Table 29: End of the Year Student Surveys: PLC Environment

At the PLC:	Site	Strongly Disagree	Disagree Somewhat	Agree Somewhat	Strongly Agree	Number of Cases
The teachers and staff care about me.	**All Sites**	**3%**	**0%**	**17%**	**80%**	**133**
	Carrollton City	0%	0%	36%	64%	22
	Floyd	6%	0%	13%	81%	54
	Richmond	3%	0%	3%	94%	57
I know that I can be academically successful.	**All Sites**	**2%**	**0%**	**22%**	**76%**	**133**
	Carrollton City	0%	0%	36%	64%	22
	Floyd	4%	0%	16%	80%	54
	Richmond	2%	0%	14%	84%	57
I have developed new goals for my future.	**All Sites**	**3%**	**4%**	**23%**	**70%**	**133**
	Carrollton City	0%	9%	18%	73%	22
	Floyd	4%	0%	26%	70%	54
	Richmond	4%	4%	24%	68%	57
I am a good student.	**All Sites**	**2%**	**1%**	**28%**	**69%**	**130**
	Carrollton City	0%	0%	36%	64%	22
	Floyd	4%	0%	17%	79%	53
	Richmond	2%	2%	31%	65%	55
I am able to complete more school work.	**All Sites**	**1%**	**3%**	**26%**	**70%**	**130**
	Carrollton City	0%	4%	32%	64%	22
	Floyd	4%	0%	17%	79%	53
	Richmond	0%	4%	29%	67%	55

Since students who come to PLC have been unsuccessful within the traditional school environment, it is the hope of the program that students come to know that they can be successful as students. For all sites, 97% of students chose "Agree Somewhat" or "Strongly Agree" to the survey statement "I know that I can be academically successful." Only two students from each Floyd County PLC and Richmond 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 provided with assistance in developing plans to achieve those goals. In response to the statement "I have developed new goals for my future," 93% of all respondents indicated that they had developed goals for the future while at PLC. At the individual PLC sites, the majority (90% or more) at each PLC indicated that they had developed future goals since coming to PLC.

It is important for students to feel a sense of accomplishment and have confidence in themselves as students in order to succeed in the classroom. Nearly all students (more than 95%) agreed to "I am a good student" and "I am able to complete more school work."

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 90% of students "Agreed" or "Strongly Agreed" that the classroom environment at the PLC encourages learning. Seven students (one from Richmond County PLC, one from Carrollton City PLC and seven from Floyd County PLC) disagreed.

Table 30: End of the Year 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	**5%**	**2%**	**4%**	**35%**	**55%**	**129**
Carrollton City	5%	0%	5%	36%	54%	22
Floyd	**6%**	**4%**	**0%**	**25%**	**65%**	**52**
Richmond	3%	0%	7%	45%	45%	55

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, 100% of students indicated that they felt safe at the PLC. No student at any site indicated that they did not feel safe at the PLC.

Table 31: End of the Year 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	23%	**2%**	9%	**12%**
Mostly Safe	23%	**21%**	42%	**29%**
Very Safe	54%	**77%**	49%	**60%**
Number of cases	22	**52**	55	**129**

Would you recommend the Performance Learning Center to other students. In terms of recommending the PLC to other students, over 99% of the students across all Performance Learning Centers would recommend it. Only one student (Floyd County PLC) reported that they would not recommend the school to others.

Table 32: End of the Year Student Surveys: Recommend the Program

Would you recommend the Performance Learning Center to other students?	Carrollton City	Floyd	Richmond	All Sites
Yes	**100%**	98%	**100%**	**99%**
No	**0%**	2%	**0%**	**1%**
Number of cases	**22**	54	**56**	**132**

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 experienced the following college and career readiness skills: Completing the Self-Assessment & Career Interest Inventories, Conducting Career Exploration, Completing College Applications, Practicing Writing Admission Letters/Essay, Researching Financing College, 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.

Table 33: End of the Year 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
Completing the Self-Assessment & Career Interest Inventories	**11**	4	7	**33**	4	17	**27**	16	13	**71**	24	38
	50%	18%	32%	**61%**	7%	31%	**48%**	29%	23%	**53%**	18%	29%
Conduct Career Exploration	**9**	4	9	**35**	10	9	**29**	17	10	**73**	31	28
	41%	18%	41%	**65%**	18%	17%	**52%**	30%	18%	**53%**	22%	25%
College Tour(s)	**16**	4	2	**31**	22	1	**23**	25	8	**70**	51	11
	73%	18%	9%	**57%**	41%	2%	**41%**	45%	14%	**57%**	35%	8%
Completing College Applications	**6**	13	3	**28**	22	4	**29**	22	5	**63**	57	12
	27%	59%	14%	**52%**	41%	7%	**52%**	39%	9%	**44%**	46%	10%
Practice Writing Admission Letters/Essay	**13**	6	3	**32**	19	3	**29**	19	8	**74**	44	14
	59%	27%	14%	**59%**	35%	56%	**52%**	34%	14%	**57%**	32%	28%
Researching Financing College	**13**	6	3	**33**	17	4	**28**	23	5	**74**	46	12
	59%	27%	14%	**61%**	32%	7%	**50%**	41%	9%	**57%**	33%	10%

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
Complete the FAFSA	**8**	8	6	**17**	26	11	**15**	33	8	**40**	67	25
	36%	36%	27%	**32%**	48%	20%	**28%**	59%	14%	**32%**	48%	20%
Write a Resume	**7**	10	5	**21**	30	3	**20**	32	4	**48**	72	12
	32%	45%	23%	**39%**	56%	5%	**36%**	57%	7%	**36%**	53%	12%
Practice Job Interviewing	**9**	10	3	**26**	24	4	**38**	16	2	**73**	50	9
	41%	45%	23%	**48%**	44%	7%	**68%**	28%	4%	**52%**	39%	11%
Learn to Dress for Success	**20**	1	1	**34**	18	2	**48**	6	2	**102**	25	5
	90%	5%	5%	**63%**	33%	4%	**86%**	11%	3%	**80%**	16%	4%
Develop Communication Skills	**17**	4	1	**43**	8	3	**41**	12	3	**101**	24	7
	77%	18%	5%	**80%**	15%	5%	**73%**	21%	5%	**77%**	18%	5%
Complete Job Applications	**13**	7	2	**35**	16	3	**34**	20	2	**82**	43	7
	59%	32%	9%	**65%**	30%	5%	**61%**	36%	3%	**62%**	33%	6%
Develop a List of References for Applications for	**11**	8	3	**34**	17	3	**28**	21	7	**73**	46	13
	50%	36%	23%	**63%**	31%	5%	**50%**	37%	13%	**54%**	35%	14%
Participate in Student Leadership, such as Morning Motivation planning	**12**	7	3	**26**	22	6	**36**	14	6	**74**	43	15
	55%	32%	23%	**48%**	41%	11%	**64%**	25%	11%	**56%**	33%	15%

All three PLC sites had consistent college and career readiness support, with 50% or more of respondents indicating that they had experienced 10 of the 14 skill areas at Floyd County PLC, 11 of the 14 at Richmond County PLC and 9 of 14 at Carrollton City PLC.

Best and Least Liked Aspects of the PLC. When students were asked to describe the aspects of the PLC they liked best, the two most common responses referred to the support from the teachers and/or staff (32 students) and the ability to work at their own pace (31 students). One Floyd County PLC student wrote: "You can work at your own pace and you can actually ask the teacher for help and they stand next to you and personally really help. They explain the material until you understand what you need to understand". Another appreciated "How understanding and helpful the teachers are. They never stop pushing you to do your best and they do absolutely everything in their power to make sure you succeed". As a Richmond County PLC student put it, "I can work at my own pace and get ahead in classes and I can actually focus on my work." Finally, seven students indicated that they liked that they could complete coursework quickly.

Students did not have many criticisms of their PLCs. When asked to describe the aspect of their PLC they liked least, over a third of the students had nothing negative to say. At Carrollton City PLC, three

students did not like the food while another five least liked "the people in the PLC". At Floyd, four students disliked lunch, three disliked sitting at a computer all day, while four disliked the dress code. At Richmond County PLC, seven students disliked sitting at a computer while another five students disliked the logistics and formatting of courses. Other responses that came up only once included the lack of student involvement, "leaving early before regular school", long and complicated courses, the amount of writing required, and students who "lack of teacher interaction."

PLC Helped Students to…Attending a PLC helped students achieve a variety of goals. When asked to describe something the PLC helped them accomplish, the most common response was that the PLC supported them in graduating, graduating early, or staying motivated to graduate (29 students). Others talked about less tangible achievements, such as earning better grades (13), increasing or maintaining their focus (6 students), and preparing for college and/or careers 8 students). Others wrote about changes in their attitude. One Richmond County PLC student wrote that the PLC allowed them to "Improve My Grades and be successful and not give up on hopes and dreams", and a second said the PLC helped him/her "Attending PLC has helped me graduate high school early. This enabled me to start exploring colleges more efficiently and pursue a higher education with a head start."

PLC Should…When given the opportunity to suggest improvements to their PLC, the most common response was that no changes were needed (40 students). "Be all over the world," wrote one student from Carrollton City PLC, and another from Richmond County PLC wrote, "Strive to be a much larger program because I feel many other students would love an opportunity that this program offers." Several others suggested the PLC should expand and/or accept additional students. There were more concrete suggestions offered, which included: having more teachers and tutoring, increase the amount of questions on the mastery tests, and integrating more activities.

Success Stories. Two students below describe their experiences at the PLC in their own words:

> "I was very impressed when I came to PLC. It was more than what I expected. We get to be very independent and work at our own pace, and the teachers help with any question you have. I enjoyed my senior year and actually didn't mind coming to school to finish. I was ready to drop out until I got into PLC." - Floyd County PLC graduating senior

> "At first I wanted to drop out of school and leave. I felt hurt because I didn't graduate on time. I disappointed my mom and my family. Then I was told about PLC. They gave me another chance. They helped me and worked with me, even when I gave them a hard time. I really loved being here. PLC is great!! - Richmond County PLC graduating senior

> "I really enjoyed this year at the PLC. It made me accomplish a lot of things. It helped me to improve my grades, and I really enjoyed being able to get ahead in classes. The PLC made this

year amazing, and I won't forget how nice the teachers are." – Carrollton City PLC graduating senior

CONCLUSIONS

All of the Race to the Top PLCs progressed largely as expected according to the PLC developmental timeline throughout the course of the Race to the Top grant. In its second year in operation, Carrollton City PLC strengthened its operations and students showed significant improvement in all academic subject areas. They increased their visibility in the district by having an article in the traditional high school's newsletter, allowing parents and students to know more about the program. The Carrollton City PLC graduated 5 students during its first year of operations and 23 students in 2013-14. Carrollton City PLC has had a change in staffing for the 2015 school year with a new CIS site coordinator. During the first month of the 2015 school year, the PLC had 67 students enrolled.

Floyd County PLC started the 2013-14 school year in a new location within the College and Career Academy with a completely new staff, but the transition went very well. While the site has less capacity in terms of staff and space, they actually served close to the same number of students as in the former location and graduated 50% more students than in the previous year. The new location allowed students access to more college and career planning resources. Floyd County PLC also experienced changes in site coordination in its third year, with a new CIS site coordinator coming on board in February of 2014. In its first year of operations, Floyd County PLC graduated 21 students, increasing to 30 in the 2013 school year and in 2014 had 45 graduates. Floyd County had 50 students enrolled at their PLC during the first month of the 2015 school year.

Richmond County PLC made great strides in implementing the model during the 2013-14 school year. The site had challenges in its first year, due to illness and subsequent absence of an academic coordinator for the site in its first year. The placement of a new academic coordinator in the second year of operations provided leadership needed to strengthen the program, resulting in most elements of the PLC model being well implemented by the end of the 3rd year of the grant. During 2013-14, students demonstrated improvement in all academic subject areas and the number of credits earned per student was up substantially over the previous two years. Richmond PLC has homerooms organized as "Tribes" to help the students to feel more connected to the school and to work toward goals together. The program graduated 19 students in its first year of operations, 29 in its second year and 31 students in 2014. The Richmond County PLC started the 2015 school year with a new CIS site coordinator and had 105 enrolled in the first month.

CIS of Georgia worked to help the PLCs become stronger and more effective, making efforts to support implement of the Common Core Standards into the PLC curriculum in our trainings. Our pilot of Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment may help PLCs not only to assess student reading and math competency, but also link them to remediation that will help them to achieve.