IV. APPLICATION ASSURANCES
(CFDA No. 84.416)

Legal Name of Applicant[1]: School Board of Miami-Dade County, FL	Applicant's NCES District ID[2]: 1200390
Applicant's Mailing Address: 1450 NE Second Avenue, Miami, FL 33132	
Employer Identification Number: 59-6000572	Organizational DUNS Number: 105964068
Race to the Top – District Contact Name: (Single point of contact for communication) Iraida R. Mendez-Cartaya	Contact Position and Office: Assistant Superintendent Office of Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Engagement
Contact Telephone: 305-995-1497	Contact E-mail Address: imendez@dadeschools.net

Required applicant Signatures:

- To the best of my knowledge and belief, all of the information and data in this application are true and correct.
- I further certify that I have read the application, am fully committed to it, and will support its implementation.
- I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001)

Superintendent (Printed Name): Alberto M. Carvalho	Telephone: 305-995-1430
Signature of Superintendent:	Date: 10/19/12
Local School Board President (Printed Name): Perla Tabares Hantman	Telephone: 305-995-1334
Signature of Local School Board President: Perla Tabares Hantman	Date: 10/20/12
President of the Local Teacher's Union or Association (Printed Name): Karen Aronowitz	Telephone: 305-854-0220
Signature of the President of the Local Teacher's Union or Association:	Date: 10/29/12

[1] Individual LEA, Lead LEA for the consortium, or eligible legal entity

[2] Consortium applicants must provide the NCES District ID for each LEA in the consortium, on a separate page and include in the Appendix. Applicants may obtain their NCES District ID at http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/districtsearch.

V. PROGRAM-SPECIFIC ASSURANCES FOR INDIVIDUAL LEA APPLICANTS

Individual LEA applicants must complete the forms in this part. For consortia applicants, the Lead LEA or representative of the eligible legal entity must complete the forms in Part VI.

ABSOLUTE PRIORITIES – INDIVIDUAL LEA APPLICANT

Absolute Priority 1

An applicant must address Absolute Priority 1 in its response to the selection criteria. Applicants do not write to Absolute Priority 1 separately.

Absolute Priorities 2 through 5

Applicants do not write to Absolute Priorities 2 through 5 separately. Instead, they complete this part by identifying the one (and only one) of Absolute Priorities 2 through 5 that applies. Please check one of the priorities below.

X **Absolute Priority 2: Non-Rural LEAs in Race to the Top States.** To meet this priority, an applicant must be an LEA in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in non-rural LEAs in States that received awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition

_____ **Absolute Priority 3: Rural LEAs in Race to the Top States.** To meet this priority, an applicant must be an LEA in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in rural LEAs (as defined in this notice) in States that received awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition.

_____ **Absolute Priority 4: Non-Rural LEAs in non-Race to the Top States.** To meet this priority, an applicant must be an LEA in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in non-rural LEAs in States that did not receive awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition.

_____ **Absolute Priority 5: Rural LEAs in non-Race to the Top States.** To meet this priority, an applicant must be an LEA in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in rural LEAs (as defined in this notice) in States that did not receive awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition.

NOTE: Race to the Top Phase 1, 2, and 3 States are: Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee and the District of Columbia.

BUDGET REQUIREMENT – INDIVIDUAL LEA APPLICANT
By completing this part, the applicant assures that its Race to the Top – District budget request conforms to the established budget ranges for the competition. The number of participating students is 11,760. The total Race to the Top – District grant funds requested is $ 30,000,000, which is within the following range: (Check the **one** range of participating students (all as defined in this notice) that applies) _____ $5-10 million - 2 ,000-5,000 participating students _____ $10-20 million - 5,001-10,000 participating students __X__ $20-30 million - 10,001-25,000 participating students _____ $30-40 million - 25,001+ participating students

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS – INDIVIDUAL LEA APPLICANT

By checking the applicable statement(s) below, the applicant assures that:

___X___ The applicant meets the definition of local educational agency (as defined in this notice).

___X___ The applicant is from one of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

___X___ This application is the only Race to the Top – District application to which the applicant has signed on.

___X___ This application serves a minimum of 2,000 participating students (as defined in this notice).

___X___ At least 40 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) across all participating schools (as defined in this notice) are students from low-income families, based on eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch subsidies under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act, or other poverty measures that LEAs use to make awards under section 1113(a) of the ESEA ***OR*** if the applicant has not identified all participating schools (as defined in this notice) at the time of application, the applicant assures that within 100 days of the grant award it will meet this standard.

___X___ The applicant has demonstrated its commitment to the core educational assurance areas (as defined in this notice) and assures that --

(i) The LEA, at a minimum, will implement no later than the 2014-2015 school year—

(A) A teacher evaluation system (as defined in this notice);
(B) A principal evaluation system (as defined in this notice); and
(C) A superintendent evaluation (as defined in this notice);

(ii) The LEA is committed to preparing all students for college or career, as demonstrated by—(check one that applies)

___X___ (A) Being located in a State that has adopted college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice); or

___X___ (B) Measuring all student progress and performance against college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice);

(iii) The LEA has a robust data system that has, at a minimum—
(A) An individual teacher identifier with a teacher-student match; and
(B) The capability to provide timely data back to educators and their supervisors on student growth (as defined in this notice);

(iv) The LEA has the capability to receive or match student level preschool through 12th grade and higher education data; and

(v) The LEA ensures that any disclosure of or access to personally identifiable information in students' education records complies with FERPA.

__X__ The application is signed by the superintendent or CEO, local school board president, and local teacher union or association president (where applicable).

APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS – INDIVIDUAL LEA APPLICANTS

By checking the applicable statement(s) below, the applicant assures that the:

___X___ State comment period was met. The LEA provided its State at least 10 business days to comment on the LEA's application and has submitted as part of its application package--

- The State's comments ***OR*** evidence that the State declined to comment
- The LEA's response (optional) to the State's comments

(The submitted comments, evidence, and responses are located in Part XXII, from pages 289 to 293 of the proposal.)

___X___ Mayor (or city or town administrator) comment period was met. The LEA provided its mayor or other comparable official at least 10 business days to comment on the LEA's application and has submitted as part of its application package—

- The mayor or city or town administrator's comments ***OR***, if that individual declines to comment, evidence that the LEA offered such official 10 business days to comment
- The LEA's response (optional) to the mayor or city or town administrator comments

(The submitted comments, evidence, and responses are located in Part XXII , from pages 294 to 367 of the proposal.)

SIGNATURE BLOCK FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL FOR ALL RESPONSES TO SECTION V

Superintendent or CEO of the LEA (Printed Name):	
Alberto M. Carvalho	
Signature of Superintendent or CEO of the LEA:	Date: 10/19/12

VII. OTHER ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS

Accountability, Transparency and Reporting Assurances

The Superintendent or CEO of the individual LEA or Lead LEA, or Legal Representative of Eligible Legal Entity, assures that:

- The LEA or consortium will comply with all of the accountability, transparency, and reporting requirements that apply to the Race to the Top – District program, including:
    - For each year of the program, the LEA or consortium will submit a report to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

Other Assurances and Certifications

The Superintendent or CEO of the individual LEA or Lead LEA, or Legal Representative of Eligible Legal Entity, assures or certifies the following:

- The LEA or consortium will comply with all applicable assurances in OMB Standard Forms 424B (Assurances for Non-Construction Programs) and to the extent consistent with the application, OMB Standard Form 424D (Assurances for Construction Programs), including the assurances relating to the legal authority to apply for assistance; access to records; conflict of interest; merit systems; nondiscrimination; Hatch Act provisions; labor standards; flood hazards; historic preservation; protection of human subjects; animal welfare; lead-based paint; Single Audit Act; and the general agreement to comply with all applicable Federal laws, executive orders and regulations.
- With respect to the certification regarding lobbying in Department Form 80-0013, no Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making or renewal of Federal grants under this program; the applicant, and for consortia each LEA, will complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," when required (34 CFR Part 82, Appendix B); and the applicant will require the full certification, as set forth in 34 CFR Part 82, Appendix A, in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers.
- Any LEA receiving funding under this program will have on file with the State a set of assurances that meets the requirements of section 442 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) (20 U.S.C. 1232e).
- Any LEA receiving funding under this program will have on file with the State (through either its Stabilization Fiscal Stabilization Fund application or another U.S. Department of Education Federal grant) a description of how the LEA will comply with the requirements of section 427 of GEPA (20 U.S.C. 1228a). The description must include information on the steps the LEA proposes to take to permit students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries to overcome barriers (including barriers based on gender, race, color, national origin, disability, and age) that impede access to, or participation in, the program.

- All entities receiving funds under this grant will comply with the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), including the following provisions as applicable: 34 CFR Part 74–Administration of Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations; 34 CFR Part 75–Direct Grant Programs; 34 CFR Part 77– Definitions that Apply to Department Regulations; 34 CFR Part 80– Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments, including the procurement provisions; 34 CFR Part 81– General Education Provisions Act–Enforcement; 34 CFR Part 82– New Restrictions on Lobbying; 34 CFR Part 84–Governmentwide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Financial Assistance); 34 CFR Part 85–Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement).

SIGNATURE BLOCK FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL FOR ALL ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS IN SECTION VII

Superintendent or CEO of individual LEA or Lead LEA, or Legal Representative of Eligible Legal Entity (Printed Name): Alberto M. Carvalho	
Signature of Superintendent or CEO of individual LEA or Lead LEA, or Legal Representative of Eligible Legal Entity:	Date: 10/19/12

IV. APPLICATION ASSURANCES
(CFDA No. 84.416)

Legal Name of Applicant[1]: School Board of Miami-Dade County, FL	Applicant's NCES District ID[2]: 1200390
Applicant's Mailing Address: 1450 NE Second Avenue, Miami, FL 33132	
Employer Identification Number: 59-6000572	Organizational DUNS Number: 105964068
Race to the Top – District Contact Name: (Single point of contact for communication) Iraida R. Mendez-Cartaya	Contact Position and Office: Assistant Superintendent Office of Intergovernmental Affairs, Grants Administration, and Community Engagement
Contact Telephone: 305-995-1497	Contact E-mail Address: imendez@dadeschools.net

Required applicant Signatures:

- To the best of my knowledge and belief, all of the information and data in this application are true and correct.
- I further certify that I have read the application, am fully committed to it, and will support its implementation.
- I am aware that any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statements or claims may subject me to criminal, civil, or administrative penalties. (U.S. Code, Title 218, Section 1001)

Superintendent (Printed Name): Alberto M. Carvalho	Telephone: 305-995-1430
Signature of Superintendent:	Date: 10/19/12
Local School Board President (Printed Name): Perla Tabares Hantman	Telephone: 305-995-1334
Signature of Local School Board President: Perla Tabares Hantman	Date: 10/20/12
President of the Local Teacher's Union or Association (Printed Name): Karen Aronowitz	Telephone: 305-854-0220
Signature of the President of the Local Teacher's Union or Association:	Date: 10/29/12

[1] Individual LEA, Lead LEA for the consortium, or eligible legal entity

[2] Consortium applicants must provide the NCES District ID for each LEA in the consortium, on a separate page and include in the Appendix. Applicants may obtain their NCES District ID at http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/districtsearch.

V. PROGRAM-SPECIFIC ASSURANCES FOR INDIVIDUAL LEA APPLICANTS

Individual LEA applicants must complete the forms in this part. For consortia applicants, the Lead LEA or representative of the eligible legal entity must complete the forms in Part VI.

ABSOLUTE PRIORITIES – INDIVIDUAL LEA APPLICANT

Absolute Priority 1

An applicant must address Absolute Priority 1 in its response to the selection criteria. Applicants do not write to Absolute Priority 1 separately.

Absolute Priorities 2 through 5

Applicants do not write to Absolute Priorities 2 through 5 separately. Instead, they complete this part by identifying the one (and only one) of Absolute Priorities 2 through 5 that applies. Please check one of the priorities below.

X **Absolute Priority 2: Non-Rural LEAs in Race to the Top States.** To meet this priority, an applicant must be an LEA in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in non-rural LEAs in States that received awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition

_____ **Absolute Priority 3: Rural LEAs in Race to the Top States.** To meet this priority, an applicant must be an LEA in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in rural LEAs (as defined in this notice) in States that received awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition.

_____ **Absolute Priority 4: Non-Rural LEAs in non-Race to the Top States.** To meet this priority, an applicant must be an LEA in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in non-rural LEAs in States that did not receive awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition.

_____ **Absolute Priority 5: Rural LEAs in non-Race to the Top States.** To meet this priority, an applicant must be an LEA in which more than 50 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) are in rural LEAs (as defined in this notice) in States that did not receive awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competition.

NOTE: Race to the Top Phase 1, 2, and 3 States are: Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee and the District of Columbia.

BUDGET REQUIREMENT – INDIVIDUAL LEA APPLICANT
By completing this part, the applicant assures that its Race to the Top – District budget request conforms to the established budget ranges for the competition. The number of participating students is 11,760. The total Race to the Top – District grant funds requested is $ 30,000,000, which is within the following range: (Check the **one** range of participating students (all as defined in this notice) that applies) _____ $5-10 million - 2 ,000-5,000 participating students _____ $10-20 million - 5,001-10,000 participating students __X__ $20-30 million - 10,001-25,000 participating students _____ $30-40 million - 25,001+ participating students

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS – INDIVIDUAL LEA APPLICANT

By checking the applicable statement(s) below, the applicant assures that:

___X___ The applicant meets the definition of local educational agency (as defined in this notice).

___X___ The applicant is from one of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

___X___ This application is the only Race to the Top – District application to which the applicant has signed on.

___X___ This application serves a minimum of 2,000 participating students (as defined in this notice).

___X___ At least 40 percent of participating students (as defined in this notice) across all participating schools (as defined in this notice) are students from low-income families, based on eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch subsidies under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act, or other poverty measures that LEAs use to make awards under section 1113(a) of the ESEA ***OR*** if the applicant has not identified all participating schools (as defined in this notice) at the time of application, the applicant assures that within 100 days of the grant award it will meet this standard.

___X___ The applicant has demonstrated its commitment to the core educational assurance areas (as defined in this notice) and assures that --

(i) The LEA, at a minimum, will implement no later than the 2014-2015 school year—

(A) A teacher evaluation system (as defined in this notice);
(B) A principal evaluation system (as defined in this notice); and
(C) A superintendent evaluation (as defined in this notice);

(ii) The LEA is committed to preparing all students for college or career, as demonstrated by—(check one that applies)

___X___ (A) Being located in a State that has adopted college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice); or

___X___ (B) Measuring all student progress and performance against college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice);

(iii) The LEA has a robust data system that has, at a minimum—
(A) An individual teacher identifier with a teacher-student match; and
(B) The capability to provide timely data back to educators and their supervisors on student growth (as defined in this notice);

(iv) The LEA has the capability to receive or match student level preschool through 12th grade and higher education data; and

(v) The LEA ensures that any disclosure of or access to personally identifiable information in students' education records complies with FERPA.

__X__ The application is signed by the superintendent or CEO, local school board president, and local teacher union or association president (where applicable).

APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS – INDIVIDUAL LEA APPLICANTS

By checking the applicable statement(s) below, the applicant assures that the:

___X___ State comment period was met. The LEA provided its State at least 10 business days to comment on the LEA's application and has submitted as part of its application package--

- The State's comments *OR* evidence that the State declined to comment
- The LEA's response (optional) to the State's comments

(The submitted comments, evidence, and responses are located in Part XXII, from pages 289 to 293 of the proposal.)

___X___ Mayor (or city or town administrator) comment period was met. The LEA provided its mayor or other comparable official at least 10 business days to comment on the LEA's application and has submitted as part of its application package—

- The mayor or city or town administrator's comments *OR*, if that individual declines to comment, evidence that the LEA offered such official 10 business days to comment
- The LEA's response (optional) to the mayor or city or town administrator comments

(The submitted comments, evidence, and responses are located in Part XXII , from pages 294 to 367 of the proposal.)

SIGNATURE BLOCK FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL FOR ALL RESPONSES TO SECTION V

Superintendent or CEO of the LEA (Printed Name):	
Alberto M. Carvalho	
Signature of Superintendent or CEO of the LEA:	Date: 10/19/12

VII. OTHER ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS

Accountability, Transparency and Reporting Assurances

The Superintendent or CEO of the individual LEA or Lead LEA, or Legal Representative of Eligible Legal Entity, assures that:

- The LEA or consortium will comply with all of the accountability, transparency, and reporting requirements that apply to the Race to the Top – District program, including:
    - For each year of the program, the LEA or consortium will submit a report to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

Other Assurances and Certifications

The Superintendent or CEO of the individual LEA or Lead LEA, or Legal Representative of Eligible Legal Entity, assures or certifies the following:

- The LEA or consortium will comply with all applicable assurances in OMB Standard Forms 424B (Assurances for Non-Construction Programs) and to the extent consistent with the application, OMB Standard Form 424D (Assurances for Construction Programs), including the assurances relating to the legal authority to apply for assistance; access to records; conflict of interest; merit systems; nondiscrimination; Hatch Act provisions; labor standards; flood hazards; historic preservation; protection of human subjects; animal welfare; lead-based paint; Single Audit Act; and the general agreement to comply with all applicable Federal laws, executive orders and regulations.
- With respect to the certification regarding lobbying in Department Form 80-0013, no Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making or renewal of Federal grants under this program; the applicant, and for consortia each LEA, will complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," when required (34 CFR Part 82, Appendix B); and the applicant will require the full certification, as set forth in 34 CFR Part 82, Appendix A, in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers.
- Any LEA receiving funding under this program will have on file with the State a set of assurances that meets the requirements of section 442 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) (20 U.S.C. 1232e).
- Any LEA receiving funding under this program will have on file with the State (through either its Stabilization Fiscal Stabilization Fund application or another U.S. Department of Education Federal grant) a description of how the LEA will comply with the requirements of section 427 of GEPA (20 U.S.C. 1228a). The description must include information on the steps the LEA proposes to take to permit students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries to overcome barriers (including barriers based on gender, race, color, national origin, disability, and age) that impede access to, or participation in, the program.

- All entities receiving funds under this grant will comply with the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), including the following provisions as applicable: 34 CFR Part 74–Administration of Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations; 34 CFR Part 75–Direct Grant Programs; 34 CFR Part 77– Definitions that Apply to Department Regulations; 34 CFR Part 80– Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments, including the procurement provisions; 34 CFR Part 81– General Education Provisions Act–Enforcement; 34 CFR Part 82– New Restrictions on Lobbying; 34 CFR Part 84–Governmentwide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Financial Assistance); 34 CFR Part 85–Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement).

SIGNATURE BLOCK FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL FOR ALL ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS IN SECTION VII

Superintendent or CEO of individual LEA or Lead LEA, or Legal Representative of Eligible Legal Entity (Printed Name): Alberto M. Carvalho	
Signature of Superintendent or CEO of individual LEA or Lead LEA, or Legal Representative of Eligible Legal Entity:	Date: 10/19/12

IX. SELECTION CRITERIA

A. Vision (40 total points)

(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision *(10 points)*

The extent to which the applicant has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that builds on its work in four core educational assurance areas (as defined in this notice) and articulates a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests.

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

The extent to which the applicant's approach to implementing its reform proposal (e.g., schools, grade bands, or subject areas) will support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation of that proposal, including—

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

(b) A list of the schools that will participate in grant activities (as available); and

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

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

The extent to which the application includes a high-quality plan describing how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools (as defined in this notice), and will help the applicant reach its outcome goals (e.g., the applicant's logic model or theory of change of how its plan will improve student learning outcomes for all students who would be served by the applicant).

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

The extent to which the applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals that are equal to or exceed State ESEA targets for the LEA(s), overall and by student subgroup (as defined in this notice), for each participating LEA in the following areas:

(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth).
(b) Decreasing achievement gaps (as defined in this notice).
(c) Graduation rates (as defined in this notice).
(d) College enrollment (as defined in this notice) rates.

Optional: The extent to which the applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals for each participating LEA in the following area:

(e) Postsecondary degree attainment.

In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria and/or provide its high-quality plan for meeting the criteria.

The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.

To provide a high-quality plan, the applicant should describe, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties (for further detail, see Scoring Instructions in Part XV or Appendix A in the NIA). The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.

Peer reviewers will reward applicants for developing goals that – in light of the applicant's proposal – are "ambitious yet achievable." In determining whether an applicant has "ambitious yet achievable" annual goals, peer reviewers will examine the applicant's goals in the context of the applicant's proposal and the evidence submitted in support of the proposal. There is no specific goal that peer reviewers will be looking for here; nor will higher goals necessarily be rewarded above lower ones.

For optional goal (A)(4)(e): Applicants scores will not be adversely impacted if they choose not to address optional goal (A)(4)(e).

Recommended maximum response length: Eight pages (excluding tables)

(A)(1) Reform vision (Under Absolute Priority 1 and 2): **Miami-Dade County Public Schools (M-DCPS)**, the fourth-largest district in the nation, is challenged to provide a 21st century education for over 340,000 students who are 91% minority (primarily Hispanic, 66%, and African-American, 24%) and 70% Economically Disadvantaged (ED) as defined by eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch. M-DCPS students include 68,000 English Language Learners (ELLs) and 36,000 Students with Disabilities (SWDs). Historically, M-DCPS has striven to close two achievement gaps – the gaps between district students and students across the state and nation, and the gaps across district demographic groups. M-DCPS is committed to identifying and implementing those pivotal changes in classroom practice and models for teaching and learning that can best support each student's achievement. M-DCPS's vision for 21st century education for all students goes beyond mastery of content knowledge and graduation readiness to encompass each student's having a post-secondary education and career plan and the intra- and inter-personal skills needed to thrive in an evolving workplace.

An unwavering focus on the singular, strategic goal of *Student* ***Achievement: Preparing Students for Success in the Third Millennium*** has driven unprecedented innovation leading to improvements in academic achievement and the quality of teaching and learning. Within Florida's Race to the Top (RTTT) efforts, M-DCPS addresses the four **core educational assurance areas** of *Standards and Assessments; Great Teachers and Leaders*; *Data Support Systems*; and *Struggling Schools.* In 2011-2012, M-DCPS teacher and principal evaluation systems were revised to prioritize student achievement as 50% of the educator's final summative performance rating. Stakes are high: Florida state statute sets performance-based termination timelines and differentiated compensation models. District data systems link student outcomes to teachers and provide teachers timely access to their students' data. M-DCPS's Common Core State Standards (CCSS) implementation includes extensive professional development. The M-DCPS Educational Transformation Office (ETO) implemented systemic reforms, including extensive professional development, lesson study, common planning time, and instructional coaching; these have led to significant improvement in student outcomes in the lowest-performing schools.

The foundational belief behind M-DCPS reforms is that changes in learner outcomes are predicated on changes in classroom practice. The guiding question is "***What should teaching and learning look like, in the 21st century?***" Teachers need timely access to student data that is immediately useful for instruction, and the resources, skills, and support to personalize the learning environment for each student. Students need access to meaningful educational activities, aligned with their interests and abilities, that foster a deeper understanding of content through real-world applications; a personalized learning plan; data and benchmarks to assess their progress; the skills to interpret and use their data; and the sense of efficacy to persist and succeed. Equity is a critical issue, and a core value of the M-DCPS design approach to implementation of the RTTT-D initiative: the best, richest, and most forward-thinking educational opportunities need to be available to all students, not just an elite few.

(A)(2) Approach to Implementation: In 2010, M-DCPS piloted the **iPrep Academy**, an innovative high-tech, blended-learning high school designed to leverage the power of online resources, coupled with effective, content-expert teachers, within a highly adaptive and flexible learning environment, to engage and empower students to take charge of their own learning. This visionary school is under the direct, hands-on supervision of the Superintendent of Schools, who is the school's principal. The **"i"** in the **iPrep model** is the **student;** instructional programs and support wrap around each student to ensure that he or she is on-track to meet graduation requirements. This transformative model demonstrates the impact on teaching and learning that results from providing teachers and students with true, 21st century resources**.** In 2011-2012, iPrep Academy students outscored other district and state students on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Tests (FCAT) with 94% scoring at or above grade level in FCAT Reading. On the Biology and Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) tests, 91% and 85%, respectively, scored in the top third and 100% of iPrep test-takers passed both the Biology and the Geometry EOCs, **a performance level matched by only four other schools in Florida**.

The iPrep 21st century school environment includes configurable workspaces and small breakout rooms in which students engage in real-world and virtual learning experiences. Students work on laptops or use the district's Bring Your Own Device policy, using their own tablets or smartphones, to access high-quality, research-based resources such as Carnegie Learning's Cognitive Tutor to

address their individual learning needs, from remedial tutoring to advanced coursework. The iPrep model is being rolled out strategically, through careful management of scarce resources to provide the necessary infrastructure and technology. As of 2012-2013, iPrep high-school-level academies are in place in nine (9) high schools.

In weighing the resources available though Race to the Top-District (RTTT-D) against the size of the district, the priority was to maximize the impact on schools to create systemic, cultural change and, specifically, to accomplish that change by providing an effective solution to a real problem of practice. To support this district-wide impact, and provide immediate access to a 21st-century learning environment to the maximum possible number of students, the design team decided to focus on one level and subject in which there is a demonstrated need for reform - **middle school mathematics -** and place **an iPrep Math learning center at every middle school beginning with the 2013-2014 school year**. iPrep Math addresses three critical issues: stagnation in middle school mathematics achievement, high failure rates in Algebra 1, and over-aged middle school students resulting from the state's mandatory third grade retention policy. iPrep Math will leverage technology resources, coupled with content-expert teachers, to address: the significant variability in the prior preparation of incoming students; the need to remediate over-aged students; and the need to provide mastery-based acceleration options. The iPrep Math model will: bring middle school mathematics instruction fully into the 21st century; drive student achievement in mathematics; and open up potential high-earning career pathways for students who historically have been left by the wayside, including minorities, economically disadvantaged, SWDs, and ELLs.

The iPrep Math environment will serve as a local example within each school for a new paradigm of 21st century blended-learning classroom practice. Each school staff is best situated to understand the needs of their school community and determine how best to implement this model across additional grades and subject areas.

The M-DCPS RTTT-D iPrep Math project goals are: *1.) Implement systemic reforms in mathematics instruction in the middle school to ensure excellence and provide equity for all students by creating a personalized learning environment that will support each student's success and increase student achievement; 2.) Increase student access to post-secondary education and career*

opportunities in STEM by increasing the number and percent of students who succeed in passing Algebra I on the first attempt; 3.) Improve the quality of teaching and learning for all students by increasing the number and percent of students taught by effective and highly-effective teachers; and 4.) Build the capacity of student services support teams to address the needs of the whole child in order to improve student achievement.

Implementation of iPrep Math: Project implementation activities are scheduled to begin in December 2012, upon notification of award. The **Project Director,** to be hired promptly upon notification of award, will be charged with: coordinating, with M-DCPS Facilities staff, the infrastructure renovation and installation needed for the 49 iPrep math centers; providing information and support regarding the iPrep Math model for middle school principals and assistant principals; recruiting and hiring the iPrep Math Facilitators; coordinating project implementation; facilitating recruitment and professional development for the iPrep Math teachers; and providing information to parents and students about iPrep Math to facilitate student recruitment.

The proposed plan for **the iPrep Math middle school** model builds upon knowledge gained from development of the iPrep high school model and identifies **four (4) critical success factors (CSF)**. **The first CSF**: *The infrastructure to support the 21st century learning environment needs to be in place from the start.* Bringing every M-DCPS middle school facility fully into the 21st century is a significant challenge. Half of the school buildings in M-DCPS are over 40 years old, with a great disparity across schools in the technology infrastructure. The physical plant conversion and wiring required to create the iPrep Math learning centers will need to begin promptly upon notification of funding award in order to ensure that they are all ready by August 2013. In planning for the implementation of iPrep Math, each school site was reviewed to identify the best strategy for optimization of the available learning space. **Attachment 1: *iPrep Math Learning Center Design Prototypes*** provides the three design layouts that have been developed for the flexible, 21st-century learning environments that will be created by combining multiple, traditional classrooms into a single, large, multi-purpose space that is adaptable to the needs of learners and learning activities.

The second CSF is fostering a culture change by *ensuring that district and school leaders share the vision, understand the model,*

and know how to guide and support the implementation at each school site and accurately assess the teaching and learning taking place. Middle school principals and assistant principals will participate in front-load orientation on the iPrep Math model in the summer of 2013, and each summer thereafter, and will receive ongoing support from the Project Director and the iPrep Math Facilitators.

The third CSF is *the need to have the right teachers, with the right skill sets, in place from the start.* Recruitment and selection of the iPrep Math teachers by the Project Director and the school principals will begin in the spring of 2013, with intensive professional development taking place in the summer of 2013, so that each teacher is well-versed in the model, comfortable with the technology, and engaged in the iPrep Math Community of Practice (COP). **The fourth CSF** is *ensuring equitable access to iPrep Math for all interested students*, so that these learning centers do not become restricted to only gifted and advanced students, or, worse, be used as "drill and kill" remedial centers for struggling students, and that SWDS and ELLS are not selectively excluded or included because of misperceptions. School student services staff are key gatekeepers in student advisement, articulation, parent outreach, and scheduling. Front-load training on the iPrep Math model for school-site student services personnel will provide a consistent vision and message across the district. In addition, **two (2) iPrep Math Student Services Support Specialists will be recruited and hired** to: support outreach efforts; facilitate access to programs and services to support the whole child; ensure that advisement, placement, and support of students in iPrep Math are equitable district-wide; and provide continuity of student support across schools.

Activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. Detailed information regarding the activities, deliverables, timelines, responsible parties, alignment with the applicable Absolute Priorities and the RTTT assurance areas, for the implementation of **iPrep Math** are provided, for each project goal, by fiscal year, in **Attachment 2: *iPrep Math Comprehensive Management Plan*.**

Ensuring access to timely and relevant data: The linchpin of the district's strategic vision is to provide all stakeholders with timely and relevant data to inform instruction for each student and to enable students and parents to make informed choices regarding educational and career-preparation options. M-DCPS has built a single-sign-on web-based portal to provide 24/7 access. The portal

provides principals with student data and dynamic accountability reports that support data-informed strategic action. Teachers have class and student data, an electronic gradebook, a collaboration site, and resources for creating and analyzing formative assessments. Students can access their test data, grades, classroom assignments, instructional resources, career preparation resources, e- textbooks, and a series of instructional tools such as *Links to Learning* - online curriculum content supporting year-round student learning beyond the school day in the form of individualized learning paths and the *Virtual Schooling Options*. The parent portal provides parents access to their student's individual data and grades and facilitates communication on student progress.

(a) Process used to select participating schools: *Why focus on the middle school?* The middle school student is often described as the "lost child" of education. Historically, educational reform tends to start either at the primary grades or the senior high school with the expectation that it will somehow percolate into the middle grades. As leadership teams turn over, reforms get replaced by other reform initiatives, and the middle schools are often left out. Yet research supports the middle school years as critical in laying foundations which have lasting and immutable effects, ultimately impacting future career choices and financial stability as adults. Middle school is when students will lay the foundations for their future careers – or fail to do so, with lasting consequences. In particular, students need to explore, experiment, and experience real-world applications of academic knowledge, deepen their conceptual understanding, and make relevant cross-disciplinary connections that will prepare them for post-secondary study and careers. District data reveal systemic weakness in middle school mathematics achievement.

Why focus on Algebra-readiness? Algebra 1 is a gatekeeper course which has been a bottleneck for M-DCPS students. M-DCPS has historically scheduled students into Algebra 1 in the 9th grade, with only a few advanced middle school students taking it in Grade 8. The 9th grade failure rate has remained problematic. Students must pass the state End-of-Course (EOC) examination in Algebra 1 in order to earn course credit and meet graduation requirements. Students who fail Algebra 1 the first time have to repeat the course while also taking Geometry; they risk not graduating on time, and some give up and drop out altogether. The foundation for success in Algebra 1 must be laid in middle school: students who are at risk of potential failure must be remediated early and effectively, and

students who are on-track to pass must have access to more challenging coursework.

(b) Participating schools: To ensure equitable access for all students, and address systemic weakness in middle school mathematics, the iPrep Math will be **implemented district-wide across all 49 traditional M-DCPS middle schools** with all students eligible to apply. **(List of schools provided in Table A2)** Each middle school will have the opportunity to implement at least one **iPrep Math** learning center to serve 240 students in grades 6, 7, and 8. Students will work in groups of 60 with a team of three teachers in an adaptive, technologically-rich, highly-engaging learning environment. The challenges potentially presented by so many students in one place are effectively and creatively addressed through the learning center design. Sound-absorbing materials, such as acoustical ceilings and carpeting, and state-of-the-art sound systems, will provide auditory buffers and learning zones. The space is deliberately over-sized, with an occupancy capacity of 85 students, thus providing the 60 students actually scheduled into the center at any given time with more workspace. The large, highly-configurable space, with multiple teacher and student stations, will provide a constructive setting that will allow students to work on meaningful learning activities according to their individual learning plan. As an example, students might be working on units of study on understanding fractions, multiplication and division, and the relationship between multiplication and division, in order to make sense of the procedures for dividing fractions. Around the iPrep Math learning center, small teams of students are exploring the concept of fractions by discussing the meaning of a problem and looking for entry points to its solution. Other students are analyzing problem information, conjecturing about potential solutions, planning a solution pathway, and applying their knowledge to independently design and solve new problems. Some students are at their desks or on computers reviewing and practicing multiplication and division; others are working on the same skills in small groups with a teacher. A second teacher is circulating around the room to hear the discussions, provide clarification, and identify any concepts that need to be retaught. The third teacher is meeting with individual students to review their most current progress data and update their learning action plans. The teachers plan collaboratively to ensure that all activities are effectively coordinated and that all students' needs are addressed.

(c) Participating student and teachers: Beginning in the fall of the 2013-2014 school year, an estimated 11,760 students will be served through the 49 iPrep Math middle school learning centers each year. **Table A2** represents projected numbers and percentages or participating students, overall, and by high-need and low-income status, based on a distributive model matching current enrolled students. The proportion of low-income students across M-DCPS exceeds 70%. Participation in the iPrep Math experience will be voluntary, by application. It is anticipated, based on the district student population, that actual participation of low-income students will significantly exceed 50%, but, at a minimum, assignment of priority weighting to applications from low-income students will ensure that the 40% participation threshold is met. If demand exceeds available seats, students will be selected by lottery, within the same parameters. Second iPrep Math rooms will be provided to schools as funding allows. Teaching assignment for the iPrep Math environment will also be choice-driven, with qualified, interested teachers submitting applications. Selection criteria for the 147 iPrep Math center teachers will include: certification in secondary Mathematics, a demonstrated history of effectiveness in driving student achievement, and a desire to engage in a collaborative, student-centered, responsive, and innovative paradigm for teaching and learning.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change: Through site-embedded, job-alike demonstration of the power of personalized learning to support the achievement of even traditionally at-risk students, iPrep Math will provide the impetus to expand the model into other mathematics classrooms and other subject areas, such as, for example, integrating science as a next step. The **iPrep Math** model was designed with an eye to efficiency, sustainability and replicability across the district, building the capacity of existing staff. At a budget of $30 million grant dollars for four years, spread over 11,760 students**, the annual cost is less than 640 dollars ($640) per participating student**. Scaling up to additional classrooms and subjects will leverage economies of scale and build on the work done in developing and implementing the iPrep Math model. As digital devices become cheaper and more powerful, more students will be able to access iPrep Math resources in schools and anytime/anywhere through web-enabled devices. It is important to note that the initial iPrep Math population size exceeds the total population of many school districts and is diverse enough to provide valuable

information regarding the effectiveness of the iPrep Math model and of model components that can be used for systematic analysis and iterative refinements of the model. Formative feedback and lessons learned will drive continuous improvement processes, identify best practices, and indicate the most effective methods for expansion to additional students and subjects. What will remain on the ground in M-DCPS when grant funding sunsets will be the improved infrastructure and technology throughout all 49 middle schools; a cadre of content-expert, technology-savvy teachers; site-embedded experience with blended learning and personalized instruction models that have been successively refined through a continuous improvement process.

Help applicant reach its outcome goals (applicant's theory of change as to how the plan will improve student learning): The literature on mathematics education reveals a long-standing concern regarding students' failure to transfer classroom-learned skills into real-world applications (Lave 1988) (Brown, Collins, & Duguid 1989) (Walkington & Sherman 2012). Work on development of understanding through "situated" learning (Núñez, Edwards, & Matos 1999) (Lave & Wenger 1991) underscores the social and observational elements of learning within a "community of practice" (COP) (Smith 2003, 2009). A COP is defined by three (3) elements: what it is about - an area of knowledge or activity; how it functions - the formal and informal rules and processes for carrying out the work; and product or outcomes - the accumulated knowledge, skills, and practices that embody the results of the work. The proposed iPrep Math model will leverage the high level of engagement and authentic application fostered through a COP, coupled with a personalized and highly-adaptive learning environment, technological resources, and skilled, content-expert teachers working in a collaborative environment. The fundamental belief underpinning the iPrep Math model is that, for students to become truly proficient in mathematics, they must be able to make sense of what they learn and to construct relevant cross-curricular connections, gaining this understanding through experiences that are well-planned, engaging, related to the students' interests, designed to enable students to apply and practice skills within real-world concepts, and that are systematic, sustained, and significant. This "wrap-around" model of personalization within an environment that also provides for meaningful peer-to-peer communication, project-based learning, and direct instruction from effective teachers who have deep content expertise, coupled with extensive

technological resources, will provide each student an environment in which he, or she, can thrive academically, and develop the interpersonal skills and intra-personal understanding that will prepare them for the 21st century workplace.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes: The tables in (A) (4), below, provide baseline performance data and annual performance goals overall and by subgroup.

(A)(2) Applicant's Approach to Implementation

			School Demographics								
			Raw Data Actual numbers or estimates (Please note where estimates are used)						Percentages		
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
LEA *(Column relevant for consortium applicants)*	**Participating School** **Location #-School Name**	**Grades/Subjects included in Race to the Top - District Plan**	# of Participating Educators	# of Participating Students	# of Participating high-need students	# of Participating low-income students	Total # of low-income students in LEA or Consortium	Total # of Students in the School	% of Participating Students in the School (B/F)*100	% of Participating students from low-income families (D/B)*100	% of Total LEA or consortium low-income population (D/E)*100
Miami-Dade	6011-Allapattah Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	187	222	251,755	633	38%	92.6	0.1
Miami-Dade	6023-Andover Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	143	195	251,755	1208	20%	81.3	0.1
Miami-Dade	6021-Arvida Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	67	123	251,755	1278	19%	51.3	0.0

			School Demographics								
			Raw Data Actual numbers or estimates (Please note where estimates are used)						Percentages		
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
LEA *(Column relevant for consortium applicants)*	**Participating School** **Location #-School Name**	**Grades/Subjects included in Race to the Top - District Plan**	# of Participating Educators	# of Participating Students	# of Participating high-need students	# of Participating low-income students	Total # of low-income students in LEA or Consortium	Total # of Students in the School	% of Participating Students in the School (B/F)*100	% of Participating students from low-income families (D/B)*100	% of Total LEA or consortium low-income population (D/E)*100
Miami-Dade	6031-Brownsville Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	177	228	251,755	670	36%	95.1	0.1
Miami-Dade	6051-Carol City Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	184	219	251,755	683	35%	91.2	0.1
Miami-Dade	6091-Citrus Grove Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	172	228	251,755	1009	24%	95.2	0.1
Miami-Dade	6611-Country Club Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	126	205	251,755	1374	17%	85.5	0.1
Miami-Dade	6071-George Washington Carver Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	17	66	251,755	986	24%	27.7	0.0
Miami-Dade	6211-Glades Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	92	163	251,755	1135	21%	67.8	0.1
Miami-Dade	6221-Hammocks Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	100	172	251,755	1181	20%	71.7	0.1

			School Demographics								
			Raw Data Actual numbers or estimates (Please note where estimates are used)						Percentages		
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
LEA *(Column relevant for consortium applicants)*	**Participating School** **Location #-School Name**	**Grades/Subjects included in Race to the Top - District Plan**	# of Participating Educators	# of Participating Students	# of Participating high-need students	# of Participating low-income students	Total # of low-income students in LEA or Consortium	Total # of Students in the School	% of Participating Students in the School (B/F)*100	% of Participating students from low-income families (D/B)*100	% of Total LEA or consortium low-income population (D/E)*100
Miami-Dade	6171-Henry Filer Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	136	228	251,755	1153	21%	94.9	0.1
Miami-Dade	6001-Herbert Ammons Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	28	117	251,755	1204	20%	48.7	0.0
Miami-Dade	6751-Hialeah Gardens Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	109	202	251,755	1873	13%	84.2	0.1
Miami-Dade	6231-Hialeah Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	141	217	251,755	872	28%	90.5	0.1
Miami-Dade	6241-Highland Oaks Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	100	168	251,755	1238	19%	69.8	0.1
Miami-Dade	6251-Homestead Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	164	227	251,755	634	38%	94.6	0.1
Miami-Dade	6411-Horace Mann Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	147	217	251,755	758	32%	90.6	0.1
Miami-Dade	6441-Howard D. McMillan Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	107	198	251,755	794	30%	82.6	0.1

			School Demographics								
			Raw Data Actual numbers or estimates (Please note where estimates are used)						Percentages		
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
LEA *(Column relevant for consortium applicants)*	**Participating School** **Location #-School Name**	**Grades/Subjects included in Race to the Top - District Plan**	# of Participating Educators	# of Participating Students	# of Participating high-need students	# of Participating low-income students	Total # of low-income students in LEA or Consortium	Total # of Students in the School	% of Participating Students in the School (B/F)*100	% of Participating students from low-income families (D/B)*100	% of Total LEA or consortium low-income population (D/E)*100
Miami-Dade	6301-John F. Kennedy Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	115	214	251755	1394	17%	89.3	0.1
Miami-Dade	6771-Jorge Mas Canosa Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	112	183	251,755	1950	12%	76.1	0.1
Miami-Dade	6361-Jose de Diego Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	187	219	251,755	500	48%	91.4	0.1
Miami-Dade	6331-Kinloch Park Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	144	225	251,755	1173	20%	93.6	0.1
Miami-Dade	6351-Lake Stevens Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	156	211	251,755	638	38%	87.8	0.1
Miami-Dade	6921-Lamar Louise Curry Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	64	164	251,755	1107	22%	68.4	0.1
Miami-Dade	6161-Lawton Chiles Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	140	193	251,755	953	25%	80.4	0.1
Miami-Dade	6391-Madison Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	186	226	251,755	568	42%	94	0.1

			School Demographics								
			Raw Data Actual numbers or estimates (Please note where estimates are used)						Percentages		
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
LEA *(Column relevant for consortium applicants)*	**Participating School** **Location #-School Name**	**Grades/Subjects included in Race to the Top - District Plan**	# of Participating Educators	# of Participating Students	# of Participating high-need students	# of Participating low-income students	Total # of low-income students in LEA or Consortium	Total # of Students in the School	% of Participating Students in the School (B/F)*100	% of Participating students from low-income families (D/B)*100	% of Total LEA or consortium low-income population (D/E)*100
Miami-Dade	6501-Miami Lakes Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	113	203	251,755	825	29%	84.4	0.1
Miami-Dade	6521-Miami Springs Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	136	207	251,755	1616	15%	86.3	0.1
Miami-Dade	6541-Nautilus Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	106	171	251,755	1149	21%	71.3	0.1
Miami-Dade	6571-Norland Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	140	204	251,755	740	32%	85.1	0.1
Miami-Dade	6591-North Dade Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	156	209	251,755	662	36%	87.2	0.1
Miami-Dade	6631-North Miami Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	162	227	251,755	982	24%	94.5	0.1
Miami-Dade	6681-Palm Springs Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	137	219	251,755	1165	21%	91.3	0.1
Miami-Dade	6701-Palmetto Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	64	77	251,755	1166	21%	31.9	0.0

			School Demographics								
			Raw Data Actual numbers or estimates (Please note where estimates are used)						Percentages		
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
LEA *(Column relevant for consortium applicants)*	**Participating School** **Location #-School Name**	**Grades/Subjects included in Race to the Top - District Plan**	# of Participating Educators	# of Participating Students	# of Participating high-need students	# of Participating low-income students	Total # of low-income students in LEA or Consortium	Total # of Students in the School	% of Participating Students in the School (B/F)*100	% of Participating students from low-income families (D/B)*100	% of Total LEA or consortium low-income population (D/E)*100
Miami-Dade	6041-Paul W. Bell Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	117	218	251,755	675	36%	90.7	0.1
Miami-Dade	6741-Ponce de Leon Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	101	188	251,755	1178	20%	78.4	0.1
Miami-Dade	6761-Redland Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	162	211	251,755	580	41%	88.1	0.1
Miami-Dade	6781-Richmond Heights Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	156	209	251,755	662	36%	87.2	0.1
Miami-Dade	6801-Riviera Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	162	227	251,755	982	24%	94.5	0.1
Miami-Dade	6821-Rockway Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	137	219	251,755	1165	21%	91.3	0.1
Miami-Dade	6121-Ruben Dario Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	64	77	251,755	1166	21%	31.9	0.0
Miami-Dade	6841-Shenandoah Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	117	218	251,755	675	36%	90.7	0.1

			School Demographics								
			Raw Data Actual numbers or estimates (Please note where estimates are used)						Percentages		
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
LEA *(Column relevant for consortium applicants)*	**Participating School** **Location #-School Name**	**Grades/Subjects included in Race to the Top - District Plan**	# of Participating Educators	# of Participating Students	# of Participating high-need students	# of Participating low-income students	Total # of low-income students in LEA or Consortium	Total # of Students in the School	% of Participating Students in the School (B/F)*100	% of Participating students from low-income families (D/B)*100	% of Total LEA or consortium low-income population (D/E)*100
Miami-Dade	5003-South Dade Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	101	188	251,755	1178	20%	78.4	0.1
Miami-Dade	6881-South Miami Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	162	211	251,755	580	41%	88.1	0.1
Miami-Dade	6861-Southwood Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	80	115	251,755	1501	16%	47.8	0.0
Miami-Dade	6281-Thomas Jefferson Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	176	214	251,755	419	57%	89	0.1
Miami-Dade	6901-W. R. Thomas Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	85	183	251,755	735	33%	76.2	0.1
Miami-Dade	6961-West Miami Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	145	211	251,755	1060	23%	88.1	0.1
Miami-Dade	6052-Zelda Glazer Middle	6-8 Math	3	240	83	171	251,755	1456	16%	71.4	0.1
TOTAL		6-8 Math	147	11760	6058	9399	251,755	49974	24%	71.9	3.7

A. (A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes

(Note to applicant: Add more rows or subgroups as needed, e.g. to provide information on both proficiency status and growth, to address additional grade levels, subjects, etc.)

(A)(4)(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth)

Summative assessments being used (e.g., name of ESEA assessment or end-of-course test): **2012 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) 2.0 Reading**

Methodology for determining status (e.g., percent proficient and above): **Proficiency Status is % Levels 3 -5**

Methodology for determining growth (e.g., value-added, mean growth percentile, change in achievement levels): **State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1 -2 by 50% over five years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 as baseline**

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
GRADE 03	OVERALL	NA	53	58	62	67	72	77
FCAT 2.0 Reading	BLACK	NA	36	42	49	55	62	68
	HISPANIC	NA	56	60	65	69	74	78
	WHITE	NA	76	78	81	83	86	88
	OTHER	NA	74	77	79	82	84	87
	ED	NA	46	51	57	62	68	73
	ELL	NA	22	30	38	45	53	61
	SWD	NA	20	28	36	44	52	60

Key: ED Economically Disadvantaged ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities

(A)(4)(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth)

Summative assessments being used (e.g., name of ESEA assessment or end-of-course test): **2012 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) 2.0 Reading**
Methodology for determining status (e.g., percent proficient and above): **Proficiency Status is % Levels 3 -5**
Methodology for determining growth (e.g., value-added, mean growth percentile, change in achievement levels): **State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1 -2 by 50% over five years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 as baseline**

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
GRADE 04 FCAT 2.0 Reading	OVERALL	NA	60	64	68	72	76	80
	BLACK	NA	44	50	55	61	66	72
	HISPANIC	NA	62	66	70	73	77	81
	WHITE	NA	79	81	83	85	87	90
	OTHER	NA	77	79	82	84	86	89
	ED	N/A	53	58	62	67	72	77
	ELL	N/A	27	34	42	49	56	64
	SWD	N/A	25	33	40	48	55	63

Key: ED Economically Disadvantaged ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities

(A)(4)(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth)

Summative assessments being used (e.g., name of ESEA assessment or end-of-course test): **2012 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) 2.0 Reading**
Methodology for determining status (e.g., percent proficient and above): **Proficiency Status is % Levels 3 -5**
Methodology for determining growth (e.g., value-added, mean growth percentile, change in achievement levels): **State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1 -2 by 50% over five years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 as baseline**

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
GRADE 05 FCAT 2.0 Reading	OVERALL	N/A	60	64	68	72	76	80
	BLACK	N/A	43	49	54	60	66	72
	HISPANIC	N/A	63	67	70	74	78	82
	WHITE	N/A	80	82	84	86	88	90
	OTHER	N/A	77	79	82	84	86	89
	ED	N/A	54	59	63	68	72	77
	ELL	N/A	23	31	38	46	54	62
	SWD	N/A	26	33	41	48	56	63

Key: ED Economically Disadvantaged ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities

(A)(4)(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth)

Summative assessments being used (e.g., name of ESEA assessment or end-of-course test): **2012 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) 2.0 Reading**
Methodology for determining status (e.g., percent proficient and above): **Proficiency Status is % Levels 3 -5**
Methodology for determining growth (e.g., value-added, mean growth percentile, change in achievement levels): **State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1 -2 by 50% over five years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 as baseline**

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
GRADE 06 FCAT 2.0 Reading	OVERALL	N/A	53	58	62	67	72	77
	BLACK	N/A	36	42	49	55	62	68
	HISPANIC	N/A	56	60	65	69	74	78
	WHITE	N/A	74	77	79	82	84	87
	OTHER	N/A	73	76	78	81	84	87
	ED	N/A	47	52	58	63	68	74
	ELL	N/A	14	23	31	40	48	57
	SWD	N/A	21	29	37	45	53	61

Key: ED Economically Disadvantaged ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities

(A)(4)(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth)

Summative assessments being used (e.g., name of ESEA assessment or end-of-course test): **2012 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) 2.0 Reading**
Methodology for determining status (e.g., percent proficient and above): **Proficiency Status is % Levels 3 -5**
Methodology for determining growth (e.g., value-added, mean growth percentile, change in achievement levels): **State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1 -2 by 50% over five years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 as baseline**

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
GRADE 07 FCAT 2.0 Reading	OVERALL	N/A	54	59	63	68	72	77
	BLACK	N/A	38	44	50	57	63	69
	HISPANIC	N/A	56	60	65	69	74	78
	WHITE	N/A	77	79	82	84	86	89
	OTHER	N/A	76	78	81	83	86	88
	ED	N/A	47	52	58	63	68	74
	ELL	N/A	13	22	30	39	48	57
	SWD	N/A	24	32	39	47	54	62

Key: ED Economically Disadvantaged ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities

(A)(4)(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth)

Summative assessments being used (e.g., name of ESEA assessment or end-of-course test): **2012 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) 2.0 Reading**
Methodology for determining status (e.g., percent proficient and above): **Proficiency Status is % Levels 3 -5**
Methodology for determining growth (e.g., value-added, mean growth percentile, change in achievement levels): **State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1 -2 by 50% over five years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 as baseline**

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
GRADE 08 FCAT 2.0 Reading	OVERALL	N/A	54	59	63	68	72	77
	BLACK	N/A	38	44	50	57	63	69
	HISPANIC	N/A	56	60	65	69	74	78
	WHITE	N/A	74	77	79	82	84	87
	OTHER	N/A	72	75	78	80	83	86
	ED	N/A	47	52	58	63	68	74
	ELL	N/A	12	21	30	38	47	56
	SWD	N/A	23	31	38	46	54	62

Key: ED Economically Disadvantaged ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities

(A)(4)(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth)

Summative assessments being used (e.g., name of ESEA assessment or end-of-course test): **2012 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) 2.0 Reading**
Methodology for determining status (e.g., percent proficient and above): **Proficiency Status is % Levels 3 -5**
Methodology for determining growth (e.g., value-added, mean growth percentile, change in achievement levels): **State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1 -2 by 50% over five years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 as baseline**

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
GRADE 09 FCAT 2.0 Reading	OVERALL	N/A	48	53	58	64	69	74
	BLACK	N/A	30	37	44	51	58	65
	HISPANIC	N/A	50	55	60	65	70	75
	WHITE	N/A	73	76	78	81	84	87
	OTHER	N/A	73	76	78	81	84	87
	D	N/A	41	47	53	59	65	71
	ELL	N/A	9	18	27	36	45	55
	SWD	N/A	20	28	36	44	52	60

Key: ED Economically Disadvantaged ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities

(A)(4)(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth)

Summative assessments being used (e.g., name of ESEA assessment or end-of-course test): **2012 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) 2.0 Reading**
Methodology for determining status (e.g., percent proficient and above): **Proficiency Status is % Levels 3 -5**
Methodology for determining growth (e.g., value-added, mean growth percentile, change in achievement levels): **State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1 -2 by 50% over five years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 as baseline**

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
GRADE 10 FCAT 2.0 Reading	OVERALL	N/A	46	51	57	62	68	73
	BLACK	N/A	30	37	44	51	58	65
	HISPANIC	N/A	47	52	58	63	68	74
	WHITE	N/A	69	72	75	78	81	85
	OTHER	N/A	75	78	80	83	85	88
	ED	N/A	39	45	51	57	63	70
	ELL	N/A	10	19	28	37	46	55
	SWD	N/A	21	29	37	45	53	61

Key: ED Economically Disadvantaged ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities

(A)(4)(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth)

Summative assessments being used (e.g., name of ESEA assessment or end-of-course test): **2012 FCAT 2.0 Math**
Methodology for determining status (e.g., percent proficient and above): **Proficiency Status is % Levels 3 -5**
Methodology for determining growth (e.g., value-added, mean growth percentile, change in achievement levels): **State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1 -2 by 50% over five years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 as baseline**

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
GRADE 03 FCAT 2.0 Math	OVERALL	N/A	60	64	68	72	76	80
	BLACK	N/A	44	50	55	61	66	72
	HISPANIC	N/A	62	66	70	73	77	81
	WHITE	N/A	78	80	82	85	87	89
	OTHER	N/A	77	79	82	84	86	89
	ED	N/A	53	58	62	67	72	77
	ELL	N/A	35	42	48	55	61	68
	SWD	N/A	29	36	43	50	57	65

Key: ED Economically Disadvantaged ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities

(A)(4)(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth)

Summative assessments being used (e.g., name of ESEA assessment or end-of-course test): **2012 FCAT 2.0 Math**
Methodology for determining status (e.g., percent proficient and above): **Proficiency Status is % Levels 3 -5**
Methodology for determining growth (e.g., value-added, mean growth percentile, change in achievement levels): **State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1 -2 by 50% over five years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 as baseline**

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
GRADE 04 FCAT 2.0 Math	OVERALL	N/A	62	66	70	73	77	81
	BLACK	N/A	47	52	58	63	68	74
	HISPANIC	N/A	65	69	72	76	79	83
	WHITE	N/A	79	81	83	85	87	90
	OTHER	N/A	80	82	84	86	88	90
	ED	N/A	57	61	66	70	74	79
	ELL	N/A	40	46	52	58	64	70
	SWD	N/A	34	41	47	54	60	67

Key: ED Economically Disadvantaged ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities

(A)(4)(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth)

Summative assessments being used (e.g., name of ESEA assessment or end-of-course test): **2012 FCAT 2.0 Math**
Methodology for determining status (e.g., percent proficient and above): **Proficiency Status is % Levels 3 -5**
Methodology for determining growth (e.g., value-added, mean growth percentile, change in achievement levels): **State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1 -2 by 50% over five years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 as baseline**

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
GRADE 05 FCAT 2.0 Math	OVERALL	N/A	58	62	66	71	75	79
	BLACK	N/A	42	48	54	59	65	71
	HISPANIC	N/A	60	64	68	72	76	80
	WHITE	N/A	78	80	82	85	87	89
	OTHER	N/A	78	80	82	85	87	89
	ED	N/A	52	57	62	66	71	76
	ELL	N/A	29	36	43	50	57	65
	SWD	N/A	28	35	42	50	57	64

Key: ED Economically Disadvantaged ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities

(A)(4)(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth)

Summative assessments being used (e.g., name of ESEA assessment or end-of-course test): **2012 FCAT 2.0 Math**
Methodology for determining status (e.g., percent proficient and above): **Proficiency Status is % Levels 3 -5**
Methodology for determining growth (e.g., value-added, mean growth percentile, change in achievement levels): **State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1 -2 by 50% over five years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 as baseline**

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
GRADE 06 FCAT 2.0 Math	OVERALL	N/A	50	55	60	65	70	75
	BLACK	N/A	34	41	47	54	60	67
	HISPANIC	N/A	52	57	62	66	71	76
	WHITE	N/A	71	74	77	80	83	86
	OTHER	N/A	71	74	77	80	83	86
	ED	N/A	43	49	54	60	66	72
	ELL	N/A	20	28	36	44	52	60
	SWD	N/A	19	27	35	43	51	60

Key: ED Economically Disadvantaged ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities

(A)(4)(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth)

Summative assessments being used (e.g., name of ESEA assessment or end-of-course test): **2012 FCAT 2.0 Math**
Methodology for determining status (e.g., percent proficient and above): **Proficiency Status is % Levels 3 -5**
Methodology for determining growth (e.g., value-added, mean growth percentile, change in achievement levels): **State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1 -2 by 50% over five years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 as baseline**

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
GRADE 07 FCAT 2.0 Math	OVERALL	N/A	52	57	62	66	71	76
	BLACK	N/A	35	42	48	55	61	68
	HISPANIC	N/A	55	60	64	69	73	78
	WHITE	N/A	74	77	79	82	84	87
	OTHER	N/A	80	82	84	86	88	90
	ED	N/A	46	51	57	62	68	73
	ELL	N/A	23	31	38	46	54	62
	SWD	N/A	22	30	38	45	53	61

Key: ED Economically Disadvantaged ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities

(A)(4)(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth)

Summative assessments being used (e.g., name of ESEA assessment or end-of-course test): **2012 FCAT 2.0 Math**
Methodology for determining status (e.g., percent proficient and above): **Proficiency Status is % Levels 3 -5**
Methodology for determining growth (e.g., value-added, mean growth percentile, change in achievement levels): **State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1 -2 by 50% over five years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 as baseline**

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
GRADE 08 FCAT 2.0 Math	OVERALL	N/A	56	60	65	69	74	78
	BLACK	N/A	41	47	53	59	65	71
	HISPANIC	N/A	58	62	66	71	75	79
	WHITE	N/A	74	77	79	82	84	87
	OTHER	N/A	80	82	84	86	88	90
	ED	N/A	50	55	60	65	70	75
	ELL	N/A	29	36	43	50	57	65
	SWD	N/A	24	32	39	47	54	62

Key: ED Economically Disadvantaged ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities

(A)(4)(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth)

Summative assessments being used (e.g., name of ESEA assessment or end-of-course test): **2012 Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) First Time Testers, Combined Grades 6-8 and Combined Grades 9-12**

Methodology for determining status (e.g., percent proficient and above): **Proficiency Status is % Levels 3 -5**

Methodology for determining growth (e.g., value-added, mean growth percentile, change in achievement levels): **State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1 -2 by 50% over five years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 as baseline**

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
GRADES 6-8	OVERALL	N/A	90	91	92	93	94	95
Algebra EOC	BLACK	N/A	81	83	85	87	89	91
	HISPANIC	N/A	90	91	92	93	94	95
	WHITE	N/A	94	95	95	96	96	97
	OTHER	N/A	95	96	96	97	97	98
	ED	N/A	87	88	90	91	92	94
	ELL	N/A	81	83	85	87	89	91
	SWD	N/A	84	86	87	89	90	92

Key: ED Economically Disadvantaged ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities

GRADES 9-12	OVERALL	N/A	43	49	54	60	66	72

(A)(4)(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth)

Summative assessments being used (e.g., name of ESEA assessment or end-of-course test): **2012 Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) First Time Testers, Combined Grades 6-8 and Combined Grades 9-12**

Methodology for determining status (e.g., percent proficient and above): **Proficiency Status is % Levels 3 -5**

Methodology for determining growth (e.g., value-added, mean growth percentile, change in achievement levels): **State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1 -2 by 50% over five years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 as baseline**

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
Algebra EOC	BLACK	N/A	32	39	46	52	59	66
	HISPANIC	N/A	46	51	57	62	68	73
	WHITE	N/A	58	62	66	71	75	79
	OTHER	N/A	62	66	70	73	77	81
	ED	N/A	41	47	53	59	65	71
	ELL	N/A	33	40	46	53	60	67
	SWD	N/A	22	30	38	45	53	61

Key: ED Economically Disadvantaged ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities

(A)(4)(b) Decreasing achievement gaps (as defined in this notice)

Specific methodology for determining achievement gap (as defined in this notice): **2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading;**
Proficiency Status is % Levels 3-5;
State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1-2 by 50% over five Years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 baseline

Goal area	Identify subgroup and comparison group	Baseline(s)				Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12 District	SY 2011-12 State	SY 2011-12 Gaps	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
GRADES 3-5 FCAT 2.0 Reading	OVERALL	N/A	58	60	-2	62	66	71	75	79
	BLACK	N/A	41	41	0	47	53	59	65	71
	HISPANIC	N/A	60	56	4	64	68	72	76	80
	WHITE	N/A	79	71	8	81	83	85	87	90
	ELL	N/A	24	23	1	32	39	47	54	62
	SWD	N/A	24	30	-6	32	39	47	54	62
Key: ED Economically Disadvantaged ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities										
GRADES 6-8 FCAT	OVERALL	N/A	54	57	-3	59	63	68	72	77
	BLACK	N/A	37	38	-1	43	50	56	62	69

(A)(4)(b) Decreasing achievement gaps (as defined in this notice)

Specific methodology for determining achievement gap (as defined in this notice): **2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading;**
Proficiency Status is % Levels 3-5;
State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1-2 by 50% over five Years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 baseline

Goal area	Identify subgroup and comparison group	Baseline(s)				Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12 District	SY 2011-12 State	SY 2011-12 Gaps	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
2.0 Reading	HISPANIC	N/A	56	52	4	60	65	69	74	78
	WHITE	N/A	75	68	7	78	80	83	85	88
	ELL	N/A	13	12	1	22	30	39	48	57
	SWD	N/A	23	24	-1	31	38	46	54	62
Key: ED Economically Disadvantaged				ELL English Language Learner				SWD Students with Disabilities		
GRADES 9-10 FCAT 2.0 Reading	OVERALL	N/A	47	52	-5	52	58	63	68	74
	BLACK	N/A	30	30	0	37	44	51	58	65
	HISPANIC	N/A	49	47	2	54	59	64	69	75

(A)(4)(b) Decreasing achievement gaps (as defined in this notice)

Specific methodology for determining achievement gap (as defined in this notice): **2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading;**
Proficiency Status is % Levels 3-5;
State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1-2 by 50% over five Years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 baseline

Goal area	Identify subgroup and comparison group	Baseline(s)				Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12 District	SY 2011-12 State	SY 2011-12 Gaps	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
	WHITE	N/A	71	65	6	74	77	80	83	86
	ELL	N/A	10	9	1	19	28	37	46	55
	SWD	N/A	20	21	-1	28	36	44	52	60

Key: ED Economically Disadvantaged ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities

(A)(4)(b) Decreasing achievement gaps (as defined in this notice)

Specific methodology for determining achievement gap (as defined in this notice): 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math;
Proficiency Status is % Levels 3-5;
State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1-2 by 50% over five Years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 baseline

Goal area	Identify subgroup and comparison group	Baseline(s)				Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12 District	SY 2011-12 State	SY 2011-12 Gaps	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
GRADES 3-5 FCAT 2.0 Math	OVERALL	N/A	60	58	2	64	68	72	76	80
	BLACK	N/A	44	40	4	50	55	61	66	72
	HISPANIC	N/A	63	56	7	67	70	74	78	82
	WHITE	N/A	78	68	10	80	82	85	87	89
	ELL	N/A	35	32	3	42	48	55	61	68
	SWD	N/A	30	33	-3	37	44	51	58	65
GRADES 6-8 FCAT 2.0 Math	OVERALL	N/A	53	55	-2	58	62	67	72	77
	BLACK	N/A	37	36	1	43	50	56	62	69
	HISPANIC	N/A	55	52	3	60	64	69	73	78
	WHITE	N/A	73	66	7	76	78	81	84	87
	ELL	N/A	24	21	3	32	39	47	54	62
	SWD	N/A	22	23	-1	30	38	45	53	61

Key: ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities

(A)(4)(b) Decreasing achievement gaps (as defined in this notice)

Specific methodology for determining achievement gap (as defined in this notice): **2012 Algebra I EOC First Time Testers, Combined Grades 6-8 and Combined Grades 9-12;**
Proficiency Status is % Levels 3-5;
State ESEA-modified AMO 2 Target to reduce % Levels 1-2 by 50% over five Years (2016-2017), using 2011-2012 baseline

Goal	Identify	Baseline(s)	Goals

area	subgroup and comparison group	SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12			SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
			District	State	Gaps					
GRADES 6-8 Algebra EOC	OVERALL	N/A	90	87	3	91	92	93	94	95
	BLACK	N/A	81	73	8	83	85	87	89	91
	HISPANIC	N/A	90	87	3	91	92	93	94	95
	WHITE	N/A	94	91	3	95	95	96	96	97
	ELL	N/A	81	65	16	83	85	87	89	91
	SWD	N/A	84	74	10	86	87	89	90	92
GRADES 9-12 Algebra EOC	OVERALL	N/A	43	45	-2	49	54	60	66	72
	BLACK	N/A	32	32	0	39	46	52	59	66
	HISPANIC	N/A	46	43	3	51	57	62	68	73
	WHITE	N/A	58	55	3	62	66	71	75	79
	ELL	N/A	33	28	5	40	46	53	60	67
	SWD	N/A	22	24	-2	30	38	45	53	61

Key: ELL English Language Learner SWD Students with Disabilities

(A)(4)(c) Graduation rates (as defined in this notice)

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
High school	OVERALL	71.3	N/A*	73.3	75.3	77.3	79.3	82.0

graduation rate	WHITE	82.5	N/A*	83.5	84.5	85.5	86.5	87.5
	BLACK	62.4	N/A*	64.4	66.4	68.4	70.4	72.4
	HISPANIC	72.8	N/A*	74.8	76.8	78.8	80.8	82.8

*The FEDERAL Longitudinal Graduation Rates for Florida are computed by the FLDOE. The 2011-12 rates have not been published. Rates are usually available in November. The FEDERAL rate excludes students who received a special diploma as graduates.

(A)(4)(d) College enrollment (as defined in this notice) rates

NOTE: College enrollment should be calculated as the ratio between college-enrolled students and their graduating cohort. For example, for SY 2010-11, the applicant should report college enrollment (as defined in this notice) as a percentage, to be calculated as follows:

- (College enrollment SY 2010-11) = Number of SY 2008-09 graduates enrolled in a higher-education institution during the 16 months after graduation
- (College enrollment rate) = (College enrollment SY 2010-11)÷(Cohort Population, e.g. total number of SY 2008-09 graduates)*100

Goal area	Subgroup	Baseline(s)		Goals				
		SY 2010-11 (optional)	SY 2011-12	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
College enrollment rate	OVERALL	67.0	68.0	69.0	70.0	71.0	72.0	73.0
	WHITE	78.4	79.4	80.4	81.4	82.4	83.4	84.4
	BLACK	62.2	63.2	64.2	65.2	66.2	67.2	68.2
	HISPANIC	69.5	70.5	71.5	72.5	73.5	74.5	75.5

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

(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success *(15 points)*

The extent to which each LEA has demonstrated evidence of—

(1) A clear record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching, including a description, charts or graphs, raw student data, and other evidence that demonstrates the applicant's ability to—

(a) Improve student learning outcomes and close achievement gaps (as defined in this notice), including by raising student achievement, high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), and college enrollment (as defined in this notice) rates;

(b) Achieve ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) or in its low-performing schools (as defined in this notice); and

(c) Make student performance data (as defined in this notice) available to students, educators (as defined in this notice), and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services.

In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria.

The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.

Recommended maximum response length: Four pages (excluding tables)

(B) (1) (1) (a) Improving student learning outcomes and closing the achievement gap: Since 2009, M-DCPS resources have been realigned based on one all-encompassing strategic goal – increasing the achievement of all students. This has led to a strong record of improving student achievement and progress in reducing the achievement gap, as evidenced across multiple measures of achievement, including the State of Florida's school grading system, student performance on college entry examinations, and graduation outcomes. Florida's school grading system awards points to schools and districts based on student achievement in writing, reading, mathematics, and science; students' annual learning gains; and the progress made by the lowest-performing students. Florida's successful application to the U.S. Department of Education for a waiver to federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act

requirements resulted in significant changes to the school grading formula as of 2011-2012, including the inclusion of significantly more students with disabilities (SWDs) and English Language Learners (ELLs) and the application of additional metrics. In addition, the 2008 Florida Senate Bill 1908 adds alternative measures of student achievement into the high school grading formula. Despite major changes in the grading formula, M-DCPS' performance has remained relatively stable over the last four school years. While the new formula resulted in fewer M-DCPS "A" schools, overall, the number of M-DCPS "F" schools decreased from 2009 to 2012. The new grading formula resulted in fewer M-DCPS middle schools earning a grade of "A" and more receiving a grade of "F" in 2012.

M-DCPS is the recipient of the 2012 Broad Prize for Urban Education, which recognizes urban school districts that demonstrate the greatest overall performance and improvement in student achievement while reducing achievement gaps among low-income and minority students. M-DCPS has been a finalist for the Broad Prize in 2006, 2007, 2008, 2011, 2012, accomplishing sustained improvement in the education of all students within a drastically poor (70% free or reduced-price lunch) and almost entirely (91%) minority urban district with one of the largest populations of English Language Learners (ELLs) (over 19%) in the nation, accomplishing this despite draconian funding cuts and a reduced workforce. This has been accomplished through the unwavering commitment by district leadership to protecting the classroom all costs, and a fundamental conviction at the school site that all students can learn. This absolute, "no-holds-barred' approach to allocating district resources and effort has resulted in greater percentages of Hispanic and Black students in M-DCPS achieving at the highest levels (Levels 4 and 5) than in other urban Florida districts. In 2011, M-DCPS Hispanic students outperformed their peers in reading and mathematics at all school levels (elementary, middle, high school) and in elementary and middle school science. Between 2008 and 2011, M-DCPS was ahead of most Florida districts in increasing the percentage of Black students who performed at the highest achievement levels in elementary and high school reading, mathematics, and science. Improvements in graduation outcomes for M-DCPS Black and Hispanic students outpaced gains observed in other urban districts nationally. Between 2008 and 2011, M-DCPS posted increases in participation rates and scores on the SAT exam across all students tested and for Black and Hispanic students separately.

(B) (1) (1) (b) Reforming lowest-performing schools: M-DCPS has traditionally struggled to improve student outcomes in a core

of persistently-low-performing schools. In 2010, M-DCPS created the Education Transformation Office (ETO) to take direct ownership of the turnaround process and to provide one-on-one support to the 19 lowest-performing schools in the district. Strategies included intensive professional development, coaching, staff reassignments, frequent progress monitoring and site visits by administrative and support teams, and a focus on frequent and effective data use to inform planning and decision-making. From the first year of the ETO, the results of this multi-level approach were significant. In 2011, seven (7) of the 19 targeted schools improved to a C; only two remained at an "F." Ten (10) of the 19 increased by one or two letter grades. The second year of ETO implementation continued to demonstrate improvement. Before the initiative started, the original 19 ETO schools included 7 "Cs"; 10 "Ds"; and 2 "Fs." In 2012, ETO posted 5 "As"; 2 "Bs"; 8 "Cs"; 3 "Ds"; and only 1 "F" school. Miami Jackson Senior High School earned the first "A" at the high school level in the urban core throughout the state, and high schools including Miami Northwestern, Miami Carol City, Miami Norland, Homestead Senior, North Miami Senior, and Miami Southridge earned letter grades higher than a "D" for the first time ever since school grades were issued. In addition, the graduation rate at all of the 10 ETO high schools increased by an average of 10 percentage points during the 2010-11 school year, with an average graduation rate of 75%. Some ETO high schools exceeded the state and national average graduation rate, including Miami Northwestern, Booker T. Washington, Miami Norland, and Miami Jackson. In 2012-2013, seven (7) additional schools that feed into the 10 ETO high schools were incorporated into ETO through an additional $6 million School Improvement Grant. Preliminary data for this school year indicate continued improvement, with ETO high school data currently reflecting a 7 percentage point increase in reading proficiency, an 18 percentage point increase in reading learning gains, and a 28 percentage point increase in reading learning gains for the "lowest 25%" students. Algebra 1 data in the ETO high schools also reflected large gains, with a 10 percentage point increase from 2010-11 to 2011-12. Preliminary data also indicate that improvements are expected once again in the areas of graduation rate, attendance, acceleration participation and performance, and college readiness for reading and mathematics. Retrofitted data based on new cut scores shows a 2 percentage point increase in reading proficiency and a 5 percentage point increase in mathematics proficiency at the elementary level. For ETO middle schools, there was a 2 percentage point increase in mathematics proficiency along with a 6 percentage point increase in science

proficiency. For the second year in a row, suspension rates declined in ETO schools. College reading readiness improved by 36 percentage points and mathematics readiness by 16 percentage points. Accelerated Participation (dual enrollment, industry certification, and Advanced Placement) improved by 49 percentage points and performance improved by 32 percentage points. M-DCPS remains fully committed to maintain this trajectory of continuous improvement in the lowest–performing schools.

District policies and practices are already in place to support full and effective implementation of school reform efforts. The district has demonstrated its total commitment to improving the performance of all schools and ensuring that all students have access to highly- effective teachers and a world-class education at every school in the district. The next identified improvement target is affecting systemic reform to improve mathematics learning in the middle school and ensure that students have the foundational skills to succeed in Algebra 1 by grade 8 and to access higher-level mathematics coursework in high school.

(B) (1) (1) (c) Increased access to student performance data to inform and improve participation, instruction, and services: M-DCPS is committed to transparency and access to data for all stakeholders, and, especially, to engaging parents and students in real-time communication to support student learning. A significant focus of the district's effort in supporting student achievement has been the development and implementation of formative assessments and the creation of a high-quality item bank from which teachers can draw to create their own assessments, linked with a technological platform which expedites scoring and facilitates multiple levels of analysis of the test data. Teachers have immediate access to test results and can use multiple, interactive reports to set instructional targets for individual students and student groups and to provide feedback that teachers can use to refine their instructional practices. M-DCPS teachers use the Electronic Gradebook to record student attendance and grades; this information is available for review and action by parents and students. The district's web portal provides students and their parents' access to their test results and grades. The M-DCPS portal applications provide principals with access to the data for all the students at their school, coupled with an informational dashboard through which they can monitor student progress Critical district focus is on data access and fostering strategic and timely conversations about data in order to inform immediate and effective action at all levels.

The Superintendent's Data Assessment and Technical Assistance/Coordination of Management (DATA/COM) model was initially

designed to provide strategic information and data analysis support to principals at the lowest-performing schools. DATA/COM meetings are data-centered and action-focused. The DATA/COM model was so successful in supporting strategic decision-making at the lowest-performing schools that it has now been made available to all schools. A data-centered Summer Leadership Institute provided principals with guidance in using the DATA/COM model and information about available data sources and resources.

The original, high-school-level iPrep Academy model is predicated upon a continuous and rich dialogue about each student's performance, based on the student's learning plan and feedback from the online learning resources, district assessments, classroom work and assessments, and teacher observation of student work. The iPrep Math middle school model will extend this strategy, incorporating explicit and developmentally appropriate instruction for students in accessing and using relevant data sources to set their learning targets and monitor their own learning progress. The iPrep Math teachers will ensure that each participating student develops and implements an individual learning plan, monitors his/her data, and learns to make decisions and understand logical consequences of those decisions, in order to build responsibility and self-efficacy, and support student achievement.

Activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. Detailed information regarding the activities, deliverables, timelines, responsible parties, alignment with the applicable Absolute Priorities and the RTTT assurance areas, for the implementation of **iPrep Math** are provided, for each project goal, by fiscal year, in **Attachment 2: *iPrep Math Comprehensive Management Plan*.**

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

The extent to which each LEA has demonstrated evidence of—

A high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments, including by making public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration. At a minimum, this information must include a description of the extent to which the applicant already makes available the following four categories of school-level expenditures from State and local funds:

(a) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff, based on the U.S. Census Bureau's classification used in the F-33 survey of local government finances (information on the survey can be found at

http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/f33agency.asp);

(b) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only;

(c) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only; and

(d) Actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level (if available).

In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria.

The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.

Recommended maximum response length: One page

Miami-Dade County Public Schools has a long track record of demonstrating a high level of transparency by making public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration. In 1997, the Florida Legislature enacted the Educational Funding Accountability Act (Senate Bill 1546) that requires Florida school districts to report certain financial information, in the form of a school financial report, to parents/guardians. The purpose of the report is to better inform parents and the public concerning how revenues were spent to operate the school during the prior school year. In order to comply with this mandate each year, the district emails a copy of the financial report for the entire district to all principals. Principals are directed to distribute a letter from the superintendent (in three languages – English, Spanish, and Haitian-Creole) and the single report page pertaining to his/her school to students to provide to their parent or guardian. The Office of the Controller's Cost and Business Services compiles the report from the district's financial records and the FEFP Program Cost Report data provided to the Florida Department of Education.

The figures in the report represent the revenues and the expenditures/operating costs allocated to the school, both in total and per full-time equivalent student. Data are compared to the rest of the schools in the district and the state. The following information is

included:

(a) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff

(b) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only;

(c) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only; and

(d) Actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level.

Please see **Attachment 3: Sample Ed Fund Accountability Report for a middle school for 2011-2012**.

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

The extent to which each LEA has demonstrated evidence of—

Successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal.

In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria.

The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.

Recommended maximum response length: Three pages

Successful conditions and sufficient autonomy: As a participating district in Florida's RTTT implementation, M-DCPS has instituted a number of reform initiatives in educator evaluation and compensation, student assessment, and professional development that support significant, lasting changes in classroom practice. There are no impediments to the reforms proposed through the RTTT-

D iPrep Math application that would require changes to or waivers from to state statutes or state board rule. State guidelines already provide for acceleration at the middle school level by demonstrated mastery of competencies rather than by seat time alone. In addition, the iPrep Math model is designed in compliance with state class size requirements by assigning a team of three (3) teachers to each iPrep Math learning center: to full-time teachers paid by the district and one part-time teacher supported through grant funds.

According to the recent report from the State Educational Technology Directors Association (SETDA) (Fletcher, Schaffhauser, & Levin 2012), the move to effective use of digital content to support student achievement requires: sustainable funding for devices; robust internet connectivity; up-to-date policies and practices; prepared educators; intellectual property and reuse rights; quality control and usability; and state and local leadership buy-in. The report moves on to recommend a move to e-textbook adoption and implementation of digital content to support instruction no later than 2017-2018. This aligns with the State of Florida's Technology Plan, which folds twelve goals into three overarching categories: creating environments for teaching and learning that engage students in ways not previously possible; expand access to innovative digital technologies and learning opportunities; and establishing supports necessary to improve students' rates of learning and transform the learning environment for students and educators to promote the dynamic, responsive, and innovative learning supported by appropriate technology tools. The plan states: *"Technology has the potential to empower students to increase their rates of learning in the classroom by reforming the instructional process of teachers. Rather than being the "sage on the stage," the teacher will become the facilitator for student learning."* Florida was the first state in the nation to offer a statewide virtual school. The success of the Florida Virtual School demonstrates the effectiveness of statewide efforts to expand student learning opportunities through the educational potential of technology. The state technology plan declares that "each child is unique and to succeed, students and educators must be able to creatively choose digital content that is tailored to meet individual student needs, spark student interest, and allow every student to excel in his or her own way." Further, students need access to tools and devices which are relevant to their lives and to their future workplace. Finally, professional development and support are keys to success in implementing a technology-rich, 21st century learning environment.

The initiatives proposed through iPrep Math align perfectly with these state priorities; they will expand upon and refine the model

used at the district's successful iPrep Academy high school, while remaining pedagogically and developmentally appropriate for the middle school student. The original iPrep Academy, which opened in 2010, is a senior high school where student coursework is delivered in a blended model; online courses are facilitated by on-site teachers and students work at their own pace to master course objectives. Interest-based projects are infused throughout the curriculum to allow students opportunities to demonstrate understanding, collaborate with peers, and solve real-world problems. Supplemental technology programs are used for both remediation and acceleration. Although the iPrep Math middle school students will self-select to participate, and are expected to represent a range of ability and preparedness at entry, district experience with the blended learning approach has proven it to be highly engaging and effective, driving unanticipated levels of student achievement. Due to the initial success of iPrep and the overwhelming demand, the district opened iPrep programs at nine (9) high school locations around the county. The programs are academy-model programs that have allowed schools to recruit and retain students in some very competitive educational markets where charter schools are drawing students away from traditional high school programs. Currently there are 1,100 students enrolled in iPrep high-school level programs district-wide, demonstrating the demand and support for this innovative model.

Provisions for acceleration and self-pacing: At the high school level, the iPrep model currently has limits on credits earned per year: students can only earn 6 credits in one school year during the school day based on the school's master schedule and seat-time requirements in the State of Florida for high school courses. This constraint is not applicable at the middle school level. iPrep Math labs at the middle schools will not be subject to the same seat-time requirements that are in place for high schools. Middle school students must take and pass three mathematics courses in order to be promoted to high school. Mid-year promotions are allowed and supported at the middle school level, based upon demonstration of mastery of competencies. In the iPrep Math middle school model, students will be able to work at an accelerated pace based on their demonstration of competency. Students that are prepared for high school Algebra and Geometry courses will work through course content and obtain high school credit by demonstrating proficiency on state EOC exams; these can be taken by any student whether or not they have sat through a formal course. The iPrep Math model provides opportunities for acceleration, both for students that are ready to advance beyond their cohort and for students

who are behind their age peers and need to recover lost ground.

Experience with competency-based course recovery: The district is already using a competency-based approach successfully for course recovery in a program designed to address the needs of over-aged middle school students who are typically not in the same grade as their age peers due to mandatory third-grade retention. Previously, once retained, these students never had the opportunity to catch up with their cohort. The district opened four Secondary Student Success Center (S3C) in the fall of 2011 to provide enrolled over-aged middle school students an opportunity to advance through middle school courses at an accelerated pace based on demonstration of competency using computer courseware and guided by on-site teachers.

In addition to parallel acceleration provisions to the S3Cs, the iPrep Math middle school model will also improve upon the iPrep high school model in the personalization of instruction. iPrep high school students use course content which is not currently adaptive in nature. Personalization is achieved through the use of supplemental programs which teachers manually assign to students.

In iPrep Math, the priority is on ensuring that students benefit from a personalized learning environment in the critically important middle grades. The Carnegie Learning MATHia course content that will be used in the iPrep Math is highly adaptive. This will help to ensure that students focus not only on grade level and course objectives but also on the pre-requisite foundational skills they need to successfully master the grade level/course objects. **Attachments 4 and 5** provide information on the Carnegie Learning resources and the implementation plan, respectively.

In compliance with the required 10 business day comment window, the M-DCPS RTTT-District proposal was submitted for review by the Florida Department of Education and all 35 Miami-Dade County municipalities on October 15, 2012. The state submission and response are provided in **Attachment 6**. The documentation regarding the municipalities is provided in **Attachment 7.**

Activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. Detailed information regarding the activities, deliverables, timelines, responsible parties, alignment with the applicable Absolute Priorities and the RTTT assurance areas, for the implementation of **iPrep Math** are provided, for each project goal, by fiscal year, in **Attachment 2: *iPrep Math Comprehensive***

Management Plan.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support *(10 points)*
The extent to which each LEA has demonstrated evidence of—

Meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal and meaningful stakeholder support for the proposal, including—

(a) A description of how students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools (as defined in this notice) were engaged in the development of the proposal and, as appropriate, how the proposal was revised based on their engagement and feedback, including—

(i) For LEAs with collective bargaining representation, evidence of direct engagement and support for the proposals from teachers in participating schools (as defined in this notice); or

(ii) For LEAs without collective bargaining representation, at a minimum, evidence that at least 70 percent of teachers from participating schools (as defined in this notice) support the proposal; and

(b) Letters of support from such key stakeholders as parents and parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, tribes, the business community, civil rights organizations, advocacy groups, local civic and community-based organizations, and institutions of higher education.

In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria.

The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.

Recommended maximum response length: Three pages

(B) (4) (a) (i): Shortly after the U.S. Department of Education announced the new Race to the Top–District competition on May 21, 2012, Miami-Dade County Public School staff met to review the proposed program and discuss interest and possible approach.

The first meeting was held in June, with subsequent meetings held prior to the release of the August 16th Notice Inviting Applications (NIA). Those meetings included representatives from Curriculum and Instruction, Human Resources (including staff overseeing the district's Race to the Top program funded by the Florida Department of Education), Instructional Technology, the Education Transformation Office (the office that serves district schools identified as persistently lowest-achieving by the Florida Department of Education), and Grants Administration. The Superintendent of Schools and several key staff members traveled to Washington, DC to participate in a one-day session sponsored by America Achieves to gain a better understanding of the intent of the federal program.

With the release of the NIA, staff members from other district offices were invited to participate in a series of brainstorming sessions. In addition to those who had come to the table earlier, staff from the following offices joined the discussion: Professional Development; Labor Relations; Assessment, Research, and Data Analysis; Facilities; Schools of Choice; Special Education; and Student Services. As the project design evolved and the team worked toward creating a true change of practice, it became clear that the proposed model would need support (in preliminary form) from the highest levels prior to roll out for stakeholder input, feedback and revisions. The grant development team, under the leadership of the Chief Officer for Innovation and Accountability, met with the Chief of Staff, Chief of Operations, and Chief Academic Officer to discuss the proposed design and seek input. The team was given the go ahead to reach out to key stakeholders to seek input and guidance in proposal design.

As a first step to engage stakeholders, a meeting was held on September 19th with 13 middle school **principals**, 3 region office administrators, and the grant development team **(Attachment 8: *Stakeholder Meeting Sign-in Sheet*)** RTTT-District program requirements, proposed project design, and guiding assumptions were outlined and school leaders were asked to provide input and concerns. Many asked about construction and infrastructure costs needed to create the learning lab at their school site (as many of the schools are more than 40 years old), and were reassured when told that this would be included in the grant budget. They expressed concern about the possible noise levels created by 60 middle school students in one large space and asked that room design include noise minimizing features. The original design spanned serving students in grades 6-7; principals requested that the project include grades 6-8 and that adjustment was made. Principals were provided a tour of an existing iPrep High School in order to gain a feel for

the proposed space.

The grant development team reached out the Miami-Dade County Council Parent Teacher Association/Parent Student Teacher Association in order to involve middle school **students and families** in proposal development. District staff met with the PTSA President to share the concept and garner input.

In another effort to involve **students**, the team met with the Student Advisor to the School Board, a member of Miami-Dade County Public Schools' Student Government Association (SGA), and the SGA advisor to request input. In the words of the Student Advisor (currently a senior), upon hearing the description of the design, "I wish I were in middle school." The Student Advisor shared the project design during the SGA meeting scheduled the next day.

On September 13, 2012, the grant team met with representatives of the United Teachers of Dade (UTD), the local **teacher**s' union, to solicit input into project design and address any concerns. UTD had specific questions about teacher selection, teacher workload, accountability under the state's new performance pay model. For the state RTTT grant application, the District worked hand-in-hand with UTD to garner support.

Teacher participation in iPrep Math will be voluntary, by application and selection. Because the teachers who will participate in the iPrep Math initiative have not yet had the opportunity to apply and be selected, there has not been an opportunity to garner their input at this time. It is intended that, once these teachers are selected, during the course of the kickoff year, the iPrep Math teacher cadre will jointly engage in professional development, collaboratively construct the portfolio of real-world-application learning projects and evaluative rubrics, form professional learning communities to engage in reflective practice and continuous improvement, and progressively refine the delivery model.

In planning the iPrep math model, content experts from the Mathematics Department were critical members of the design team. These included former and current teachers of mathematics, including a current iPrep high school mathematics teacher, and curriculum support specialists who work with the target schools on a daily basis and have a clear understanding of the challenges classroom teachers and students face.

(B)(4)(b): Letters of support from key stakeholders are included in **Attachment 9**. Please refer to this Attachment for copies of the letters from Miami-Dade Council PTA/PTSA, M-DCPS Student Government Association, The Children's Trust, Dade County Council for Teachers of Mathematics, Dade County Science Teachers Association, the Miami Coalition for a Safe, Healthy, and Drug Free community, the Early Learning Coalition, etc.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (*5 points)*

The extent to which each LEA has demonstrated evidence of—

A high-quality plan for an analysis of the applicant's current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic behind the reform proposal contained within the applicant's proposal, including identified needs and gaps that the plan will address.

In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria and/or provide its high-quality plan for meeting the criteria.

The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.

To provide a high-quality plan, the applicant should describe, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties (for further detail, see Scoring Instructions in Part XV or Appendix A in the NIA). The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

(B) (5) Analysis of needs and gaps: For the past four years, M-DCPS has implemented a Continuous Improvement Model (CIM) throughout all levels of the district to drive decision-making across all of the pillars in the strategic framework to support student achievement. Through the CIM, M-DCPS engages in ongoing review of multiple data sources to: identify early warning signs of

potential problems; pinpoint current weaknesses; probe for root causes and contributing factors; identify opportunities for strategic actions and apply the necessary resources to effect change; set targets for improvement, review processes; and assess outcomes. Through this process, the district has identified the need to significantly improve middle school mathematics outcomes, particularly in preparing students for success in Algebra 1. The proposed two-pronged approach will: 1. provide students with a personalized learning environment that will maximally leverage all available resources, including technology, support services, data sources, and 2. provide teachers with the resources and skills they need to: ensure rigorous and relevant instruction in mathematics for all students; support and engage students with the technology; work collaboratively in a co-teaching environment with large groups of students with diverse readiness levels; and build Communities of Practice through which student learning and professional growth can take place. In developing this model, M-DCPS reviewed best practices and the *2008 Foundations for Success: The Final Report of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel*, which specifically recommends: #6) "All school districts should ensure that all prepared students have access to an authentic algebra course—and should prepare more students than at present to enroll in such a course by Grade 8"; # 10) "To prepare students for Algebra, the curriculum must simultaneously develop conceptual understanding, computational fluency, and problem solving skills…These capabilities are mutually supportive, each facilitating learning of the others" and # 13) "Mathematics performance and learning of groups that have traditionally been underrepresented in mathematics fields can be improved by interventions that address social, affective, and motivational factors. Recent research documents that social and intellectual support from peers and teachers is associated with higher mathematics performance for all students, and that such support is especially important for many African-American and Hispanic students." This last is particularly relevant, as close to 9 out of every 10 M-DCPS students are Hispanic or African-American.

One powerful way to leverage technology to personalize learning environments in mathematics education is using intelligent tutoring systems (ITS) that adapt problem selection, track mastery, and provide just-in-time feedback and hints. Further, emergent work addresses a new and potentially important form of personalization of learning – presenting instruction in the context of students' individual or personal interests (Hidi & Renninger 2006) (Renninger, Ewen, & Lasher 2002). For example, **Carnegie Learning's**

MATHia ITS personalizes middle school mathematics problems to different categories of student interest, such as sports, art, and music (Carnegie Learning 2011). A recent large, randomized control study of Algebra I students receiving context personalization within an intelligent tutoring system, **Cognitive Tutor Algebra**, suggests that personalization of instruction to students' personal interests mediates performance and learning in potentially powerful ways.(Walkington & Sherman 2012). The authors found that the effect of personalization is largest when it makes a previously irrelevant problem relevant to students' experiences.

In addition to, and in support of, personalization of the learning environment, iPrep Math will engage students in project-based learning aligned with the content and their areas of academic and career interest that are relevant to real-world applications in order to foster students' situated cognition. Situated cognition is based on learning knowledge and skills in contexts that reflect their real-life applications (Brown, Collins, and Duguid 1989). Situated learning theory emphasizes social interactions and authentic learning through tasks that parallel real-world situations. This approach is anticipated to benefit all participating students, but, most particularly, when coupled with direct and explicit instruction, provide ELLS and SWD with opportunities to access, practice, and apply the learning and make meaningful connections to their own experiences and across disciplines.

Activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. Detailed information regarding the activities, deliverables, timelines, responsible parties, alignment with the applicable Absolute Priorities and the RTTT assurance areas, for the implementation of **iPrep Math** are provided, for each project goal, by fiscal year, in **Attachment 2: *iPrep Math Comprehensive Management Plan*.**

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

(C)(1) Learning *(20 points)*

The extent to which the applicant has a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. This plan must include an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students (as defined in this notice) that enable participating students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) and college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice) and accelerate his or her learning through support of his or her needs. The quality of the plan will be assessed based on the extent to which the applicant proposes an approach that includes the following:

Learning: An approach to learning that engages and empowers all learners, in particular high-need students, in an age-appropriate manner such that:

(a) With the support of parents and educators, all students—

(i) Understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals;

(ii) Identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice), understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goals;

(iii) Are able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest;

(iv) Have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning; and

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

(b) With the support of parents and educators, there is a strategy to ensure that each student has access to—

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

(ii) A variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments;

(iii) High-quality content, including digital learning content (as defined in this notice) as appropriate, aligned with college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements

(as defined in this notice);

(iv) Ongoing and regular feedback, including, at a minimum—

(A) Frequently updated individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice), or college- and career-ready graduation requirements; and

(B) Personalized learning recommendations based on the student's current knowledge and skills, college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice), and available content, instructional approaches, and supports; and

(v) Accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students (as defined in this notice) to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice); and

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

In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria and/or provide its high-quality plan for meeting the criteria.

The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.

To provide a high-quality plan, the applicant should describe, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties (for further detail, see Scoring Instructions in Part XV or Appendix A in the NIA). The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.

Recommended maximum response length: Eight pages

(C)(1) Learning (a) (i) and (ii): The M-DCPS strategic framework focuses all district work on the central goal of preparing

students to achieve at their highest potential, develop a post-secondary plan, and graduate equipped with the academic and personal skills to succeed in the workforce or higher education. The iPrep Math model represents a significant departure from the traditional methods of mathematics instruction in M-DCPS – one that is more aligned with the goals of the Common Core State Standards and one that will provide students with a foundation and experiences, such as independence, decision-making, collaboration, persistence-on-task, and self-pacing, that are relevant to the 21st century work environment into which they will graduate. These initiatives in the iPrep Math model align with the Secondary School Reform Plan (SSRP) outlined in the ***M-DCPS Student Progression Plan (SPP)*** which is designed to ensure instructional excellence and community engagement. The underlying principle of the SSRP is to significantly alter the educational experience of students in grades 6 through 12 in order to: raise the academic performance of all students; increase the graduation rate; reduce the achievement gap; implement a cycle of continuous improvement in academics; and produce literate graduates who are ready for college, career, and citizenship. In order to implement this reform effort, M-DCPS has adopted the core principles of: personalized learning environments; academic engagement of all students; empowered educators; accountable leaders; engaged community and youth; and an integrated system of high standards, curriculum, instruction, assessments, and supports. The Florida Secondary School Redesign Act predicates that: struggling students need the highest-quality teachers and dramatically different, innovative approaches to teaching and learning; every teacher is to contribute to every student's reading improvement; quality professional development is directed toward better serving students; small learning communities allow teachers to personalize instruction to address student learning styles, strengths, and weaknesses; intensive intervention in reading and mathematics must occur early and through innovative delivery systems; parents need access to tools they can use to monitor their child's progress in school, communicate with teachers, and act early on behalf of their child; applied and integrated courses help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future; school is more relevant when students choose courses based on their goals, interests, and talents; master schedules should not determine instruction and must be designed based on student needs, not institutional needs; and academic and career planning engages students in developing a personally meaningful course of study so that they can achieve the goals they have set for themselves. The M-DCPS

Education Plan is supported by the Comprehensive Student Services Program, PK-Adult (CSSP), which is delivered by an integrated team of student services professionals who are uniquely trained to address the academic, personal/social, career/community awareness, and health and wellness development needs of all students. The Student Development Framework (SDF) is the basis for the delivery of student services to support student achievement and personal growth. The SDF standards and benchmarks address the age-appropriate knowledge, skills, and competencies that students need to develop at each educational level, in order to: set personal learning goals and career aspiration; make connections between their learning path and their personal and career goals; develop interpersonal skills; and effectively manage their lifelong developmental tasks. Student services staff provide program support to assist students in career and postsecondary planning as part of CSSP Objective 2: *To Increase the Graduation Rate and Readiness for Postsecondary Education and Employment*.

The M-DCPS SPP spells out the courses of study, academic options, and promotion, retention, and graduation requirements. The SPP requirements include completion of a Career and Educational Planning course by all middle school students, prior to being promoted to high school, to ensure that all students are prepared for future careers, whether they leave school and go directly to work, attend a technical/community college, attend a university, or join the military. Students explore careers and develop a personalized career and educational plan. Students review high school graduation requirements, high school assessments and college entrance test requirements, Florida Bright Futures Scholarship Program requirements, state university and Florida college admission requirements, and programs through which a high school student can earn college credit, including Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, International Certificate of Education, dual enrollment, career academy opportunities, and courses that lead to national industry certification. The SPP specifies that students should be encouraged to enroll in advanced/honors mathematics and science courses whenever appropriate. Acceleration in mathematics and science in the middle school offers students the opportunity to take higher-level mathematics and science courses in senior high school. Implementation of iPrep Math in the middle schools will provide opportunities for students to advance at their own pace, with acceleration mechanisms in place for students who are ready to move on to higher-level coursework, and remediation strategies for students who have fallen behind.

(i), (ii), (iii): The iPrep Math model is founded on empowerment – of parents, students, and teachers. Parents are empowered to choose an educational program that fits their child's needs, interests, post-secondary plans, and learning styles. Students are empowered to take charge of their own learning path, and to work on high-interest projects, independently and collaboratively, in meaningful learning communities, to develop transferable academic and interpersonal skills that they will employ in their future workplace and their personal lives. Teachers are empowered to work within an authentic 21st century learning environment that provides them with the resources to personalize the learning environment to meet the needs of each student.

In order to ensure that parents and students are provided appropriate information and guidance in making decisions regarding participation in iPrep Math, middle school counselors will receive training on the iPrep Math learning model, the individual learning action plan (iLAP), and scheduling and advisement of students. School counselors in the 49 schools will work with the iPrep Math teachers to ensure that students identify and pursue their individual learning and career goals, are working on a personalized learning plan that is preparing them for post-secondary study or career entry; and know how to assess their progress in meeting milestones and timelines for accomplishing their goals. In order to foster students' understanding of the connection between the learning experiences in the classroom and their personal and career aspirations, each iPrep Math student will develop an individual learning action plan (iLAP) providing a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development targets designed to enable the student to achieve his/her learning goals and ensure that he/she is on-track for graduation and on the path to college and career readiness. Students will be able to personalize their learning paths to address areas of academic and career interests and to include a range of individual and group learning experiences that are carefully designed to foster fluency and understanding and real-world application.

(iv): In order to support the district-wide implementation of iPrep Math, two (2) student services professionals (counselors/social workers/psychologists) will be hired, beginning the first year of the project. These student services professionals will: work with feeder pattern elementary schools and senior high schools for articulation and coordination to ensure continuity of the educational program for each iPrep Math student; conduct outreach, recruitment, and orientation; provide ongoing support to the school-site

student services staff; liaise with community agencies and services; and facilitate access to wrap-around support services for students in iPrep Math. The student services professionals will work with school-site student services staff and iPrep Math teachers to ensure that students have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives in alignment with CSSP Objective 6: *To Promote and Enhance a Healthy and Safe Learning Environment. "Foster attitudes of respect for others which are free from discrimination and/or harassment and help students develop an appreciation for the benefits of diversity in our community."*

(v): Successful implementation of the iPrep Math model will require a change in the culture of the classroom and the expectations regarding the roles of teachers and students in the middle school. The teacher teams leading each iPrep Math learning center will be at the vanguard of this reform, providing students with an environment that fosters the development of 21st century skills. Students need to be prepared to think critically and creatively, learn and adapt, work independently, work collaboratively, solve problems, and communicate effectively in a global and ever-changing society. Academic rigor is traditionally equated with mastery of content knowledge, but knowledge and information bases evolve constantly. Students need both content knowledge and the skills to apply and transform their knowledge into useful and creative purposes. In the 21st century, rigor means that a student can look at a problem they have never encountered before and know how to organize the data and design a solution. Teachers need to know how to facilitate and mediate the process so that students learn to be effective managers of their own learning. The iPrep Math model is a significant departure from the traditional methods of mathematics instruction in M-DCPS – one that is more aligned with the goals of the Common Core Standards and one that will provide students with a foundation and experiences, such as independence, decision-making, collaboration, persistence-on-task, and self-pacing that are directly relevant to the 21st century work environment into which they will graduate.

(b) (i), (ii): The iPrep Math model builds upon prior district work in preparing teachers to differentiate instruction using an approach based on the work of Bernice McCarthy. Dr. McCarthy differentiates four individual learning preferences that are based on the intersection of perception and processing. Individual learners use all four learning preferences but tend to favor one more than the others. Differentiation is best accomplished not by selectively targeting a single learning strategy to match a student's

primary learning preference but, rather, by designing lessons so that all students experience all four learning preferences. M-DCPS has trained mathematics leaders, coaches, and teachers in a Stairway to Learning Success lesson design mode which is predicated upon exposing students to meaningful activities that allow their brain to find the pattern in the information. The Learning Success model will be implemented as part of the blended learning approach. The Learning Success model learning sequence progresses through Preparation, Meaning, Content, Practice, and Performance. ***Preparation:*** Teachers begin by focusing on specific, desired student learning outcomes. Students are empowered to monitor their learning progress and track their concept mastery through a checklist of student learning goals, concepts, and skills. ***Meaning***: Learning activities must be carefully designed to be relevant and support the development of personal meaning and connection with others. Students imagine, reflect, and discuss with other students in a small group setting, a past or real-life experience that relates to the concept of the lesson. Students develop the meaning for their learning through hands-on discovery activities and appropriate use of technology. ***Content:*** In a whole-class setting, students review their activities and share their learning discoveries. The teacher follow-up includes a recapitulation of the learning and direct instruction through demonstrations, readings, and lecture, as needed. Students will use learning journals to track their learning progression and write learning reflections, including a record of the processes used to do the work, throughout the session. ***Practice:*** Students engage in activities to practice the skills learned, using a range of individual and group tasks while teachers circulate to assist and monitor the work, providing clarification and support, or whole-group instruction, as needed. Students practice with their learning teams and the learning teams present solutions to the work they are practicing. Quality of activities and feedback of a problem-solving practice episode is more important than mere quantity of problems. ***Performance:*** This is a creative real-world application of the concepts learned. The student will demonstrate his/her understanding by selecting a real-world problem related to his/her academic and career interests and apply the knowledge learned by investigating, presenting, and using the concepts learned. Projects such as “create a mobile consisting of polygons with the same area” or “develop a sprinkler system” which addresses a community need provide an opportunity for the student to demonstrate the concepts learned. The iPrep Math model provides for individualized student learning stations within the practice sessions. As an outcome, students will have: made a

personal connection with the content; reacted to the concept; built on prior knowledge to examine expert knowledge; and practiced the skills necessary to master the content and integrate the learning into their real-world context. This is the stair case for high-quality learning through which content is rendered meaningful and useful and the student has made long-lasting connections.

(iii) The content that the students will study is defined by the Common Core State Standards in Mathematics (CCSSM). The CCSSM are composed of two types of mutually supportive mathematics standards: the Standards for Mathematical Practice and the Standards for Mathematical Content. The Standards for Content provide the knowledge and skills students will need to be successful in future endeavors. The Standards for Mathematical Practice describe the ways in which students should be engaged in the mathematics they are learning. The CCSSM contain college and career readiness expectations, include rigorous content and applications, stress conceptual understanding as well as procedural skills, are organized around important mathematical themes that are developed across grades based on research-based learning progressions, and provide greater focus and coherence in the teaching and learning of mathematics. CCSSM are organized around core mathematics themes that are developed across grade levels. M-DCPS has begun the transition to the CCSSM. Beginning in 2011, the CCSSM was included in the district pacing guides so that teachers may plan mathematics instruction that meets the standards. In Grade 6, student learning focuses on four critical areas: (1) connecting ratio and rate to whole number multiplication and division and using concepts of ratio and rate to solve problems; (2) completing understanding of division of fractions and extending the notion of number to the system of rational numbers, which includes negative numbers; (3) writing, interpreting, and using expressions and equations; and (4) developing understanding of statistical thinking. In Grade 7, student learning focuses on four critical areas: (1) developing understanding of and applying proportional relationships; (2) developing understanding of operations with rational numbers and working with expressions and linear equations; (3) solving problems involving scale drawings and informal geometric constructions, and working with two- and three-dimensional shapes to solve problems involving area, surface area, and volume; and (4) drawing inferences about populations based on samples. In Grade 8, student learning focuses on three critical areas: (1) formulating and reasoning about expressions and equations, solving linear equations and solving systems of linear equations; (2) using functions to describe quantitative

relationships; (3) analyzing two- and three-dimensional space and figures using distance, angles, similarity, and congruence, and understanding and applying the Pythagorean Theorem.

(iv) Each iPrep Math student will be pre-assessed to determine strengths, weaknesses, and learning targets that will be incorporated into the iLAP. The student and teacher will create a specific topic list of all concepts that the student will study, with goals, timelines, and milestone tasks. Teachers will analyze all student data and organize the order of completion for learning tasks; students will complete the modules within the learning task according to their iLAP. Students will participate in the district interim assessments, classroom-based assessments, informal and formal progress monitoring, and all required motional, state, and district assessment programs. Data on student progress and needs will be gathered from these measures, from team analysis of student work, and from monitoring of data generated through the technology resources. Teachers will use formative assessment, including interim assessment data and assessments embedded within the technology resources, and data garnered from review of progress in iLAP goals to provide feedback to students and make personalized recommendations and adjustments, based on the needs and progress of each student.

(v) M-DCPS generates a comprehensive *Student Assistance Profile* which provides a comprehensive report based on specific criteria that identify students who are not on-track of meeting academic goals and may place them at-risk of failure or dropping out of school. These criteria include: absences, reading and mathematics scores, standardized test scores, retentions, academic averages, grade point average, credits earned, and suspensions. Based upon the number of these criteria that a student has met, a severity level is determined and students are ranking accordingly. School counseling professionals periodically review this report to identify student needs and target their programs and services. M-DCPS implements a Response to Intervention model (RtI) which incorporates progress monitoring of students who are not meeting state and district performance levels. Students who are at risk of falling behind are provided tiered levels of intervention and support. Teachers will continually monitor each student's progress in order to identify any needed support and will avail themselves of the resources made available through academic coaches, interventionists, and tutorial programs and student services staff in order to ensure that each student's needs are addressed and the

student is on-track toward meeting the goals on their learning plan and for college and career readiness.

(c) School-site and district student services staff and the iPrep Math teacher teams at each schools will teach students how to develop and maintain their iLAP and will monitor each student's progress, checking back with students regularly to ensure that students understand how to use the iLAP to manage their learning and monitor their own progress. Feedback on all learning is provided via ongoing formative and summative assessments. Learning tasks will include criteria by which student's performance will be determined. Mastery is achieved through remediation that directly targets where the students have gone wrong in answering questions related to a concept. Checkpoints and mastery assessments will offer immediate feedback to the students. Performance criteria will be closely aligned with the learning goals identified in the student's iLAP.

Activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. Detailed information regarding the activities, deliverables, timelines, responsible parties, alignment with the applicable Absolute Priorities and the RTTT assurance areas, for the implementation of **iPrep Math** are provided, for each project goal, by fiscal year, in **Attachment 2: *iPrep Math Comprehensive Management Plan*.**

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

The extent to which the applicant has a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. This plan must include an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students (as defined in this notice) that enable participating students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) and college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice) and accelerate his or her learning through support of his or her needs. The quality of the plan will be assessed based on the extent to which the applicant proposes an approach that includes the following:

Teaching and Leading: An approach to teaching and leading that helps educators (as defined in this notice) to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice) by enabling the full implementation of personalized learning and teaching for all students such that:

(a) All participating educators (as defined in this notice) engage in training, and in professional teams or communities, that supports their individual and collective capacity to—

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

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

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

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

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

(i) Actionable information that helps educators (as defined in this notice) identify optimal learning approaches that

respond to individual student academic needs and interests;

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

(iii) Processes and tools to match student needs (see Selection Criterion (C) (2) (b) (i)) with specific resources and approaches (see Selection Criterion (C) (2) (b)(ii)) to provide continuously improving feedback about the effectiveness of the resources in meeting student needs.

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

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

(ii) Training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps (as defined in this notice).

(d) The applicant has a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals (as defined in this notice), including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects (such as mathematics and science), and specialty areas (such as special education).

In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria and/or provide its high-quality plan for meeting the criteria.

The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.

To provide a high-quality plan, the applicant should describe, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties (for further detail, see Scoring Instructions in Part XV or Appendix A in the NIA). The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.

Recommended maximum response length: Eight pages

(C)(2)(a) Successful implementation of iPrep math will require transformation of the culture of teaching and learning. The teacher teams leading each iPrep Math learning center will be at the vanguard of this reform. The 98 full-time and 49 part-time iPrep Math teachers (2 full-time and 1 part-time per center, for the 49 centers) will be recruited and selected based on content knowledge, a history of effectiveness, and a desire to engage in the iPrep model.

(i), (ii), (iii): Participating teachers will receive extensive "front-load" training in the initial year, as the physical and technical infrastructure is put in place, on co-teaching; e-learning facilitation; project-based learning; personalized learning; using multiple data sources to differentiate instruction; formative assessment; and on the use of the technology resources and platforms. They will engage in ongoing professional development throughout the year, supported by the iPrep Math Project Director and support team, and will engage in professional learning communities (PLCs) to: ensure a common vision and fidelity of implementation across all participating schools, identify emerging opportunities for improvement, and share best practices and lessons learned. It is anticipated that the delivery model will undergo successive refinements as a result of this ongoing professional dialogue.

The iPrep Math learning center model design is driven by a vision of a 21st century learning environment that is adaptive, learner-centered, and personalized to the needs of each learner. This level of personalization can only be accomplished through a re-conceptualization of the classroom, from the physical layout to the way participants approach teaching and learning. In order to protect teaching and learning time, intensive training will take place during the summers each year. Throughout the year, the iPrep Math teachers will engage in ongoing professional development and PLCs to ensure a common vision and fidelity of implementation across all participating schools and establish a community of practice (COP) focused on the effective reform of mathematics education in the district. To this end, the iPrep Math teachers will also engage in collaborative learning with other teachers in the school, and will open up their classrooms to interested peers.

The iPrep Math COPs will build on the initiatives already in place in the schools to improve teacher learning by fostering a collaborative team culture at each school. Department chairs are taught the protocols for guiding teams of teachers in creating a culture of learning. These leaders provide the conditions and structures needed to change isolated teacher decision-making into a high-performing collaborative school-site mathematics team. Teams of teachers are guided in the exploration and implementation of a lesson design model that actively engages students and develops the meaning for the content studied. Teachers are empowered by this job-embedded professional learning. The CCSSM require new levels of knowledge and skills for the teachers as they seek to understand what the CCSS expect students to learn at each grade level and *how* they expect the students to learn it. Teachers teams identify the content they want the students to learn and then determine how they will assess the students' understanding and learning. Both formative and summative assessments are developed and discussed. It is this real-time data that is used to monitor student progress and make instructional decisions Teachers teams analyze student work and provide feedback so that immediate intervention helps keep students on track and successful.

While the focus of this application is on middle school mathematics, as the most critical area of need, other content teachers within the school will also benefit. The iPrep Math environment will serve as a demonstration site within the school for an entirely new paradigm of digital-age classroom practice. In order to extend the benefits of the model to more students and teachers, other classroom teachers will be able to sit in on the iPrep Math classrooms to see how the implementation of the model is improving student engagement and changing teacher-student interaction. After the first year of implementation, iPrep Math teachers will serve as mentors to encourage the use of the rich digital tools available to all teachers in the district to substantively improve classroom practice. Because each school staff is best situated to understand the needs of their schools and students, dissemination of practices will be organic rather than top-down. For example, schools could elect to expand the blended-learning approach into science, and leverage existing resources such as (b)(4) and (b)(4), or may elect to integrate a blended-learning approach in English Language Arts.

Adult learning theory indicates that adults learn best when information or skills are directly relevant to their own needs and are

immediately applicable to their work. Adults benefit from opportunities to observe, engage, and practice new models and behaviors. Embedding the iPrep Math learning centers in each middle school will address the key barriers of accessibility (it's right there), unfamiliarity (come see it working), skepticism (it's working with the same kids in the same school), and resistance to change (given the scarcity of resources, early second-wave adopters are projected to be volunteers). The past century has taught us that technology adoption begins with a few brave or eager pioneers who "make or break' the product, then rolls out exponentially until it becomes the new norm. As the value of the model is proven in each school, and as resources become more distributed, it is anticipated that this personalized, student-centered, blended-learning model will become the "new normal" of middle school.

After the first year of implementation during the 2013-2014 school year, the summer professional development will consist of 15 days of training centered on issues and topics identified through surveys and focus groups and based on feedback from teachers and administrators and analysis of teacher evaluation results from the previous year. Job-embedded professional learning will continue throughout the school year. Any iPrep Math teachers who have not previously been trained on the Stairway to Learning Success learning design model will participate in this training. Teachers will learn how to construct meaningful and engaging authentic learning tasks that will provide a basis for students, individually and collectively, to construct meaning and develop deep understanding of mathematics concepts and applications. Professional development stipends and a sixth period supplement have been included in the budget specifically to support this critical professional development component.

(iv): The district's teacher evaluation system, Instructional Performance Evaluation and Growth System (IPEGS), contains all of the major components at the forefront of the national dialogue on evaluation; it was included in the district's response to the state Race to the Top initiative. The system was jointly developed by M-DCPS and the United Teachers of Dade.

IPEGS has a four-tiered ranking system: highly effective, effective, developing/needs improvement, and unsatisfactory. Fifty percent (50%) of the final evaluation is based on student learning gains as measured by state standardized tests; and the remaining 50% is based on teacher performance as measured by seven (7) Performance Standards which include: Knowledge of Learners, Instructional Planning, Instructional Delivery and Planning, Assessment, Communication, Professionalism, and Learning

Environment. Included in the system is support for new teachers in the important role of mentor teachers and a peer review and assistance component. IPEGS reflects the fundamental role that effective communication and feedback plays in every aspect of the evaluation process. Since the goal of any evaluation is to continue successful job performance or improve less successful performance, assessor-professional communication is essential. Thus, opportunities for systemic communication between assessors and instructional personnel are built into IPEGS. Effective feedback must be learning-focused, complex, and an integral part of a learning system. Because classroom practice, teacher-student interaction, resources, and pedagogy will be different in the iPrep Math classroom, providing the necessary training to develop a thorough understanding of the model and classroom practice for school-site administrators, region and district administrators, and peer reviewers is critical. Evaluators must be able to assess teacher practice appropriately and provide relevant and timely feedback to the iPrep Math teachers. Because the iPrep Math model presents such a different culture of classroom practice, it is important that the principals and assistant principals who will be supervising and observing the iPrep Math teachers fully understand the model. Consequently, these administrators will also participate in a "front-load" orientation and receive ongoing updated information regarding implementation of the model. They will, in addition, participate in professional development on "Instructional Rounds" (City, Elmore, Fireman,& Title 2009), which is a model that reflect practices used in medical education, and in conducting classroom walkthroughs, with the purpose of establishing a shared perspective and common language for assessing teaching and learning in this blended-learning, non-traditional, highly-personalized environment. Principals and leadership teams will also receive training and support in providing effective feedback for continuous improvement.

(b): The M-DCPS web portal serves as an access point for data and resources to support teaching, learning, and instructional decisions. The portal provides students and their parents' access to their current data, including test scores and grades. Teachers have access to class-level and individual student data, including academic profiles, test data, attendance, and grades. Principals have access to data on all students at their school, as well as to a series of strategic reports that provide current data on metrics aligned with school performance, school grades, and student learning indicators. The district's commitment to a culture of data-informed

decision-making emphasizes training stakeholders on accessing and using data resources effectively. Principals receive training on effective data use through their monthly Regional Center meetings and through professional development initiatives such as the Leadership Institute. Teachers engage in PLCs at the school site to analyze student data and review instructional practice; they may also avail themselves of multiple professional development sessions each year on analyzing data, using data to differentiate instruction, and data coaching for instructional improvement. New teachers supported through the Mentoring and Induction for New Teachers (MINT) are specifically required to participate in two (2) professional development days on accessing and analyzing the multiple data resources, using data to differentiate instruction, and assessing student learning; they are, in turn, supported by experienced teachers who are trained in mentoring and in data coaching. Each school's School Improvement planning team receives training in analyzing student data to identify priorities and targets for school improvement planning. Administrators at each school site engage in Data Chats with teachers and students; teachers and teacher teams engage in parallel dialogue with each other and with their students. It is this commitment to transparency and access to data that has underlain the significant commitment of resources to developing and implementing formative assessments and an administration and scoring platform to provide an "early warning system" for student progress (or lack thereof); creating the web-based portal to provide anytime/anywhere access to relevant data; and moving to an electronic gradebook application.

A range of high-quality digital content is currently available to district teachers and students. M-DCPS has been actively incorporating technology into the classroom for the past 20 years, moving from the single-computer-lab model to push for deployment of computer resources into every classroom. Despite the massive challenges presented by the age of so many of the school buildings, the district has aggressively leveraged resources, pursued and developed alternative funding sources, and created partnerships with provider to build infrastructure, purchase technology, and provide high-value content for students and teachers.

A number of software applications that supplement core instruction and textbooks and remedial applications that provide remediation activities for students are available throughout the district. Students also have access to virtual courses, especially at the high school level. In the past three years there has been an explosion of rich digital resources that began to supplant traditional

textbooks in many classrooms. Where e-textbooks are available, students can access them anytime/anywhere through the student portal. In order to ensure equity of access for students who do not have their own computers at home, each iPrep Math learning center will have 25 laptops available for student checkout on weeknights; classroom laptops will also be available for checkout on the weekend if needed. The district will also assist students who lack internet connectivity at home by providing a listing of free wireless hotspots in their neighborhood and also by directing students to resources such as (b)(4) program which provides internet access at $10 per month for students that are on free and reduced price lunch and that live in an area served by (b)(4)

Access to digital resources, however rich, cannot create a truly personalized learning environment for students. Reciprocally, no single teacher, however expert, can provide the full range of differentiation of content, process, and product to customize a learning environment for every one of the hundred-plus students that pass through a middle school classroom every day. It is the synergistic relationship of the highly-skilled teacher team and the high-quality digital content, coupled with the peer-to-peer learning experiences provided through the carefully designed learning projects that will transform the middle school classroom into a personalized learning environment for each student through which he or she can succeed in his or her individual learning plan.

M-DCPS has striven to not just keep abreast but to be at the forefront of the digital shift, with huge investments in financial and human capital. Given the size and diversity of the district, this has resulted in great disparities across schools and classrooms. There are highly-innovative, technology-rich environments such as the iPrep Academy high school settings, and there are classrooms that have very limited student stations. Some schools have web-enabled smartboards throughout the building, while others have none. The district is in the process of putting a $1.2 billion General Obligation bond before county voters in order to provide equitable access to 21st century instructional technology to all schools.

The goal of the iPrep Math program is to ultimately change classroom practice in all middle schools mathematics classes by implementing a new model of teaching and learning in every middle school across the district that will not only impact student performance but create within each participating school a visible and accessible demonstration site for what is possible for all

classrooms, teachers, and students.

(c): The M-DCPS culture is data-centered and focused on continuous, reflective analysis of multiple data resources to effect process improvements that positively impact student outcomes. M-DCPS Superintendent of Schools Alberto Carvalho was recently awarded district data leader of the year by FLDOE. School administrators in M-DCPS have significant autonomy in site-level decisions, including scheduling and resource allocation, and teacher recruitment and assignment. Administrators observe and evaluate teachers with the intent of improving teacher effectiveness and, consequently, student access to effective instruction. All administrators who have responsibility for teacher supervision and evaluation are trained each year in the IPEGS. It is essential that iPrep classrooms are viewed through a consistent, well-informed lens and that evaluators have the necessary tools to provide effective feedback that will help teachers to improve professional practice. Training will take place during the summer of 2013 that will focus on the following: the iPrep Math Model; links between the model and evaluation and how that alignment drives professional learning for teachers. Throughout the school year, district staff will collect formal evaluation data, look for trends, and discuss with administrators what can be gleaned from the data. Administrators and coaches will do co-observe iPrep teachers in other schools so that we can review their observation notes collectively in an effort to calibrate observational practices to ensure a consistent eye, common language and a clear goal for moving forward. The project director and the **iPrep Math teacher-trainers** will meet with site administrators and teacher teams to maintain regular two-way communication, identify any emerging issues, and foster a COP. Feedback obtained from classroom visits will be used to refine the iPrep Math model and identify needed resources and opportunities for improvement. In addition to engaging in the structured work of developing an overarching School Improvement Plan each year to improve teaching and learning, school teams, which include site administrators and teacher-leaders are trained on the Continuous Improvement Model. Annual School Improvement Plan targets address student achievement and outcome measures, narrowing the achievement gap across subgroups and against benchmarks, and detail strategies and resources allocated to these purposes.

(d): Teacher and principal evaluation systems have undergone collaborative redesign to include the state-required professional

practice and student-growth-measure elements. For 2011-2012, Miami-Dade County Public Schools (M-DCPS) implemented new teacher and school-site administrator evaluation systems containing these two elements. In June of 2012, both teachers and school-site administrators' range of professional practice results were collected and prepared for combination with the student growth measures as approved and provided by the Florida Department of Education. Florida's Value-added Model, FLDOE's approved model for the student growth measure, is pending release in mid-October 2012. Once the data have been obtained by M-DCPS, the district will expedite the incorporation of professional practice and student growth measures as prescribed by law and the evaluation systems. Teachers and administrators will receive summative performance ratings on a four-level scale from "Highly Effective" to "Unsatisfactory." Subsequent to the release of final unified summative evaluation ratings, the district will move to make the appropriate human capital decisions based on evaluation data.

Activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. Detailed information regarding the activities, deliverables, timelines, responsible parties, alignment with the applicable Absolute Priorities and the RTTT assurance areas, for the implementation of **iPrep Math** are provided, for each project goal, by fiscal year, in **Attachment 2: *iPrep Math Comprehensive Management Plan*.**

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

The extent to which the applicant has a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator (as defined in this notice), and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed. The quality of the plan will be determined based on the extent to which--

(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules *(15 points)*

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

(a) Organizing the LEA central office, or the consortium governance structure (as defined in this notice), to provide support and services to all participating schools (as defined in this notice);

(b) Providing school leadership teams in participating schools (as defined in this notice) with sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and noneducators, and school-level budgets;

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

(d) Giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways; and

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

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

The LEA and school infrastructure supports personalized learning by—

(a) Ensuring that all participating students (as defined in this notice), parents, educators (as defined in this notice), and other stakeholders (as appropriate and relevant to student learning), regardless of income, have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation of the applicant's proposal;

(b) Ensuring that students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders (as appropriate and relevant to student learning) have appropriate levels of technical support, which may be provided through a range of strategies (e.g., peer support, online support, or local support);

(c) Using information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format

(as defined in this notice) and to use the data in other electronic learning systems (e.g., electronic tutors, tools that make recommendations for additional learning supports, or software that securely stores personal records); and

(d) Ensuring that LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems (as defined in this notice) (e.g., systems that include human resources data, student information data, budget data, and instructional improvement system data).

In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria and/or provide its high-quality plan for meeting the criteria.

The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.

To provide a high-quality plan, the applicant should describe, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties (for further detail, see Scoring Instructions in Part XV or Appendix A in the NIA). The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.

Recommended maximum response length: Seven pages

(D)(1)(a) LEA Organizational Structure and Support: On July 26, 2012, the School Board of Miami-Dade County approved a new organizational structure to further refine M-DCPS' alignment of support between district offices and schools to ensure "a synchronicity of purpose and action aligned to the strategic framework." Specifically, the new structure enhances educational delivery of services at the school site; empowers highly-effective principals by providing more site-based autonomy related to performance history in order to optimize instructional effectiveness, and established a differentiated pay schedule for principals. Under the auspices of Teaching and Learning, three cabinet level positions were reclassified in order to streamline district support to schools: Chief Innovation and Accountability Officer, Chief Academic Officer, and Chief Operating Officer. **(Attachment 10: Organizational Chart)** All three officers have collaborated in the design of RTT-D iPrep Math project. iPrep Math will be located within the Office of Innovation and Accountability, which is charged with identifying and championing new and powerful strategies

for improving teaching and learning.

Specific district support for the implementation of iPrepMath: District office staff will be hired to oversee all grant activities and to provide mentoring and support services to the 49 participating middle schools. **Four (4) iPrep Math Facilitators** who are content experts in mathematics **and one project director** will be hired to: support the initial implementation in years 1, 2 and 3, provide the intensive "front-load" training needed to jump start the implementation; provide mentoring and support to school-level teams; and coordinate the project management across the district. As the project implementation matures, it is anticipated that two (2) of the iPrep Math Facilitators will remain on the project team for the final year, along with the project director, to provide ongoing training and support to school sites to facilitate dissemination of best practices and expansion of the iPrep math model. In order to ensure that class-size requirements are met, and that the flexibility of the model is maintained and students have access to teacher support as they need it, a third, hourly, teacher will be hired to work in each iPrep Math classroom.

In addition two (2) iPrep Math Student Service Support Specialists will be hired, throughout the course of the project, to: support parent and student outreach and student recruitment and articulation; coordinate access to and delivery of services throughout the district to ensure that social, emotional, and health needs of students are met and that parents and families have access to needed support services; ensure that participating students have personal learning plans that align with their academic and career goals and understand the link between the classroom and their future workplace. The iPrep Math Student Services Support Specialists are critical to ensuring equity of access for students and to deploying best practices and research-based strategies for student, teacher, and parent support, as peer trainers, to student services teams across all middle schools.

Hiring of key project staff will begin within 90 days of receiving notification of funding so that the project team can work with the schools to fully deploy the iPrep Math model across all middle schools in the fall of 2013-2014 school year. Project staff will work with schools to identify teachers and schedule students. They also will develop the implementation guidelines and project starters for each quarter of the school year and for each of the mathematics courses associated with this project. They will develop the training plans and will coordinate and oversee the teacher training. They will order project equipment, materials, and supplies.

They will work with school leaders and district facilities staff on the renovation of the classroom spaces. The district will recruit project staff from both within the school district as well as from outside the district in order to obtain the most qualified personnel for these positions. Candidates for these positions will be highly-qualified secondary mathematics teachers **with a minimum of three years teaching experience**. Candidates must also have had experience with project-based learning and using technology in the classroom.

(b) Flexibility and Autonomy: In Miami-Dade County, individual schools have significant autonomy. Schools establish bell schedules, make personnel decisions, assign responsibilities to staff, and control school-level budgets. Individual schools cannot establish calendars (in-session dates) that are different from the district calendar nor can they require staff to perform duties that violate labor contracts. All middle schools will be invited to participate in this project and there are sufficient resources identified in the proposal so that each school can offer the program in at least one (1) iPrep Math lab to serve 240 students. However, should a school decide that this program is not appropriate for the school community at this time, they can decline the invitation. Participating schools will be allowed to request the additional lab which was given up by the school that declined to participate. Second labs will be given to schools with the largest populations and the greatest needs – highest percentage of students on free and reduced price lunch, greatest number of students performing below grade level on state assessments, greatest number of students who are ELLs, etc. When and if second labs become available, consideration will also be given to schools with staff members who are willing and qualified to step into these roles. Schools with the greatest needs may not be the best places for additional iPrep Math labs if teachers do not opt-in to the role.

Each participating school will have the autonomy to select the teachers that will be involved in the project. The district will provide guidelines on the identification of staff. Like the iPrep Math Facilitators, the iPrep Math classroom teachers must have a strong foundation in mathematics instruction, prior experience using project-based learning and integrating technology into the curriculum. It is anticipated that some school leaders will ask teachers to apply to teach in the iMath labs while others will select the teachers on their staffs they feel are the best candidates for the job. In either scenario, teachers will have to agree to participate.

They cannot be assigned to these roles. Schools will also hire the hourly teachers who will work in the iPrep Math classrooms. The teacher teams at each school will have the autonomy to determine how they share the work. Participating teachers will be given an extra planning period. This will allow time for regular and ongoing data analysis, planning, reflection, and adjustment of plans based on all of these. Teachers will also be paid an extra teaching period supplement. The rationale behind this is as follows. Most of the best teachers at secondary schools teach an additional period for additional compensation. Teacher compensation is low for district teachers in their first ten years of teaching. There is significant risk that the most qualified and enthusiastic teachers who would be best suited to implement iPrep Math would opt against participation solely because they cannot afford to give up an extra teaching period supplement. This model will require a substantial level of commitment and effort in the development, implementation, and refinement of the model that needs to be reflected in the teacher compensation and the structure of the workday. These teachers will be helping to create a model that will improve middle school mathematics instruction throughout the district in subsequent years.

(c) Student progress and demonstrated mastery: The district's Student Progression Plan (SPP) establishes the requirements and procedures for student progression within M-DCPS. The SPP details the performance requirements for all K-12 and Adult Education Students including the requirements for Exceptional Education Students. At the middle school level, the SPP allows for promotion based on demonstrated mastery. Promotion is not restricted based on seat time. Promotion based on mastery, while not widely utilized, is allowed. This is most critical as an avenue for recovery for those students who, because of previous retentions or interrupted schooling, are over-aged for their assigned grade. Historically, these students are at high risk of disengaging from school and dropping out. Students who accelerate through Algebra I and Geometry in middle school will be able to access more advanced mathematics courses in high school.

(d) Mastery of Standards: Students will be given the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparative ways. The design of the iPrep Math lab lends itself to providing students with different mechanisms to demonstrate mastery. The (b)(4) software that will be used in the individual learning centers has embedded

formative assessments which will allow students to demonstrate mastery. In the collaboration center, students will demonstrate mastery through completion of real-world projects that are designed based on their interests and goals. In the small group center or during one-on-one sessions with the teachers, students will demonstrate mastery through discussion-based assessments. Teacher-created assessments and district interim assessments will provide additional opportunities for students to achieve and demonstrate mastery.

(e) Practices: iPrep Math labs will incorporate learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities (SWDs) and English Language Learners (ELLs). ELL students enrolled in Miami-Dade County Public Schools are afforded the opportunity to participate in grade-level curriculum. In order to meet the student performance standards for the appropriate grade level, Miami-Dade County Public Schools provides a curriculum that is adaptable to ELL students' needs through the use of ESOL strategies and a variety of instructional resources and practices. All teachers who work with ELL students must complete the training requirements stipulated in the META consent decree, which requires a defined number of ESOL courses based on the job role. Furthermore, ELLs are included in the assessment procedures as stipulated in the district's K-12 Comprehensive Research-based Reading Program and state assessment programs. ELLS receive appropriate accommodations, as allowed for each assessment program that are needed for students to complete assessment requirements; these parallel the accommodations and supports provided in the classroom setting.

The iPrep Math program will be open to interested SWDs who can benefit from this innovative blended-learning environment with appropriate supports. It is anticipated that the level of technology support and experiential, project-based learning that is at the heart of the iPrep Math model may be engaging and effective as a learning model for students who experience difficulty with a more traditional classroom environment. These decisions and placements will be made on an individual basis to address the needs, interest, and learning goals of each student. With relatively few exceptions, the majority of SWDs participate in the state and district assessments for their grade level, and are provided accommodations as allowable for each assessment program and according to their classroom-based accommodations and supports. The frequent feedback available from the technology-based

assessments will support ongoing progress-monitoring and early and appropriate interventions to support student success. SWDs already have Individual Education Plans; these will be meshed with the iPREP Math iLAPS to provide each student with a coherent plan of study.

(D)(2)(a) Stakeholder Access: Students and teachers will be provided with the materials, curriculum and technology needed to implement this program. Classrooms will be retrofitted for the necessary technology access including presentation-station and interactive technologies. Sixty (60) laptop computers will be restricted to classroom use during the week in order to ensure that they are available for student use each day. In addition to the 60 laptops, each iPrep Math lab will have 25 laptops available for student checkout ensuring that students who do not have their own computers at home will have a resource to support home-learning; these will be allocated on an equitable basis, as-needed. The classroom laptops will also be available for checkout on the weekend if demand exceeds what is available for check-out. The district will assist students who lack internet connectivity at home by providing a listing of free wireless hotspots in their neighborhood and also by directing students to resources such as (b)(4) (b)(4) program which provides internet access at $10 per month for economically disadvantaged students that live in an area served by (b)(4)

(b) Technical Support: Each school in Miami-Dade County has a technical support person. Middle schools have designated Network Infrastructure Support Technicians that maintain computers and network equipment. These technicians will provide technical support to teachers and students. In addition to technical support, the grant will fund 4 full-time iPrep Math Facilitators for years 1, 2, and 3, and 2 iPrep Math Facilitators in year 4, who will provide on-site support in the form of coaching and mentoring. iPrep Math Facilitators will organize and lead PLCs. Teachers will use collaborative tools such as Edmodo – a free resource available through the district web portal for educational social networking as a means to share questions and insights and to provide and obtain support and maintain a COP. Students will also use collaboration tools and will become members of a district wide iPrep Math COP where they share their projects and experiences in the iPrep Math labs. Parent workshops will be held at each school so that parents can learn about the technology tools their students are using in class and what new data are available to them

and their students through iPrep Math.

(c) Information Technology Systems: M-DCPS already provides a resource-rich, district-wide web portal to improve learning potential for children, enhance parents' ability to participate in the education of their children, and improve the effectiveness and productivity of teachers and school administrators. The district's enterprise portal provides all users with a single point of access for relevant information, services, and applications. All applications and systems are accessed though single sign-on technology that was developed and maintained by district staff.

- **Students.** Students are provided with a view of personal data, a class list by period (including grades) including links to eTextbooks, a MySite space for storing documents, school announcements and events, a district calendar, and links to all the supplemental software programs the district licenses for student use. The portal also links to the district's Learning Village Learning Management System (instructional content), Florida Academic Counseling and Tracking for Students (an online student-advising system), and FCAT Explorer (an online resource that reinforces reading and mathematics skills outlined in state standards and covered by the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test). FCAT-eligible students also have Links to Learning, a district initiative which pairs third party software to students based on their assessment information.
- **Parents.** Parents are provided with a view of their child's student information, class list (including grades), assessment information, and school bus information. The portal also links to an online grade viewer, state graduation requirements, Florida sex offender data, immunization guidelines, state and national parent-teacher associations, and the web site for the No Child Left Behind Act, the district's Parent Academy, relevant school district forms, and several other resources.
- **Teachers.** Teachers are provided with a view of their personal information, their e-mail and calendar, and a MySite space to store documents. The portal also provides a list of classes; a roster of students in each class; detailed data from the Student Information System; and a graphical "student scorecard" that shows each child's current performance and whether that performance is improving, holding steady, or decreasing over time. Instructional content and lesson plans from the Learning Village system are made available directly on the portal, in a manner tailored to the grade levels/courses taught by each user.

The portal also links to many other useful resources and applications, including the district's electronic grade book, FCAT Explorer, and professional development.

- **Collaboration.** Extensive collaboration features enable staff, educators, parents, and students to work together more closely. Key features will include meeting spaces, classroom sites, document posting (including homework), discussion groups, and real-time communication.
- **Principals.** Principals are provided with a view of personal information; calendars; weekly district briefings; a MySite space; a Report tab with provide up-to-date reports from the district's data warehouse and other systems; and links to other relevant resources, forms, administrative tools, personal earnings information and professional development.

In order to meet the requirements of RTTT-D, a new student download file will be created and made available through the district portal. This will allow students to download their information in order to use it in other applications.

(d) Interoperable Data Systems: Miami-Dade County Public Schools places human resources data, student information data, budget data, instructional improvement system data, and more in the (b)(4) data warehouse. The data warehouse feeds numerous applications and reports that are available to the different constituents across the district. The district has complied with all state requirements for the RTTT data systems and is standing by ready to incorporate tools being developed at the state level into the district's portal infrastructure.

Activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. Detailed information regarding the activities, deliverables, timelines, responsible parties, alignment with the applicable Absolute Priorities and the RTTT assurance areas, for the implementation of **iPrep Math** are provided, for each project goal, by fiscal year, in **Attachment 2: *iPrep Math Comprehensive Management Plan*.**

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

Because the applicant's high-quality plan represents the best thinking at a point in time, and may require adjustments and revisions during implementation, it is vital that the applicant have a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve its plan. This will be determined by the extent to which the applicant has—

(E)(1) Continuous improvement process *(15 points)*

A strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. The strategy must address how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top – District, such as investments in professional development, technology, and staff;

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

Strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders; and

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

Ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures. For each applicant-proposed measure, the applicant must describe—

(a) Its rationale for selecting that measure;

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

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

The applicant must have a total of approximately 12 to 14 performance measures.

The chart below outlines the required and applicant-proposed performance measures based on an applicant's applicable population.

(Note: A table is provided below to support responses to performance measures in the applicant's narrative.)

Applicable	Performance Measure

Population	
All	a) The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup (as defined in this notice), whose teacher of record (as defined in this notice) and principal are a highly effective teacher (as defined in this notice) and a highly effective principal (as defined in this notice); and b) The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup (as defined in this notice), whose teacher of record (as defined in this notice) and principal are an effective teacher (as defined in this notice) and an effective principal (as defined in this notice).
PreK-3	a) Applicant must propose at least one age-appropriate measure of students' academic growth (e.g., language and literacy development or cognition and general learning, including early mathematics and early scientific development); and b) Applicant must propose at least one age-appropriate non-cognitive indicator of growth (e.g., physical well-being and motor development, or social-emotional development).
4-8	a) The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness based on the applicant's on-track indicator (as defined in this notice); b) Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate academic leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan; and c) Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan.
9-12	a) The number and percentage of participating students who complete and submit the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) form; b) The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness based on the applicant's on-track indicator (as defined in this notice); c) Applicant must propose at least one measure of career-readiness in order to assess the number and percentage of participating students who are or are on track to being career-ready; d) Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate academic leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan; and e) Applicant must propose at least one grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan.

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

Plans to evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities, such as professional development and activities that employ technology, and to more productively use time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results, through such strategies as improved use of technology, working with community partners, compensation reform, and modification of school schedules and structures (e.g., service delivery, school leadership teams (as defined in this notice), and decision-making structures).

In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria and/or provide its high-quality plan for meeting the criteria.

The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.

To provide a high-quality plan, the applicant should describe, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties (for further detail, see Scoring Instructions in Part XV or Appendix A in the NIA). The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.

In determining whether an applicant has "ambitious yet achievable" performance measures and annual targets, peer reviewers will examine the applicant's performance measures and annual targets in the context of the applicant's proposal and the evidence submitted in support of the proposal. There is no specific annual target that peer reviewers will be looking for here; nor will higher targets necessarily be rewarded above lower ones. Rather, peer reviewers will reward applicants for developing "ambitious yet achievable" performance measures and annual targets that – in light of the applicant's proposal – are meaningful for the applicant's proposal and for assessing implementation progress, successes, and challenges.

Recommended maximum response length: Eight pages (excluding tables)

(E)(1): M-DCPS will work with the Department of Education (ED) and any national evaluator assigned to the project or other entity designated by the ED to ensure that all required data collection and program design are consistent with the national evaluation and with project solutions and strategies. Consistent with 34 CFR 80.36 and State and local procurement procedures, M-DCPS will include in contracts with external vendors provisions that allow contractors to provide implementation data to the LEA, the Department, the national evaluator, or other appropriate entities in ways consistent with all privacy laws and regulations, including

Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). M-DCPS will develop, in consultation with the national evaluator, a plan for identifying and collecting reliable and valid baseline data for program participants.

M-DCPS implements a continuous improvement process at every operational level throughout the district and supports strategic use of timely and appropriate data to guide planning and decision-making. Compliance with grant-related timelines, activities, and reporting requirements will be monitored on an ongoing basis by the Project Director. In compliance with M-DCPS approved procurement procedures, M-DCPS selected an external project evaluator from the approved list of respondents to RFP -026-MM10 July 18, 2012. The selected evaluation team will provide an external, impartial perspective on the implementation and who will provide regular formative feedback to inform continuous improvement efforts. Because of the confidentiality afforded through an external evaluator, it is anticipated that valuable information regarding processes and practices, including the quality of support provided to school teams by project staff, will come to light more readily and quickly than would be the case relying on site visits by the project team alone. Process feedback will be obtained on a regular basis through site visits, focus groups, and meetings with the COPs to identify any emerging issues, identify areas of success and opportunities for improvement, and continuously refine the implementation model.

Continuous, formative assessment should be seen as a constructive aspect of teaching and learning. It differs from traditional assessment which comes at the end of a unit, month, or grading quarter, seeking instead to provide ongoing feedback on the trajectory of student performance, continuously calling attention to student progress and the potential need for remediation and enrichment. Continuous improvement involves routine assessment for the benefit of both teachers and students, flagging the need for possible changes in instructional methods or content. It also becomes a strategy for meaningful reporting to parents and other stakeholders. Further, these data will provide project staff, under the guidance of the project director, with valuable guidance in improving processes and professional development strategies.

A key element in the continuous formative assessment process for the iPrep Math project will be the assessment embedded within the curricula of (b)(4) software. This software provides for ongoing assessment of each student's ability to

perform mathematical tasks and problem solving activities. This will enable instruction tailored to each student's individual needs. Teachers will review these data on a daily basis, monitoring each student's skill and comprehension level. This will guide the process of differentiated instruction, enabling teachers to provide students with support for continuous progress, and remediation and enrichment when needed. This continuous assessment process will enable teachers to adapt instruction to the individualized needs of each student and to provide remediation and challenges, as appropriate, and provide direction to students in the selection and implementation of relevant learning tasks involving real-world application of knowledge.

The investment in professional development and technology made by RTTT-D funding will be monitored, measured, and publicly shared. The impact of professional development and utilization of the technology provided in the classrooms will be continuously assessed using a range of methods. The (b)(4) software will provide one means of monitoring the extent and manner in which knowledge and skills acquired through professional development activities impact student outcomes. The manner in which students and teachers utilize this software, including the extent of student performance monitoring, will be reviewed by the external evaluators. In addition, routine visits to the iPrep Math classrooms will be conducted by trained iPrep Math Facilitators and observers. These classroom visits and observations will engage teachers in a review of the extent to which they are fully and appropriately employing knowledge culled during professional development and the extent to which teachers and students are utilizing the technology resources provided through this project. Rubrics developed for the iPrep Math project, assessing varied aspects of treatment fidelity such as student-teacher interaction and use of the technology and software will structure the observations conducted and provide information to the external evaluators for review.

The continuous improvement of the iPrep Math project will consist of a feedback loop for program assessment and will be multifaceted. The formative evaluation of the project will provide for daily review of student performance which will inform teachers about how to guide student learning. Teacher, principal, and student focus groups, as well as anonymous teacher, principal, student, and parent surveys and meetings with these stakeholders will serve as means of self-assessment. Data gathered from these events will be analyzed by external evaluators and serve as a vehicle for the formative review needed to affirm productive aspects of the project,

and prompt changes in other aspects of the project, as needed.

(E)(2): An **iPrep Math web page** will be created that will be used to publish and share process and outcome information about the project, including project-funded activities such as professional development, technology investments, staffing practices, and student achievement to support transparency and accountability. However, any personally identifiable data will be handled in compliance with board policy, contract guidelines, and applicable statues and rules, including FERPA. The iPrep Math website will contain contact information for both internal and external stakeholders to provide feedback and comments throughout the implementation. Within the district web-portal, an **iPrep Math collaboration site** will provide a forum for sharing and discussion through e-communication to enrich and extend the professional conversations taking place through the COPs.

An **iPrep Math implementation committee** will include representation from stakeholders at multiple levels, including district and regional administration, mathematics content experts, school administrators, iPrep Math teachers, parents, and community and business leaders. This committee will provide a forum for discussion and feedback and for communication by the project team with stakeholder groups. Meetings may be conducted face-to-face or though web-based support, as deemed appropriate by the group. Data and feedback gathered through the website, focus groups, site visits, and surveys will be analyzed by the M-DCPS –selected grant evaluator in order to provide regular formative feedback regarding, among other issues: fidelity or divergence of implementation across sites; process measures; progress measures; emerging issues of practice, positive or negative; promising practices; and identified unaddressed needs.

(E)(3) Required Performance Measures (a, b, c): Implementation of iPrep Math involves a significant range of variables, some of which are inter-dependent and some of which can be viewed as independent. Evaluation of iPrep Math will integrate measures of process, progress, and outcomes, which will be guided by the required reporting measures, research questions, and the need to support continuous improvement and refinement of the model. The external evaluator who will be contracted to conduct the analyses and provide the rich data and feedback to inform the Continuous Improvement Model will implement a multi-modal approach, including making maximal use of passive data capture, gleaning from existing sources such as formative and summative assessments and the

data resources embedded in the (b)(4) and (b)(4) and attendance, suspension, and academic grade records, and a combination of surveys, site visits, and focus groups. Among the project performance measures derived from the research questions discussed in the following section, under (E)(4) are:

d) Health and Wellness measure: Compliance with mandatory timelines and guidelines for required immunizations is selected as a measure which addresses removal of a barrier to school attendance, as non-compliant students are excluded from school. It is also used as a proxy measure for the status of the whole child and family supports, under the working theory that failure to meet immunization requirements can be a warning indicator of other unmet family and wellness needs that can impact attendance and achievement.

e) Measures of fidelity of implementation and continuous improvement: Accurate implementation of personalized instruction using innovative technologies is the goal of this project and as such the classroom will show fidelity to the concept proposed and continuous improvement to implementation over time. Fidelity will be measured through the use of a rubric during regular classroom visits by iPrep Math Facilitators and the evaluation team which will allow for both a measure of how the model is implemented and document positive changes put in place as a result of feedback provided through the use of this rubric. Documentation of visits, rubric assessments, and suggested improvements will provide a measure of the goal of fidelity and continuous improvement and will be reported informally during the course of the school year and annually. Increases in the percent of participating students in iPrep Math classrooms that evidence high-fidelity implementation of the model will confirm the project's goals.

f) Student engagement and understanding: In order to create sustainability we need to assure that all stakeholders, but most particularly the students, are engaged in this model. This will be measured by surveys and focus groups with stakeholders to determine the extent to which participants and stakeholders: understand the model and can articulate the elements and functions of the iPrep Math model. An increase in these measures over the course of the project, above the baseline established in the start of year 1, will indicate a higher probability of successful sustainability of the model throughout the district.

g) and h) Absenteeism and Attendance: Students who are engaged in learning should show increased attendance and reduced

disciplinary actions in the form of indoor and outdoor suspensions. This will be measured by analysis of district student records of attendance and indoor and outdoor suspension rates for participants for the baseline years and annually over the course of the grant. An increase in attendance and reduction of suspensions both over time and compared to those rates for non-participant comparison groups will indicate greater engagement.

i) Student persistence-on-task: Persistence-on-task will be used as a measure of engagement and an indirect measure of self-efficacy. Student persistence-on-task will be measured through completion of study units as measured through (b)(4) (b)(4) and (b)(4) software and tracking through the students' individual learning plan (iLAP). An increase in the number of successful completions is projected each year from the baseline level established in the first year. Success will be confirmed by the use of a comparison group of all non-participants within each school. A second comparison group may be possible. Students wishing to participate in this project will apply and if applications exceed capacity, students will be selected by lottery. If this number is large enough across the district a second comparison group will be created of these interested students. This would enable an analysis based on a randomized selection of participants. Superior outcomes by the project participants will indicate success of the project model.

j) Increased student engagement and efficacy: Changing the structure/culture of learning through the iPrep Math model and project- based education should increase students' sense of control over their own learning experience, and improve their sense of personal efficacy and optimism about their future. Participants will complete surveys that will include measures of locus of control, personal efficacy, persistence, and optimism. Baseline measures at the onset of participation and throughout the student's experience in this learning environment will show increased competency in these areas. It is expected that this increase will predict educational success in terms of graduation rates and post-secondary school enrollment.

k) Post-secondary education/career plan: A core mission for M-DCPS and for iPrep Math as well, is for students to connect the classroom and the workplace, and to develop and implement a plan that will carry them through high school and beyond, helping them attain their educational and career objective. Effectiveness of this component will be measured through the percent of participating Grade 8 students who transition to high school with a plan for their post-secondary education or career.

l) Increase parental engagement: Parental choice and empowerment is a linchpin of this project. This will be maintained and strengthened over the course of the four year project. Measures of parental engagement will be measured by analysis of parental access to the on-line District Parent Portal by which they can monitor the progress of their children and engage with them in their learning activities. An increased use of this portal will demonstrate greater parental involvement. In addition, increases in parent participation in meetings and workshops measured by school-level records of attendance and evaluations of these events will be used to monitor school-level parental involvement.

(E)(4) Plan for Evaluating Effectiveness of Investments: In addition to reporting on the required performance measures, the project's external evaluator will address the following fundamental research questions:

1. Changes in classroom practice: Do teachers in the 49 iPrep Math middle school classrooms who have participated in professional development related to the personalized instructional model subsequently integrate what they have learned into their teaching practices in mathematics? Do teachers integrate the use of innovative technologies and digital content presented to them as part of the iPrep Math professional development? Are teachers able to develop a personalized instructional model that is aligned with appropriate curriculum and standards?
2. Changes in student indicators: Do the students in the 49 iPrep Math middle school classrooms demonstrate gains in their academic performance, retention rate, improved attendance, reduction in disciplinary actions, and increased graduation rate?
3. Changes in student outcomes: Do the students in the 49 iPrep Math middle school classrooms demonstrate significantly greater gains in academic performance than a comparison group of students in the same schools who are not enrolled in iPrep Math?
4. Changes in processes for engaging stakeholders: What strategies have been used to develop and implement communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders? How effective have these strategies been?

Research Question 1. The integration of the personalized instructional model into teaching and learning and the responses to professional development will be examined through several data collection methods. This question is, in effect, an issue of "treatment fidelity." As the grant progresses, teachers are expected to utilize a personalized instructional model in their daily instructional

activities with students. During the four years of the grant, iPrep Math Facilitators and members of the evaluation team will conduct classroom visits to ensure that personalized instructional models in mathematics are being implemented. iPrep Math Facilitators will review the lesson plans that teachers have developed to guide project-based learning endeavor, the appropriate use of the newly constructed, uniquely-designed classroom space and technology. Rubrics will be developed by the evaluation team, in collaboration with iPrep Math Facilitators, teachers and district staff, for this purpose. The need for construct and content validity will be addressed, as well as methods to insure confidentiality of the information being collected. Data generated from the (b)(4) software will also provide information about the breadth and depth of the personalized instructional activities occurring. As noted earlier, teacher, principal, and student focus groups, as well as anonymous teacher, principal, student, and parent surveys, and meetings with these stakeholders, will provide data about the extent to which a personalized instructional model, including the components of continuous student assessment, has been integrated, challenges to the integration of this innovative instructional approach, as well as the extent to which the school is developing the capacity to continue the positive changes in teaching and learning achieved during the Race to the Top – District initiative, beyond the time period of the grant.

Research Question 2. This question will examine whether there are changes in the academic performance retention, attendance, disciplinary issues, and graduation rates of students in the 49 middle school iPrep Math classes. The hypothesis that will be examined is that the students in the 49 iPrep Math middle school classrooms will demonstrate continuous improvement in their academic performance, as measured by teacher-created assessments, district interim assessments, the targets embedded their iLAPs, and significant annual improvement on standardized tests.

Research Question 3. A quasi-experimental design will be employed to address this question. Data analysis will compare the changes in the academic measures noted in the performance measures of the students in the iPrep Math classes (treatment group) with that of students enrolled in non-iPrep Math classes (comparison group) in the identified 49 middle schools. The hypothesis that will be examined is that the treatment group students who have been exposed to a personalized instructional model will demonstrate significantly greater improvement in their academic performance than students in the comparison group. The evaluation will compare

the treatment and comparison group students on numerous variables including school (identified by a random number), grade level, gender, race/ethnicity, students with disabilities (SWDs), and English Language Learners (ELLs), free/reduced lunch (FRL) eligibility, and performance on baseline academic measures. Each year of the project, changes in the performance measures of the treatment group students will be compared to changes in comparison group.

The annual summative reports will examine changes over the course of the grant. A multi-level model will be employed to account for the various contexts or levels in this design. In this project students are nested within classrooms over several cohorts/grades which are either iPrep Math (treatment) or non-iPrep Math (comparison) classes, within schools. A multi-level model will allow us to account for the influence and effect of these various levels on student outcome. The model utilized will also facilitate an examination of the changes in student achievement by gender, race/ethnicity, and SWD, ELL, and FRL status.

Research Question 4. This research question concerns the strategy to develop effective lines of communication with internal and external stakeholders. Periodic meetings with staff and other stakeholders, as well as periodic surveys will be utilized to assess their level of satisfaction with the nature, quality, and quantity of communication and their level of engagement in the project, and assess their level of understanding and knowledge about the various components of the iPrep Math project such as continuous assessment.

Formative/Summative Evaluation The formative evaluation to be prepared by the evaluation team will provide qualitative and quantitative data to assess whether progress is being made towards the attainment of the performance measures. This will enable project staff to engage in continual review of whether the activities undertaken are having the desired impact. The collection and analysis of data for the formative evaluation activities will be conducted in collaboration and consultation with the district staff and project staff, including the Student Services staff. Scheduled meetings during the school year will serve as a forum during which the collection and analysis of data reviewing project progress will be presented. The external evaluation team will prepare brief formative evaluation reports, as well as annual summative reports assessing the extent to which performance measures were achieved.

Activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. Detailed information regarding the activities, deliverables, timelines, responsible parties, alignment with the applicable Absolute Priorities and the RTTT assurance areas, for the implementation of **iPrep**

Math are provided, for each project goal, by fiscal year, in **Attachment 2: *iPrep Math Comprehensive Management Plan*.**

E)(3) Performance Measures – Required for all applicants

Performance Measure (All Applicants – a) a) The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup (as defined in this notice), whose teacher of record (as defined in this notice) and principal are a highly effective teacher (as defined in this notice) and a highly effective principal (as defined in this notice).[1.]	**Applicable Population**: All participating students

		Baseline *[Provide Year]*			**Target**														
					SY 2012-13			**SY 2013-14**			**SY 2014-15**			**SY 2015-16**			**SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)**		
		A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**	**J**	**K**	**L**	**M**	**N**	**O**	**P**	**Q**	**R**
Subgroup	**Highly Effective Teacher or Principal**	**# Participating Students with Highly Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Highly Effective Teachers/Principal (A/B)*100**	**# Participating Students with Highly Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Highly Effective Teachers/Principal (D/E)*100**	**# Participating Students with Highly Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Highly Effective Teachers/Principal (G/H)*100**	**# Participating Students with Highly Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Highly Effective Teachers/Principal (J/K)*100**	**# Participating Students with Highly Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Highly Effective Teachers/Principal (M/N)*100**	**# Participating Students with Highly Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Highly Effective Teachers/Principal (P/Q)*100**
All Participating Students	Teacher	0	11760	0%	353	11760	3%	706	11760	6%	1058	11760	9%	1411	11760	12%	1764	11760	15%
	Principal	0	11760	0%	353	11760	3%	706	11760	6%	1058	11760	9%	1411	11760	12%	1764	11760	15%
WHITE	Teacher	0	912	0%	27	912	3%	55	912	6%	82	912	9%	109	912	12%	137	912	15%
	Principal	0	912	0%	27	912	3%	55	912	6%	82	912	9%	109	912	12%	137	912	15%
HISPANIC	Teacher	0	7840	0%	235	7840	3%	470	7840	6%	706	7840	9%	941	7840	12%	1176	7840	15%
	Principal	0	7840	0%	235	7840	3%	470	7840	6%	706	7840	9%	941	7840	12%	1176	7840	15%
BLACK	Teacher	0	2820	0%	85	2820	3%	169	2820	6%	254	2820	9%	338	2820	12%	423	2820	15%
	Principal	0	2820	0%	85	2820	3%	169	2820	6%	254	2820	9%	338	2820	12%	423	2820	15%
OTHER	Teacher	0	188	0%	6	188	3%	11	188	6%	17	188	9%	23	188	12%	28	188	15%
	Principal	0	188	0%	6	188	3%	11	188	6%	17	188	9%	23	188	12%	28	188	15%

Performance Measure (All Applicants – a) a) The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup (as defined in this notice), whose teacher of record (as defined in this notice) and principal are a highly effective teacher (as defined in this notice) and a highly effective principal (as defined in this notice).[1.]	**Applicable Population**: All participating students

		Baseline ***[Provide Year]***			**Target**														
					SY 2012-13			**SY 2013-14**			**SY 2014-15**			**SY 2015-16**			**SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)**		
		A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**	**J**	**K**	**L**	**M**	**N**	**O**	**P**	**Q**	**R**
Subgroup	**Highly Effective Teacher or Principal**	**# Participating Students with Highly Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Highly Effective Teachers/Principal (A/B)*100**	**# Participating Students with Highly Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Highly Effective Teachers/Principal (D/E)*100**	**# Participating Students with Highly Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Highly Effective Teachers/Principal (G/H)*100**	**# Participating Students with Highly Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Highly Effective Teachers/Principal (J/K)*100**	**# Participating Students with Highly Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Highly Effective Teachers/Principal (M/N)*100**	**# Participating Students with Highly Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Highly Effective Teachers/Principal (P/Q)*100**
ELL	Teacher	0	2618	0%	79	2618	3%	157	2618	6%	236	2618	9%	314	2618	12%	393	2618	15%
	Principal	0	2818	0%	85	2818	3%	169	2818	6%	254	2818	9%	338	2818	12%	423	2818	15%
ED	Teacher	0	9402	0%	282	9402	3%	564	9402	6%	846	9402	9%	1128	9402	12%	1410	9402	15%
	Principal	0	9402	0%	282	9402	3%	564	9402	6%	846	9402	9%	1128	9402	12%	1410	9402	15%
SWD	Teacher	0	2618	0%	79	2618	3%	157	2618	6%	236	2618	9%	314	2618	12%	393	2618	15%
	Principal	0	2618	0%	79	2618	3%	157	2618	6%	236	2618	9%	314	2618	12%	393	2618	15%

1. *Because of significant delays in the release of the 2012 Florida Value-Added Model data which comprise 50% of teacher and principal summative evaluations, the 2012 M-DCPS teacher and principal evaluations are* ***not yet final; these baseline results and targets will be submitted as soon as available.***

Performance Measure (All Applicants – b) b) The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup (as defined in this notice), whose teacher of record (as defined in this notice) and principal are an effective teacher (as defined in this notice) and an effective principal (as defined in this notice).	**Applicable Population**: All participating students

		Baseline *[Provide Year]*			**Target**														
					SY 2012-13			**SY 2013-14**			**SY 2014-15**			**SY 2015-16**			**SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)**		
		A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**	**J**	**K**	**L**	**M**	**N**	**O**	**P**	**Q**	**R**
Subgroup	**Effective Teacher or Principal**	**# of Participating Students with Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Effective Teachers/Principal (A/B)*100**	**# of Participating Students with Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Effective Teachers/Principal (D/E)*100**	**# of Participating Students with Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Effective Teachers/Principal (G/H)*100**	**# of Participating Students with Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Effective Teachers/Principal (J/K)*100**	**# of Participating Students with Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Effective Teachers/Principal (M/N)*100**	**# of Participating Students with Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Effective Teachers/Principal (P/Q)*100**
All Parti-cipating Students	Teacher	9408	11760	80 %	9761	11760	83 %	10114	11760	86%	10466	11760	89%	10819	11760	92%	11172	11760	95%
	Principal	9408	11760	80 %	9761	11760	83 %	10114	11760	86%	10466	11760	89%	10819	11760	92%	11172	11760	95%
WHITE	Teacher	730	912	80 %	757	912	83 %	784	912	86%	812	912	89%	839	912	92%	866	912	95%
	Principal	730	912	80 %	757	912	83 %	784	912	86%	812	912	89%	839	912	92%	866	912	95%
HISPANIC	Teacher	6272	7840	80 %	6507	7840	83 %	6742	7840	86%	6978	7840	89%	7213	7840	92%	7448	7840	95%
	Principal	6272	7840	80 %	6507	7840	83 %	6742	7840	86%	6978	7840	89%	7213	7840	92%	7448	7840	95%
BLACK	Teacher	2256	2820	80 %	2341	2820	83 %	2425	2820	86%	2510	2820	89%	2594	2820	92%	2679	2820	95%
	Principal	2256	2820	80 %	2341	2820	83 %	2425	2820	86%	2510	2820	89%	2594	2820	92%	2679	2820	95%

Performance Measure (All Applicants – b) b) The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup (as defined in this notice), whose teacher of record (as defined in this notice) and principal are an effective teacher (as defined in this notice) and an effective principal (as defined in this notice).	**Applicable Population**: All participating students

		Baseline *[Provide Year]*			**Target**														
					SY 2012-13			**SY 2013-14**			**SY 2014-15**			**SY 2015-16**			**SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)**		
		A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**	**J**	**K**	**L**	**M**	**N**	**O**	**P**	**Q**	**R**
Subgroup	**Effective Teacher or Principal**	**# of Participating Students with Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Effective Teachers/Principal (A/B)*100**	**# of Participating Students with Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Effective Teachers/Principal (D/E)*100**	**# of Participating Students with Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Effective Teachers/Principal (G/H)*100**	**# of Participating Students with Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Effective Teachers/Principal (J/K)*100**	**# of Participating Students with Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Effective Teachers/Principal (M/N)*100**	**# of Participating Students with Effective Teacher/Principal**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% with Effective Teachers/Principal (P/Q)*100**
OTHER	Teacher	150	188	80 %	156	188	83 %	162	188	86%	167	188	89%	173	188	92%	179	188	95%
	Principal	150	188	80 %	156	188	83 %	162	188	86%	167	188	89%	173	188	92%	179	188	95%
ELL	Teacher	2094	2618	80 %	2173	2618	83 %	2251	2618	86%	2330	2618	89%	2409	2618	92%	2487	2618	95%
	Principal	2254	2818	80 %	2339	2818	83 %	2423	2818	86%	2508	2818	89%	2593	2818	92%	2677	2818	95%
ED	Teacher	7522	9402	80 %	7804	9402	83 %	8086	9402	86%	8368	9402	89%	8650	9402	92%	8932	9402	95%
	Principal	7522	9402	80 %	7804	9402	83 %	8086	9402	86%	8368	9402	89%	8650	9402	92%	8932	9402	95%
SWD	Teacher	2094	2618	80 %	2173	2618	83 %	2251	2618	86%	2330	2618	89%	2409	2618	92%	2487	2618	95%
	Principal	2094	2618	80 %	2173	2618	83 %	2251	2618	86%	2330	2618	89%	2409	2618	92%	2487	2618	95%

2. *Because of significant delays in the release of the 2012 Florida Value-Added Model data which comprise 50% of teacher and principal summative evaluations, the 2012 M-DCPS teacher and principal evaluations are* ***not yet final; these baseline results and targets will be submitted as soon as available****.*

Performance Measure (All Applicants – c) [Please describe the Performance Measure in the cells below, as well as the methodology for calculating the measure.]	**Applicable Population**	**Subgroup**	**Baseline** *[2012-2013]*	**Target**				
				SY 2012-13	**SY 2013-14**	**SY 2014-15**	**SY 2015-16**	**SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)**
c) Percent of students over-age in grade at transition to grade 9. Rationale: Course recovery/acceleration is a key measure for success of personalized learning environments. Because of seat-time requirements for promotion/course completion in high school, the critical window for accelerating over-aged students is middle school. Baseline will be SY 2012-2013. Methodology: Measured in fall of grade 9 each year by comparison of student cohort percent over-age for grade.	Grade 8	OVERALL		Baseline Year	Baseline – 10%	Baseline – 20%	Baseline – 30%	Baseline – 40%
		BLACK		Baseline Year	Baseline – 10%	Baseline – 20%	Baseline – 30%	Baseline – 40%
		HISPANIC		Baseline Year	Baseline – 10%	Baseline – 20%	Baseline – 30%	Baseline – 40%
		WHITE		Baseline Year	Baseline – 10%	Baseline – 20%	Baseline – 30%	Baseline – 40%
		OTHER		Baseline Year	Baseline – 10%	Baseline – 20%	Baseline – 30%	Baseline – 40%
		ED		Baseline Year	Baseline – 10%	Baseline – 20%	Baseline – 30%	Baseline – 40%
		ELL		Baseline Year	Baseline – 10%	Baseline – 20%	Baseline – 30%	Baseline – 40%
		SWD		Baseline Year	Baseline – 10%	Baseline – 20%	Baseline – 30%	Baseline – 40%

(E)(3) Performance Measures – Required for applicants with participating students in grades 6-8

Performance Measure (Grades 6-8 – a)	**Applicable Population**: Grades 6-8, Assessments: FL Algebra I End of Course Assessment.
a) The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness based on the applicant's on-track indicator (as defined in this notice). Goal: reduce the % not-on-track by 50% over five years using 2011-2012 as baseline	On track to college and career-readiness is measured by Achievement Level 4 or higher on Algebra I EOC

	Baseline *[Provide Year]*			**Target**														
				SY 2012-13			**SY 2013-14**			**SY 2014-15**			**SY 2015-16**			**SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)**		
	A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**	**J**	**K**	**L**	**M**	**N**	**O**	**P**	**Q**	**R**
Subgroup	**# Participating Students who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness (A/B)*100**	**# Participating Students who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness (D/E)*100**	**# Participating Students who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness (G/H)*100**	**# Participating Students who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness (J/K)*100**	**# Participating Students who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness (M/N)*100**	**# Participating Students who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness (P/Q)*100**
OVERALL	2106	4257	49	2303	4257	54	2520	4257	59	2737	4257	64	2954	4257	69	3171	4257	75
BLACK	222	627	35	260	627	42	301	627	48	342	627	55	382	627	61	423	627	68
HISPANIC	1400	2860	49	1547	2860	54	1693	2860	59	1839	2860	64	1985	2860	69	2131	2860	75
WHITE	379	628	60	402	628	64	427	628	68	452	628	72	477	628	76	502	628	80
OTHER	105	142	74	109	142	77	112	142	79	116	142	82	120	142	84	124	142	87
ED	1137	2678	42	1280	2678	48	1435	2678	54	1591	2678	59	1746	2678	65	1901	2678	71

Performance Measure (Grades 6-8 – a) a) The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness based on the applicant's on-track indicator (as defined in this notice). Goal: reduce the % not-on-track by 50% over five years using 2011-2012 as baseline	**Applicable Population**: Grades 6-8, Assessments: FL Algebra I End of Course Assessment. On track to college and career-readiness is measured by Achievement Level 4 or higher on Algebra I EOC

	Baseline *[Provide Year]*			**Target**														
				SY 2012-13			**SY 2013-14**			**SY 2014-15**			**SY 2015-16**			**SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)**		
	A	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**I**	**J**	**K**	**L**	**M**	**N**	**O**	**P**	**Q**	**R**
Subgroup	**# Participating Students who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness (A/B)*100**	**# Participating Students who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness (D/E)*100**	**# Participating Students who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness (G/H)*100**	**# Participating Students who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness (J/K)*100**	**# Participating Students who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness (M/N)*100**	**# Participating Students who are on track to college- & career-readiness**	**Total # of Participating Students**	**% who are on track to college- & career-readiness (P/Q)*100**
ELL	24	46	52	26	46	57	28	46	62	31	46	66	33	46	71	35	46	76
SWD	33	69	48	37	69	53	40	69	58	44	69	64	47	69	69	51	69	74

E)(3) Performance Measures – Required for applicants with participating students in grades 6-8

Performance Measure (Grades 4-8 –b, c) [Please describe the Performance Measure in the cells below, as well as the methodology for calculating the measure.]	**Applicable Population**	**Subgroup**	**Baseline** *SY 2011-12*	**Target**				
				SY 2012-13	**SY 2013-14**	**SY 2014-15**	**SY 2015-16**	**SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)**
b) Grade-appropriate leading academic indicator:	Grade 7	OVERALL	50	55	60	65	70	75

		BLACK	35	42	48	55	61	68
		HISPANIC	52	57	62	66	71	76
		WHITE	74	77	79	82	84	87
		OTHER	80	82	84	86	88	90
		ED	44	50	55	61	66	72
		ELL	20	28	36	44	52	60
		SWD	20	28	36	44	52	60
c) Social/Emotional Measure As a result of participating in the transition curriculum program "*Moving On*" delivered by the school counselor, incoming grade 6 students will demonstrate increases in their 1) knowledge of and b) comfort with the procedures and requirements of middle school as measured by pre- and post-surveys. Rationale: A key factor in student success in middle school is understanding how middle school works and how to work effectively in the middle school.	All Grade 6 participating students	OVERALL	N/A	Baseline Year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 15%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 25%
		BLACK	N/A	Baseline Year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 15%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 25%
		HISPANIC	N/A	Baseline Year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 15%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 25%
		WHITE	N/A	Baseline Year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 15%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 25%
		OTHER	N/A	Baseline Year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 15%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 25%
		ED	N/A	Baseline Year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 15%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 25%
		ELL	N/A	Baseline Year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 15%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 25%
		SWD	N/A	Baseline Year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 15%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 25%

Performance Measure Applicant-proposed	Applicable Population	Subgroup	Baseline *SY 2011-12*	Target				
				SY 2012-13	**SY 2013-14**	**SY 2014-15**	**SY 2015-16**	**SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)**
d)Performance Measure Health/Wellness Increase required 7th grade immunization rates as measured by MDCPS Immunization Report. Rationale: Failure to obtain age/grade appropriate immunizations may result in the student being excluded from attending school and impact attendance and academic achievement. Target: 100% Compliance by SY 2016-2017	Grade 7	All Participating Students	N/A	Baseline Year	Baseline + 5%	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 15%	100%
		BLACK	N/A	Baseline Year	Baseline + 5%	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 15%	100%
		HISPANIC	N/A	Baseline Year	Baseline + 5%	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 15%	100%
		WHITE	N/A	Baseline Year	Baseline + 5%	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 15%	100%
		OTHER	N/A	Baseline Year	Baseline + 5%	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 15%	100%
		ED	N/A	Baseline Year	Baseline + 5%	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 15%	100%
		ELL	N/A	Baseline Year	Baseline + 5%	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 15%	100%
		SWD	N/A	Baseline Year	Baseline + 5%	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 15%	100%

Performance Measure: Applicant-proposed	Applicable Population	Subgroup	Baseline *2011-2012*	Target				
				SY 2012-13	**SY 2013-14**	**SY 2014-15**	**SY 2015-16**	**SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)**
e)Percent of participating students attending iPrep Math classroom demonstrating high	Grades 6, 7, 8	All Participating Students	N/A	N/A	Baseline	Baseline + 15%	Baseline + 25%	100%
		BLACK	N/A	N/A	Baseline	Baseline + 15%	Baseline + 25%	100%

fidelity in model implementation as measured on an implementation rubric through site visits, observations, and surveys. Baseline levels will be determined in Year 1 2013-2014. Surveys and rubric will be developed January-June 2013 for use beginning 2013-24 school year. Rationale: monitor fidelity of implementation across schools and students to ensure equity of access/delivery. Target: 100% by SY 2016-2017		HISPANIC	N/A	N/A	Baseline	Baseline + 15%	Baseline + 25%	100%
		WHITE	N/A	N/A	Baseline	Baseline + 15%	Baseline + 25%	100%
		OTHER	N/A	N/A	Baseline	Baseline + 15%	Baseline + 25%	100%
		ED	N/A	N/A	Baseline	Baseline + 15%	Baseline + 25%	100%
		ELL	N/A	N/A	Baseline	Baseline + 15%	Baseline + 25%	100%
		SWD	N/A	N/A	Baseline	Baseline + 15%	Baseline + 20%	100%
Performance Measure: Applicant-proposed	**Applicable Population**	**Subgroup**	**Baseline** *2011-2012*	**Target**				
				SY 2012-13	**SY 2013-14**	**SY 2014-15**	**SY 2015-16**	**SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)**
f)Percent of participating students who **demonstrate an understanding of the iPrep Math model** by articulating the elements and functions of the model as measured through focus groups and surveys. Rationale: To be effective members of the COP, students must understand their role and	Grades 6, 7, 8	All Participating Students	N/A	N/A	Baseline	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		BLACK	N/A	N/A	Baseline	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		HISPANIC	N/A	N/A	Baseline	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		WHITE	N/A	N/A	Baseline	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		OTHER	N/A	N/A	Baseline	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		ED	N/A	N/A	Baseline	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%

responsibilities and those of other members. Target: Increase by 10% each year from baseline level set in first students participation year, 2013-2014		ELL	N/A	N/A	Baseline	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		SWD	N/A	N/A	Baseline	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
Performance Measure Applicant-proposed	**Applicable Population**	**Subgroup**	**Baseline *2011-2012***	**Target**				
				SY 2012-13	**SY 2013-14**	**SY 2014-15**	**SY 2015-16**	**SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)**
g)Decrease absenteeism for participating iPrep Math students from baseline levels determined in 2013-2014 (first year of student participation) . Target: average 2% absenteeism (reflecting achievement of 98% average attendance) by Year 5.	All participating students, Gr. 6, 7, 8	All Participating Students	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	4%	3%	2%
		BLACK	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	4%	3%	2%
		HISPANIC	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	4%	3%	2%
		WHITE	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	4%	3%	2%
		OTHER	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	4%	3%	2%
		ED	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	4%	3%	2%
		ELL	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	4%	3%	2%
		SWD	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	4%	3%	2%
Performance Measure Applicant-proposed	**Applicable Population**	**Subgroup**	**Baseline *2011-2012***	**Target**				
				SY 2012-13	**SY 2013-14**	**SY 2014-15**	**SY 2015-16**	**SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)**
h) Decrease rates of indoor and outdoor suspension for iPrep Math students by 5% each year from baseline established in the first student year, 2013-2014.	All participating students, Gr. 6, 7, 8	All Participating Students	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline - 5%	Baseline - 10%	Baseline - 15%
		BLACK	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline - 5%	Baseline - 10%	Baseline - 15%
		HISPANIC	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline - 5%	Baseline - 10%	Baseline - 15%
		WHITE	N/A	N/A	Baseline	Baseline -	Baseline -	Baseline -

					year	5%	10%	15%
		OTHER	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline - 5%	Baseline - 10%	Baseline - 15%
		ED	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline - 5%	Baseline - 10%	Baseline - 15%
		ELL	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline - 5%	Baseline - 10%	Baseline - 15%
		SWD	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline - 5%	Baseline - 10%	Baseline - 15%

Performance Measure : Applicant-proposed	Applicable Population	Subgroup	Baseline *[Provide Year]* 2011-2012	Target				
				SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
i)Increase average levels of student **persistence-on-task** as measured by completion of study units and learning tasks as measured through (b)(4) and (b)(4) data and tracked through each student's individual learning plan (iLAP) Rationale: Task persistence to completion is an essential skill for post-secondary success. This is a skill explicitly fostered in iPrep Math. Target: Increase by 10% per year from baseline in 2013-2014.	All participating students, Gr. 6, 7, 8	All Participating Students	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		BLACK	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		HISPANIC	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		WHITE	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		OTHER	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		ED	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		ELL	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		SWD	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
Performance Measure : Applicant-proposed	**Applicable Population**	**Subgroup**	**Baseline *[Provide Year]* 2011-2012**	**Target**				
				SY 2012-13	**SY 2013-14**	**SY 2014-15**	**SY 2015-16**	**SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)**
j) Social/Emotional Measure Increase participating students' sense of self-efficacy as measured through surveys and self-assessments. Target: demonstrate increases of 10% of each year of participation, as determined from baseline in	All participating students, Gr. 6, 7, 8	All Participating Students	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		BLACK	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		HISPANIC	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		WHITE	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		OTHER	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%

fall of each student's first year of participation.		ED	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		ELL	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		SWD	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
Performance Measure: Applicant-proposed	**Applicable Population**	**Subgroup**	**Baseline *[Provide Year]* 2011-2012**	**Target**				
				SY 2012-13	**SY 2013-14**	**SY 2014-15**	**SY 2015-16**	**SY 2016-17**
k) Social/Emotional Measure Percent of participating grade 8 students who transition to high school with a plan for post-secondary education or career. Target: 100% by Year 5	Participating Grade 8 students	All Participating Students	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	80%	90%	100%
		BLACK	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	80%	90%	100%
		HISPANIC	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	80%	90%	100%
		WHITE	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	80%	90%	100%
		OTHER	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	80%	90%	100%
		ED	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	80%	90%	100%
		ELL	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	80%	90%	100%
		SWD	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	80%	90%	100%
Performance Measure: Applicant-proposed	**Applicable Population**	**Subgroup**	**Baseline *[Provide Year]* 2011-2012**	**Target**				
				SY 2012-13	**SY 2013-14**	**SY 2014-15**	**SY 2015-16**	**SY 2016-17**
l) Parental Involvement Measure Percent of participating students whose parents demonstrate parental engagement through accessing student grades, progress	All participating students, Gr. 6, 7, 8	All Participating Students	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		BLACK	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		HISPANIC	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		WHITE	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%

reports, teacher/parent communications, and parent resources through the district web portal Target: Increase by 10% each year from baseline levels established in the first nine weeks (first grading period) in year 1, 2012-2013		OTHER	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		ED	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		ELL	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%
		SWD	N/A	N/A	Baseline year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%

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

The extent to which—

(F)(1) Budget for the project *(10 points)*

The applicant's budget, including the budget narrative and tables—

(a) Identifies all funds that will support the project (e.g., Race to the Top – District grant; external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds); and

(b) Is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal; and

(c) Clearly provides a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities, including--

(i) A description of all of the funds (e.g., Race to the Top – District grant; external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds) that the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal, including total revenue from these sources; and

(ii) Identification of the funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grant period, as described in the proposed budget and budget narrative, with a focus on strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the personalized learning environments; and

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

The applicant has a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. The plan should include support from State and local government leaders and financial support. Such a plan may include a budget for the three years after the term of the grant that includes budget assumptions, potential sources, and uses of funds.

In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria and/or provide its high-quality plan for meeting the criteria.

The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.

To provide a high-quality plan, the applicant should describe, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties (for further detail, see Scoring Instructions in Part XV or Appendix A in the NIA). The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.

Recommended maximum response length: Six pages (excluding tables)

(F)(1)(a): M-DCPS requests funding in the amount of $30,000,000 over four years from the U.S. Department of Education's Race to the Top-District competition as outlined in the budget narrative and tables. This support will provide critical seed money and serve as the catalyst to create personalized learning environments, transform classroom practice, and accelerate student achievement. In addition to the RTTT-D funds, an additional $25,741,408 will be leveraged (from District, State and other Federal Funds) to support the project (see line 12 of the budget for additional detail). The 98 teachers are district paid at the cost of $52,721 per year for 3.5 years, or $18,083,303 plus fringe benefits.

(b): Table 4-1 provides detail of expenditures by line item and includes cost descriptions and cost assumptions. The overall budget has been broken into the following four project-level budgets – 1) project management, evaluation, and stakeholder engagement; 2) renovation and wireless; 3) building local capacity; and 4) student access and support. Shortly after grant award notice in December 2012, renovation of the 49 classrooms will begin at an estimated cost of $190,000 per middle school. The plan is to have the renovation, infrastructure, wiring, and upgrades completed from January – July 2013 so that students and teachers can enter the newly designed spaces on the first day of school, August 19, 2013. The student access and support budget includes funds for curriculum, technology, software, two (2) project-specific student services staff , and hourly support for certified teachers to assist the two teachers in the classroom. As teaching and leading are key components of the design, a third project-specific budget is dedicated to building local capacity. It includes funds for four (4) iPrep Math Facilitators who will support the teachers and administrators at the 49 school sites, an additional teaching period supplement for the 98 teachers (budgeted at $6,650 per teacher), rigorous summer and year-round professional development, and out-of-county travel to attend national conferences in Years 3&4 of the grant. Finally, the budget includes a project management section which includes funds for a full-time project director, outside evaluators to assist with continuous improvement model, and project-required travel to the project directors' annual meeting.

(c)(i)(ii): Rationale for Investments and Priorities: Table 4-1 provides a description of the funds that M-DCPS will use to support project implementation, as well as rationale for investments and priorities. Included in the Table is a description of which funds will be used for a one-time investment versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs. Please refer to Table 4 for

a detailed explanation of all budget costs.

(F)(2): M-DCPS has identified the need for reform in middle school mathematics instruction as a priority to be addressed initially, but not exclusively, through the iPrep math model. M-DCPS is fully committed to carrying out the initiatives proposed for the iPrep Math in the middle schools. M-DCPS is further committed to implementing a continuous improvement and evaluation process that will identify best practices for replication, including identifying practices that prove to be more effective in specific settings or for specific subgroups, and any differential impact on student achievement of standards. The iPrep Math labs will serve a crucible for reform, putting ideas and practices to the test in schools across the district. The iPrep math classrooms will also provide a site-based model in each school that can be used to expand the model to other classrooms and content areas. To this end, substitute money has been allocated for years 3 and 4 of the grant, in the amount of $500 per participating school per year. These funds will allow principals to release interested teachers from the classroom for a period or block, several times each year, to observe, participate in, or co-teach a lesson in the iPrep Math classroom. One substitute can cover several classes, in rotation, within the day, so that several teachers can have this experience.

Since 2010, the first year of the iPrep Academy high school, which started at a single school site, the iPrep high school model has expanded to additional sites across the county, with more in the works to meet parent and student demand. In addition to expanding access to this highly-engaging, blended-learning model to more high school students, the next push is addressing the demonstrated needs of the middle schools, including improving mathematics achievement and algebra-readiness and providing recovery options for over-aged middle school students to catch up to their cohort and graduate. In order to accomplish this, M-DCPS will leverage a broad range of current resources, ongoing initiatives, and aggressive pursuit of additional revenue. Implementation of the Continuous Improvement Model, feedback obtained from ongoing formative evaluation of iPrep Math implementation and outcomes, and careful monitoring of return-on-investment (ROI) of program components will provide a basis for ongoing refinement of the iPrep Math model, leveraging of resources, replication of emerging and identified best practices, testing the fundamental theory of action, and identifying those program elements which demonstrate the greatest efficiency and

highest potential value for district-wide implementation.

M-DCPS initiatives that are already in place to expand technology access for all students, bridge the digital divide and support anytime/anywhere learning include:

- **21st Century Schools** M-DCPS is in the process of asking county voters to invest in their schools by approving the issuance of a $1.2 billion General Obligation (GO) Bond for renovating facilities, updating technology, building school replacements, expanding student capacity, and enhancing facility safety to remedy the inequity between the instructional experience of students attending newer schools and those in outdated buildings so that all students can take full advantage of current technology and digital learning environments.
- **E-rate** The Universal Service Fund for Schools and Libraries program is a federal funding source made available through the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to provide deeply discounted services for Internet access, telecommunications, and local area network installations, based on each individual school's free and reduced lunch level of participation. The E-Rate discount average for M-DCPS is currently at 78%. E-rate requires maintenance of effort such that ineligible services, such as terminals and workstation computers and printers, software, electrical capacity, among others, must be budgeted to correspond with the infrastructure upgrade requested through e-rate. These infrastructure upgrades will support the implementation of the initial iPrep math learning centers and the future expansion to create additional iPrep Math learning centers in schools where parent and student demand exceeds capacity.
- **Foundation for New Educational Initiatives (FNEI)** was created by the district to implement innovative strategies for supplementing district resources and securing matching funds to support and extend district initiatives. The FNEI **Bringing Wireless Technology to the Classroom drive** in 2011-2012 pulled in community-wide contributions and support from local and national foundations in support of matching e-rate funding for wireless technology improvements in schools and provide students with laptop computers. This demonstrates the importance that parents and community members and business leaders place on ensuring that M-DCPS students have the technological infrastructure and resources they need, and bodes well for the potential success of the 21st

Century School s bond referendum. **Dial-A-Teacher:** An online, free service provided by M-DCPS, in cooperation with United Teachers of Dade and WLRN, Dial-A-Teacher offers homework help in most subject areas in grades K-12 and provides parents/guardians with assistance in helping their children complete homework assignments. Hours of operation are Monday through Thursday on school nights from 5:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m. Bilingual assistance is available. **The Parent Academy:** A year-round initiative providing free classes and workshops at more than 200 sites throughout the county, the Foundation helps parents become full partners in their child's education.

Miami-Dade County Public Schools has a long history of successful grants administration. In the last 5 years the district has secured (either directly or as a lead partner) **$17.6 million** in grants from the private sector and **$1.86 billion** in grants from the state or federal government. The district has been in full compliance on each of these grants and has received ongoing awards from many of our public and private sector partners as a result of its stellar grants administration and meeting or exceeding the proposed targets. Many of the initiatives started through grants have been integrated into the district's ongoing work. The district will aggressively pursue additional sources of funding to support and expand the iPrep model. Funding obtained through the upcoming bond referendum is specifically targeted at renovating crumbling and antiquated school facilities to bring classrooms into the 21st century. This includes providing infrastructure and internet access for technology-supported learning across the district.

The district's efforts to develop innovative approaches to meet the educational needs of our children is paying off – recent data confirms that they have made significant gains in every sub-group, are closing achievement gaps, and showing improved graduation rates and decreased dropout rates.

Activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. Detailed information regarding the activities, deliverables, timelines, responsible parties, alignment with the applicable Absolute Priorities and the RTTT assurance areas, for the implementation of **iPrep Math** are provided, for each project goal, by fiscal year, in **Attachment 2: *iPrep Math Comprehensive Management Plan*.**

X. COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

Competitive Preference Priority: Results, Resource Alignment, and Integrated Services. The Department will give priority to an applicant based on the extent to which the applicant proposes to integrate public or private resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students (as defined in this notice), giving highest priority to students in participating schools with high-need students (as defined in this notice). To meet this priority, an applicant's proposal does not need to be comprehensive and may provide student and family supports that focus on a subset of these needs.

To meet this priority, an applicant must—

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

(2) Identify not more than 10 population-level desired results for students in the LEA or consortium of LEAs that align with and support the applicant's broader Race to the Top – District proposal. These results must include both educational results and other education outcomes (e.g., children enter kindergarten prepared to succeed in school, children exit third grade reading at grade level, and students graduate from high school college- and career-ready) and family and community supports (as defined in this notice) results;

(3) Describe how the partnership would –

(a) Track the selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all children within the LEA or consortium and at the student level for the participating students (as defined in this notice);

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

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

(d) Improve results over time;

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

(5) Describe how the partnership and LEA or consortium would build the capacity of staff in participating schools (as defined in this notice) by providing them with tools and supports to –

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

(b) Identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community that are aligned with those goals for improving the education and family and community supports (as defined in this notice) identified by the applicant;

(c) Create a decision-making process and infrastructure to select, implement, and evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating students (as defined in this notice) and support improved results;

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

(e) Routinely assess the applicant's progress in implementing its plan to maximize impact and resolve challenges and problems; and

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

In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the priority and/or provide its high-quality plan for meeting the priority.

The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers, including at a minimum the evidence listed in the priority (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the priority. Evidence or attachments must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.

To provide a high-quality plan, the applicant should describe, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties (for further detail, see Scoring Instructions in Part XV or Appendix A in the NIA). The narrative and attachments

may also include any additional information the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.

Recommended maximum response length: Six pages (excluding tables)

(1) Description of Partnerships: In order to address the comprehensive, complex, and diverse needs of over 340,000 largely minority students, of whom 70% are economically disadvantaged, and over 90% are minorities, M-DCPS works in close partnership with both public resources and private community organizations to provide supports for students and families. Several of these organizations participate at a policy level, with representation on M-DCPS advisory committees, such as the Student Services Advisory Committee and the School Health Medical Advisory Committee, to guide and support the implementation of the M-DCPS Comprehensive Student Services Plan. Other organizations focus directly on support for students in school, and for families throughout the community. Examples of some of the numerous district partnerships: **Amigos for Kids** provides child abuse prevention and awareness campaigns, and activities and afterschool programs; **Citrus Health Network** provides substance abuse and mental health services; **Informed Families** provides substance abuse prevention education and resources; the **Miami-Dade County Health Department** supports the School Health Program screening services; **Miami Lighthouse for the Blind & Visually Impaired** provides educational services, support, and materials for visually impaired students and community members; **The Children's Trust** provides coordination of services through Health Connect in Our Schools, Service Partnerships, summer and after-school programs, and Youth Violence Prevention programs; **The Listeners/Oyentes Program** provides mentors for at-risk students; **The Melissa Institute** focuses on violence prevention, and bullying prevention; **The Miami Coalition for a Safe and Drug-free Community** provides training and support for student services professionals to help ensure that students have a safe learning environment in which to thrive. Some community-based organizations partner with just one or a few schools, or selected student populations, while others work district-wide, such as the **United Way**. The United Way is one of the largest and most long-standing partnerships with M-DCPS, dating back to 1974. Historically, M-DCPS employees, students, and their parents are, together, the largest contributors to the United Way.

Reciprocally, United Way funds agencies and services around the county that provide desperately-needed services for students and families.

Several organizations provide college tuition scholarships to selected students, including Take **Stock in Children** and **I Have a Dream**; the support and commitment of these organizations affords students who would not traditionally have considered college a possibility a chance at a college education. The district's Office of Community Engagement is charged with supporting students' learning and stakeholder satisfaction by developing community support and partnerships. **Florida KidCare** offers health insurance for children, birth -18, to ensure that children have access to medical, dental, vision, and mental health services. **Miami-Dade County Public Schools' Division of Full Service Schools and Comprehensive Health Services** provide annual training for school site staff in health-related issues and coordinates mandatory school health screenings; follow up services are provided through cooperative agreements with s agencies including the **Dr. Bruce Heiken Memorial Fund**, the **Instant Vision** mobile vans, the **Easter Seal Society**, and the **American Red Cross**. Over the past three decades, M-DCPS has experienced dramatic growth in the range and quantity of health services offered to students, but the needs continue to grow, particularly in these difficult economic times. The School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida, has taken an active role in advocating for partnerships and programs which will promote healthy schools and healthy children. **Project Upstart** is a **Homeless Children and Youth Program** that has been in operation in Miami-Dade County Public Schools (M-DCPS) since 1992 to provide the best educational experience for homeless children and youth ages 3-20, in partnership with the 14-18 shelters throughout the county to ensure the basic needs of targeted children, youth, and families are met, and that additional services are offered to assist participants cope with mental and physical health issues.

(2) Population-level desired results for students in the LEA or consortium of LEA: The population-level desired results listed in the chart in Section XI focus on leveraging the home-school-community partnership to: eliminate multiple potential barriers to student attendance; ensure that parents have the information and resources they need to support and guide their children through the middle school years and make an effective transition into high school; and ensure that the social, emotional, and academic needs

of each student are met so that he/she can succeed.

(3) (a) (b): Each of the population-level desired outcomes will be tracked through the applicable performance indicator listed in the "Desired results" section. The identified metrics are readily available through data sources already in place in the district, such as the data warehouse, the principal's portal, and other reports. These data, along with the indicators described in Sections A and E, will be used to identify student needs and strategically target resources to improve outcomes for participating students.

(c) (d): M-DCPS provides each of the 49 middle schools with a Comprehensive Student Services Program that is an integral part of the district's educational program. School student services teams include school counselor(s) a TRUST (To Reach Ultimate Success Together) specialist, a school social worker, and a school psychologist, who are charged with providing students with the necessary "wrap-around" counseling and services to support academic development and meet each student's personal/social, health/wellness needs while successfully guiding them towards higher education, college and career planning. Building capacity founded on the strong collaborative partnerships between our existing teams of student services professionals and community-based organizations, institutes of higher education and public health providers, will help M-DCPS ensure that all of our middle school students, including those at-risk and with special needs, have the resources and services they need to succeed. Engaging families in the work of learning includes reaching out to make sure that all parents know they are welcome and needed as partners in their child's education, and that the school team is there to help them access to services and information they need to support their children academically and emotionally. M-DCPS student services staff know that learning does not stop at the schoolhouse door; conversely, neither do students' personal, family or community concerns. Students live and learn in both settings, and need to be supported in both settings, by the people who care about them most – their families and their teachers. Student services teams bridge both worlds to ensure that the needs of the whole child are addressed, wherever and whenever those services are needed, either in the school, the home, or the community. It is these school-family-community partnerships that support academic success and future career outcomes of students. Therefore, student services professionals are called to create, lead, and facilitate these partnerships and work to remove barriers to these vital collaborative relationships. In order to best meet these needs, student services professionals need access to

current information on available resources and the skills to provide needed services and facilitate access for students and parents.

(4) (5) Building capacity and expanding the model and range of services beyond the participating students: In order to stay abreast of current research and best practices, student services professionals need timely, relevant, and high-quality professional development that is directly applicable to the needs of their schools and students. In order to deliver an effective, comprehensive program of support and direct services to students, parents, teachers, and administrators, student services team members need training on the design and implementation of data-informed school counseling programs that align to school improvement plans, and address specific goals such as school safety (essential in addressing potential student mental health issues), student achievement, graduation rates, attendance, and achievement gaps – all of which are critical needs in M-DCPS middle schools.

The training model selected is the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) training, as best aligned with the needs and priorities of both M-DCPS and the iPrep Math initiative in supporting the academic, social, and emotional development of the whole child. ASCA training is high-quality, research-based and aligned with current standards and practices for quality school counseling programs. The goals of the ASCA Model training are: 1. Increase skills and knowledge in developing a school counseling program based on the ASCA National Model; 2. Focus on how to develop or improve the foundation, delivery, management and accountability systems for the school counseling program; 3. Learn to take a leadership role to not only focus on individual student needs but also to focus on system change that addresses what all students need to know and be able to do to ensure success; 4. Focus on methods for teaming and collaborating to create or improve the school counseling program structure emphasizing the delivery system and accountability system; and 5. Create and implement a data-driven action plan that aligns with school improvement goals, addresses specific goals, such as student achievement, graduation rates, attendance, achievement gaps and/or school safety. These professional and hands-on workshops will allow the counseling professionals to learn the skills and strategies to incorporate the use of data to make school counseling program decisions. MDCPS data indicate that the needs of the district's middle school student population place significant demands on counselors' skills in numerous areas, ranging from academic advisement and career education, through leadership development and self-efficacy skills, to bullying prevention and violence prevention, while, in

addition, addressing students' social/emotional development, health and nutrition, and mental health issues.

First-year training plans include employing the services of the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) for district-wide (with distinct emphasis on the targeted schools) training to include: Getting Started with the ASCA National Model ($2,500 for full-day training); the ASCA National Model and the Use of Data ($2,500 for full-day training); and Recognized ASCA Model Program (RAMP): Putting It All Together ($2,500 for full-day training). This training is customized by ASCA to meet the needs and goals of the school district. The emphasis is on goal-setting and accountability for counseling programs. School counselors need to learn to set clear, measureable, and data-based goals and to collect and analyze data for continuous improvement. In years two and three, counselors will participate in a yearly refresher all-day training Finally, upon the implementation of the ASCA Model Program; schools should be able to apply for national recognition from ASCA through RAMP.

Additional training plans include PREPARE (suicide awareness and prevention training), Kristie House (Human trafficking awareness).and Choices training on the Florida Choices Planner and Professional tools (a free internet-based career information delivery system provided by the Florida Department of Education). Choices training will be in alignment with State legislation of HB 7059 which states the career and education planning course may be taught in sixth, seventh, or eighth grade by any member of the instructional staff and is designed to help students become aware of the relationships that exist between education and career achievement as outlined in s. 1003.4156, F.S. Students are introduced to educational alternatives and course options as they prepare for the transition to high school. The career and education planning course must do the: result in a completed personalized academic and career plan for the student; and emphasize technology or the application of technology in career fields.

Counseling services to students in the proposed project population will be enhanced by the increased strengthening of the workforce. Building capacity and collaboration of all student services professionals at iPrep Math schools is a recognized need in ensuring that all students in the general population and areas of special needs are serviced in academic, personal/social, college/career awareness, and health/wellness development. An increased focus of academic and career planning at the proposed

iPrep Math schools is threefold: to help students acquire the skills to achieve academic success, to make connections between school and life experiences and to acquire knowledge and skills to be college- and career-ready upon high school graduation. Building capacity and collaboration of all student services professionals will serve to ensure the delivery of comprehensive, data-informed, student-centered school counseling program, that: adheres to local, state, and national standards; meets the needs of all students in the general and special needs population; and is delivered by certified, state-credentialed professionals. Teaming and collaboration strategies will be a key component. For accountability purposes, the counseling professionals will collect and analyze data in all areas of counseling services, programs, and activities to evaluate the effectiveness and outcomes of the services provided. The use of a program audit as recommended by ASCA, self-assessments, reflection statements, and a Counseling Management Agreement to be signed and agreed upon by the student services professionals, administrator, and a parent will ensure that a Comprehensive Student Services Program is successful; student-centered, designed to understand cultural diversity, and supports maximum development of student potential.

Research indicates that it is critical for school counselors to deliver results-based accountability school counseling programs which carefully consider the demographic needs and socio-economic climate of the community, (*Stone, Carolyn and Dahir, Carol A., School Counselor Accountability: A MEASURE of Student Success, 2004*). Early adolescents are in a particularly difficult state of development. As stated by the National Middle School Association, this complicated period of transition has often been associated with a decline in academic achievement, performance motivation, and self-perceptions. It is a time when young adolescents are most likely to experiment with at-risk behaviors. It is also the point at which children begin to make pivotal decisions regarding their academic and career choices -- precisely at a time when they may be distracted or turned off by academic endeavors. If these difficulties and stresses are addressed in a preventative manner this can improve, not only the student's ability to perform in school, but also their interpersonal relationships with peers, parents and teachers, and can also positively impact their sense of self-worth and self-efficacy (Akos, 2005; Hiebert et al., 1998; Kesici, 2007). Additionally, according to Moore-Thomas and Lent (2007), "adolescents' developmental needs mandate uniquely designed comprehensive,

developmental and systemic school counseling programs and services."

(6) Performance measures and desired results: The key performance measures identified and described in the table in Section XI focus on three core issues. Measures 1, 2, and 3 address removing potential barriers to attendance and engagement in school, ranging from immunization compliance to unmet social/emotional or family needs. Measure 4 addresses parental involvement and empowerment, with the desired second-level outcome of having students make effective and informed decisions about their high school course selection and preparation for post-secondary education or careers. Measure 5 addresses academic progression through middle school, including acceleration options, with the derided second-level effects of decreasing the dropout rate and increasing positive graduation outcomes.

Activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. Detailed information regarding the activities, deliverables, timelines, responsible parties, alignment with the applicable Absolute Priorities and the RTTT assurance areas, for the implementation of **iPrep Math** are provided, for each project goal, by fiscal year, in **Attachment 2: *iPrep Math Comprehensive Management Plan*.**

X. COMPETITIVE PREFERENCE PRIORITY

Competitive Preference Priority: Population-Level Desired Results

	Population Group	Type of Result (e.g., educational or family and community)	Desired Results	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
1	7th grade students	Family and Community	Through effective home-school communication regarding immunization requirements and available community resources, increase the percent of students meeting the 7th grade immunization requirement **as measured by the MDCPS Immunization report.** *Rationale: Failure to obtain appropriate immunizations may result in a student being excluded from school.*	Baseline Year	Baseline + 5%	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 15%	100%
2	6-8th gr. students	Educational, Family, and Community	All students will have access to responsive services including internal and external referral procedures, short-term counseling or crisis intervention focused on mental health or situational (e.g. grief, difficult transitions) concerns with the intent of removing barriers to learning and promoting effective coping skills**, as measured by a reduction in indoor and outdoor suspensions.** *Rationale: Provision of timely and responsive support services to students will enable them to demonstrate more effective coping skills and reduce the frequency and severity of inappropriate behaviors that would lead to disciplinary actions, such as suspensions, and enable students to be in attendance at school.*	Baseline Year	Baseline – 10%	Baseline – 20%	Baseline – 30%	Baseline – 40%
3	6-8th gr. students	Educational, Family, and Community	Students and their families will receive appropriate school-based support and referrals to community-based services, as necessary, to remove barriers to student attendance**, as measured by increases in the average daily attendance rates.** (Note: current attendance rates hover in the 90%+ range. Therefore, the projected target increases, although apparently small, do represent significant student hours of increased	Baseline Year	Baseline + 1%	Baseline + 2%	Baseline + 3%	Baseline + 4%

	Population Group	Type of Result (e.g., educational or family and community)	Desired Results	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
			classroom attendance.) *Rationale: When students and their families lack needed support services, students encounter significant barriers to school attendance, such as, for example, missing school to babysit siblings or care for a sick family member, working to help the family economically, or experiencing unattended health issues.*					
4	6-8th gr. Students	Family	Effective home/school communication will keep parents informed, and help them become skilled in dealing with issues related to transition between school levels (e.g., middle school to high school) **as measured by increased parent attendance at parent workshops and school meetings and by increases in parent use of the district's web-based parent portal.** *Rationale: In order to support their children through the transition into high school and help them develop and implement a plan for their post-secondary education and career, parents need access to appropriate information regarding academic choice options, and available services and resources.*	Baseline Year	Baseline + 10%	Baseline + 20%	Baseline + 30%	Baseline + 40%

	Population Group	Type of Result (e.g., educational or family and community)	Desired Results	SY 2012-13	SY 2013-14	SY 2014-15	SY 2015-16	SY 2016-17 (Post-Grant)
5	6-8th gr. Students	Educational	Through provision of appropriate academic advisement and support, including acceleration options, throughout the middle school grades, the number of overage middle students will be reduced **as measured by a decrease of students who are over-age-for-grade when they enter high school at grade 9.** *Rationale: Students who are significantly behind their age peers in academic grade level are at greater risk of dropping out of school rather than graduating, with potential life-long consequences.*	Baseline Year	Baseline – 10%	Baseline – 20%	Baseline – 30%	Baseline – 40%

XI. BUDGET

BUDGET SUBPART 1: OVERALL BUDGET SUMMARY

Budget Table 1-1: Overall Budget Summary Table
Evidence for: (F)(1)

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$1,342,404.50	$2,160,286.00	$2,116,186.00	$2,494,837.50	$8,113,714.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$236,421.00	$384,386.00	$380,053.00	$436,946.00	$1,437,806.00
3. Travel	$7,500.00	$30,000.00	$30,000.00	$30,000.00	$97,500.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$4,728,007.00	$71,350.00	$71,350.00	$75,159.00	$4,945,866.00
6. Contractual	$10,679,304.00	$1,260,100.00	$1,225,700.00	$1,150,100.00	$14,315,204.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	$16,993,636.50	$3,906,122.00	$3,823,289.00	$4,187,042.50	$28,910,090.00
10. Indirect Costs*	$640,660.00	$147,261.00	$144,138.00	$157,851.00	$1,089,910.00
11. Total Grant Funds Requested (lines 9-10)	$17,634,296.50	$4,053,383.00	$3,967,427.00	$4,344,893.50	$30,000,000.00
12. Funds from other sources used to support the project	$1,692,775.00	$7,428,622.00	$7,248,669.00	$9,371,378.00	$25,741,444.00
13. Total Budget (lines 11-12)	$19,327,071.50	$11,482,005.00	$11,216,096.00	$13,716,271.50	$55,741,444.00

BUDGET SUBPART 2: OVERALL BUDGET SUMMARY NARRATIVE

Note: See budget summary narrative and instructions above, in particular "Subpart 2: Overall Budget Summary Narrative."

The budget narrative that accompanies the Budget Summary Table should respond to Selection Criterion (F)(1) and be of sufficient scope and detail for the Department to determine whether the costs are necessary, reasonable, and allowable. This subpart should also include a summary of the projects that the applicant has included in its budget, including the project name, associated criteria, total grant funds requested, and total budget (see Budget Table 2-1).

M-DCPS is requesting $30 million in RTTT-D grant support over the four-year project. The budget is driven by the project design and input from District leadership, the grant development team and all stakeholders. Detail has been provided throughout Budget Subpart 2 as evidence that all costs are necessary and reasonable for the successful implementation of the project. The overall budget includes four project-level budgets: 1) Project Management, Evaluation and Stakeholder Engagement; 2) Renovation and Wireless; 3) Building Local Capacity; and 4) Student Access and Support. See Budget Table 2, below, for a list of each project and the corresponding primary/additional criteria.

In addition to RTTT-D grant support, the project will be supplemented with district funds for classroom teacher salaries and fringes, technical support, administrative support and oversight, in-county travel, facilities project management and maintenance. Other resources, such as Federal E-rate Funds, will be used for infrastructure and wireless technology for qualifying schools as funds become available. The Foundation for New Education Initiatives, Inc., a Direct Support organization for M-DCPS, aggressively pursues private and corporate funding for district-wide wireless initiative and innovative instructional programs.. M-DCPS is in the process of asking county voters to invest in their schools by approving the issuance of a $1.2 billion General Obligation (GO) Bond for renovating facilities, updating technology, building school replacements, expanding student capacity, and enhancing facility safety to remedy the inequity between the instructional experience of students attending newer schools and those in outdated buildings so that all students can take full advantage of current technology and digital learning environments. Detailed information is included in Table 4.

Budget Table 2-1: Overall Budget Summary Project List Evidence for: (F)(1)				
Project Name	**Primary Associated Criterion and location in application**	**Additional Associated Criteria and location in application**	**Total Grant Funds Requested**	**Total Budget**
Project Management, Evaluation, and Stakeholder Engagement	Criteria (A)(1),(2),(3),(4) (B)(2), (3), (4), (5) (C)(1),(2) (D)(1)(a)(b) (D)(2)(a)(b)(c)(d) (E)(1). (E)(2),(E)(3),(a-l), tables (E)(4) (F)	Competitive Preference Priority X Management Plan - Appendix 2	$1,193,249.00	$1,315,232.00
Renovation and Wireless	Criteria (A)(2) (B)(3)	Management Plan – Appendix 2	$11,463,524.00	$11,591,403.00
Building Local Capacity	Criteria (B)(1)(1)(c) (B)(2) (C)(1)(a)(i),(ii),(iii),(iv) (C)(2)(a)(i),(ii),(iii),(iv) (C)(2)(c)	Competitive Priority X Management Plan – Appendix 2	$5,252,385.00	$5,281,877.00
Student Access and Support	Criteria (A)(1),(2),(3) (B)(3),(5) (C) (D)(1) (F)(2)	Competitive Preference – Priority X Management Plan-Appendix 2	$12,090,842.00	$37,552,932.00
			$30,000,000.00	$55,741,444.00
			Total for Grant Funds	**Total Budget**

BUDGET SUBPART 3: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET SUMMARIES

Note: See budget summary narrative and instructions above, in particular "Subpart 3: Project-Level Budget Summary Tables."

Table 3-1 Project 1: Project-Level Budget Summary Table: Evidence for (F)(1)
Project Name: Project Management, Evaluation, and Stakeholder Engagement
Primary Associated Criterion(a) and Location in Application: Criteria A)(1),(2),(3), (4) pp 11-20; (B)(2),(3),(4),(5) pp 54-65; (C)(1),(2) pp 68-85; (D)(1)(a)(b) pp 87-90; D)(2)(a)(b)(c)(d) pp 92-94; (E)(1),(E)(2),(E)(3),(a-l) pp 97-103; tables (E)(4) pp 103-106; (F) pp -124-127;
Additional Associated Criteria (if any) and Location in Application: Competitive Preference Priority X pp 130-136**;** Management Plan, Appendix2

Budget Categories	**Project Year 1 (a)**	**Project Year 2 (b)**	**Project Year 3 (c)**	**Project Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$65,249.50	$85,666.00	$85,666.00	$106,082.50	$342,664.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$16,736.00	$22,106.00	$22,106.00	$27,477.00	$88,425.00
3. Travel	$4,500.00	$4,500.00	$4,500.00	$4,500.00	$18,000.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$12,000.00	$10,000.00	$10,000.00	$13,809.00	$45,809.00
6. Contractual	$175,000.00	$160,000.00	$160,000.00	$160,000.00	$655,000.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	$273,485.50	$282,272.00	$282,272.00	$311,868.50	$1,149,898.00
10. Indirect Costs*	$10,310.00	$10,642.00	$10,642.00	$11,757.00	$43,351.00
11. Total Grant Funds Requested (lines 9-10)	$283,795.50	$292,914.00	$292,914.00	$323,625.50	$1,193,249.00

12. Funds from other sources used to support the project	$20,281.00	$34,967.00	$34,967.00	$31,768.00	$121,983.00
13. Total Budget (lines 11-12)	$304,076.50	$327,881.00	$327,881.00	$355,393.50	$1,315,232.00

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-13.
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.
*If the applicant plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget part.

Table 3-1 Project 2: Project-Level Budget Summary Table: Evidence for (F)(1)
Project Name: Renovation and Wireless
Primary Associated Criterion and Location in Application: Criteria (A)(2) pp 12-18; (B)(3) pp 56-59
Additional Associated Criteria (if any) and Location in Application: Competitive Preference Priority X pp 130-136**;** Management Plan Appendix2

Budget Categories	**Project Year 1 (a)**	**Project Year 2 (b)**	**Project Year 3 (c)**	**Project Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$1,737,050.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$1,737,050.00
6. Contractual	$9,310,000.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$9,310,000.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	$11,047,050.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$11,047,050.00

10. Indirect Costs*	$416,474.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$416,474.00
11. Total Grant Funds Requested (lines 9-10)	$11,463,524.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$11,463,524.00
12. Funds from other sources used to support the project	$127,879.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$127,879.00
13. Total Budget (lines 11-12)	$11,591,403.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$11,591,403.00

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-13.
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.
*If the applicant plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget part.

Table 3-1 Project 3: Project-Level Budget Summary Table: Evidence for (F)(1)
Project Name: Building Local Capacity
Primary Associated Criterion and Location in Application: (B)(1)(1)(c) pp 52-53; (B)(2) pp 54-55;(C)(1)(a)(i),(ii),,(iii), (iv), pp 68-71; (C)(2)(a)(i),(ii),(iii), (iv), pp 78-81; (C)(2)(c) pp 84
Additional Associated Criteria (if any) and Location in Application: Competitive Preference Priority X pp 130-136; Management Plan Appendix 2,

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$985,275.00	$1,098,100.00	$1,054,000.00	$1,066,675.00	$4,204,050.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$161,022.00	$192,380.00	$188,047.00	$181,261.00	$722,710.00
3. Travel	$3,000.00	$25,500.00	$25,500.00	$25,500.00	$79,500.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$25,704.00	$5,000.00	$24,600.00	$0.00	$55,304.00

7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	$1,175,001.00	$1,320,980.00	$1,292,147.00	$1,273,436.00	$5,061,564.00
10. Indirect Costs*	$44,298.00	$49,801.00	$48,714.00	$48,008.00	$190,821.00
11. Total Grant Funds Requested (lines 9-10)	$1,219,299.00	$1,370,781.00	$1,340,861.00	$1,321,444.00	$5,252,385.00
12. Funds from other sources used to support the project	$7,373.00	$7,373.00	$7,373.00	$7,373.00	$29,492.00
13. Total Budget (lines 11-12)	$1,226,672.00	$1,378,154.00	$1,348,234.00	$1,328,817.00	$5,281,877.00

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-13.
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.
*If the applicant plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget part.

Table 3-1 Project 4: Project-Level Budget Summary Table: Evidence for (F)(1)
Project Name: Student Access and Support
Primary Associated Criterion and Location in Application: A)(1),(2), (3), pp 11-20; (B)(3) pp 56-59 (B)(5), pp 63-65;(C) pp 68-85; (D)(1) pp 87-92; (F)(2) pp 125-127
Additional Associated Criteria (if any) and Location in Application: Competitive Preference Priority X pp 130-136**;** Management Plan, Appendix 2

Budget Categories	**Project Year 1 (a)**	**Project Year 2 (b)**	**Project Year 3 (c)**	**Project Year 4 (d)**	**Total (e)**
1. Personnel	$291,880.00	$976,520.00	$976,520.00	$1,322,080.00	$3,567,000.00

2. Fringe Benefits	$58,663.00	$169,900.00	$169,900.00	$228,208.00	$626,671.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$2,978,957.00	$61,350.00	$61,350.00	$61,350.00	$3,163,007.00
6. Contractual	$1,168,600.00	$1,095,100.00	$1,041,100.00	$990,100.00	$4,294,900.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	$4,498,100.00	$2,302,870.00	$2,248,870.00	$2,601,738.00	$11,651,578.00
10. Indirect Costs*	$169,578.00	$86,818.00	$84,782.00	$98,086.00	$439,264.00
11. Total Grant Funds Requested (lines 9-10)	$4,667,678.00	$2,389,688.00	$2,333,652.00	$2,699,824.00	$12,090,842.00
12. Funds from other sources used to support the project	$1,537,242.00	$7,386,282.00	$7,206,329.00	$9,332,237.00	$25,462,090.00
13. Total Budget (lines 11-12)	$6,204,920.00	$9,775,970.00	$9,539,981.00	$12,032,061.00	$37,552,932.00

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-13.
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.
*If the applicant plans to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget part.

BUDGET SUBPART 4: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Management/Marketing/Evaluation. This budget supports the project management, marketing to schools and communities, parent and student outreach and recruitment, teacher and support staff recruitment, project evaluation and data management, and

implementation of continuous improvement processes. Ongoing operational expense.

Table 4-1-1: Project-Level Itemized Costs Project Management, Evaluation and Stakeholder Engagement		
Cost Description	**Cost Assumption (including whether the cost is one-time investment or ongoing operational cost)**	**Total**
1. Personnel: Explain the importance of each position to the success of the project and connections back to specific project plans. If curriculum vitae, an organizational chart, or other supporting information will be helpful to reviewers, attach in the Appendix and describe its location.		
• Project Director The Project Director will dedicate 100% time and effort to the responsibilities of this grant-funded position. Responsibilities include, but are not limited to, the following: managing all facets of grant implementation; serving as liaison with District offices that will support project activities including Facilities, Human Resources, Professional Development, Instructional Technology, Data and Assessment; supervising iPrep Math staff; supporting school site activities; coordinating stakeholder and advisory sessions; supervising the delivery of professional development; ensuring project activities are completed on a timely basis; working with outside evaluators to ensure ongoing continuous improvement; and submission of required reports. The individual filling this position will have, among other qualifications, a minimum of three years of experience with instructional technology reform initiatives and blended learning environments, grants and budget management skills, experience working with multi-faceted support teams (administrative,	• Salary of position: $81,666 (MEP Level 22) • Number of Employees: 1 • Amount of Time to be Expended: 100% Time & Effort • Ongoing operational cost	• Year 1- $61,249.50 • Year 2 - $81,666 • Year 3 - $81,666 • Year 4 - $102,082.50 = $326,664

professional and technical) to implement blended learning models; and leadership and stakeholder engagement experience.		
• Hourly Funds for the Office of Program Evaluation Funds included for hourly support from Office of Program Evaluation staff (housed in Assessment, Research and Data Analysis). Staff will work closely with external evaluators to provide data, create new reports required for program management and for student data export to other applications, in order to ensure that project goals and objectives are met. Calculated at average hourly salary of $35/hour for an estimated 100 hours/year.	• Salary of position: $25/hour • Number of Employees: 1-2 • Amount of Time to be Expended: Approximately 100 hours/year • Ongoing operational cost	• $2,500/year x 4 years = $10,000
• Hourly Funds for Website Development and Maintenance Funds included for hourly support from Informational Technology Services (ITS) to design and update a project-specific website that will be used to engage stakeholders and apprise the community of project activities and outcomes.	• Salary of position: $30/hour • Number of Employees: 1-2 • Amount of Time to be Expended: Approximately 50 hours/year • Ongoing operational cost	• $1,500/year x 4 years = $6,000
2. Fringe Benefits: Explain the nature and extent of fringe benefits to be received and by whom.		
Fringe benefits for: • Project Director • Hourly Program Evaluation Support Staff • Hourly Web Development Support Staff	• Fringe benefit percentages for all personnel in the project: 15.61% • Insurance cost per person: $8,732.00 • Ongoing operational cost	• Year 1 - $16,736 • Year 2 - $22,106 • Year 3 - $22,106 • Year 4 - $27,477 = $88,425
3. Travel: Explain the purpose of the travel, how it relates to project goals, and how it will contribute to project success.		
• Travel to required grantee meetings for Project Director and two other key staff as required by	• Ongoing operational cost	• 3 staff X $1500/year X 4

grantor		years = $18,000
4. Equipment Explain what equipment is needed and why it is needed to meet program goals. Consistent with SEA and LEA policy, equipment is defined as tangible, non-expendable, personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of $5,000 or more per unit.		
There is no capital equipment that exceeds the cost threshold.		
5. Supplies Explain what supplies are needed and why they are necessary to meet program goals. Consistent with LEA policy, supplies are defined as tangible personal property excluding equipment.		
• Laptop computers and software for Project Director and iPrep Math Facilitators (Year 1 expense only) will be used to monitor and support project implementation. Supplies and materials to support marketing/outreach/ information/recruitment. iPrep math is a choice program. In order to ensure that all stakeholders are able to make informed decisions about participation, project staff will conduct school-level presentations, parent and student outreach events, community meetings, and teacher recruitment and orientation sessions. Outreach and presentation materials may include informational handouts, flyers, brochures, electronic documentation.	• General office supplies, general technology supplies • Ongoing operational cost	• Year 1- $12,000 • Year 2 - $10,000 • Year 3 - $10,000 • Year 4 - $13,809 = $45,809
6. Contractual Explain what goods/services will be acquired, and the purpose and relation to the project for each expected procurement. **NOTE:** Because grantees must use appropriate procurement procedures to select contractors, applicants do not need to include information in their applications about specific contractors that may be used to provide services or goods for the proposed project if a grant is awarded.		
• Contract for external program evaluator. In order to monitor project implementation and impact and provide regular formative feedback for continuous improvement, and refinement of the iPrep math project, the district will contract with an external program evaluator selected from	• Ongoing operational cost	• $150,000/year x 4 years = $600,000

the approved list of respondents to the district's RFP -026-MM10 July 18, 2012. Employing and external evaluator to conduct site visits, focus groups, interviews and surveys is expected to generate feedback regarding project implementation, training, and support to schools and classrooms from project staff that is more frank and detailed, and richer in information to guide continuous improvement than would be the case for information garnered by project staff alone. All contracts will be awarded pursuant to district procurement policies and procedures and the procedures for procurement under 34CFR Parts 74.40 – 74.48 and Part 80.36.		
• Contract with a media resource provider to create promotional/informational video materials. In order to provide access and fidelity of message throughout outreach, marketing, and recruitment efforts, promotional video materials will be developed. These will be used in presentations, posted on the iPrep Math website, and distributed electronically in order to reach the broadest possible audience. All contracts will be awarded pursuant to district procurement policies and procedures and the procedures for procurement under 34CFR Parts 74.40 – 74.48 and Part 80.36.	• One-time cost	• $15,000
• Contract for programmer to develop export report and protocol to ensure that students can export their data in a format that will allow data use in outside applications as needed. All contracts will be awarded pursuant to district procurement policies and procedures and the procedures for procurement under 34CFR Parts 74.40 – 74.48 and Part 80.36.	• Ongoing operational cost	• 4 years x $10,000/year = $40,000
7. Training Stipends Explain what training is needed, and the purpose and relation to the project. **NOTE:** The training stipend line item only pertains to costs associated with long-term training programs and college or university		

coursework, not workshops or short-term training supported by this program. Salary stipends paid to teachers and other school personnel for participating in short-term professional development should be reported in Personnel (line 1).		
• N/A	• N/A	• $0.00
8. Other Explain other expenditures that may exist and are not covered by other categories.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $0.00
9. Total Direct Costs: Sum lines 1-8.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $1,149,898.00
10. Total Indirect Costs Identify and apply the indirect cost rate.		
• Indirect cost rate as approved by FLDOE	• 3.77%	• $43,351.00
11. Total Grant Funds Requested Sum lines 9-10.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $1,193,249.00
12. Funds from other sources used to support the project Identifies all non-grant funds that will support the project (e.g., external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds)		
• Salaries and fringe benefits for district personnel who will oversee project management and implementation. Also includes in-county mileage.	• LEA, other Federal funds	• $121,983.00
13. Total Budget Sum lines 11-12.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $1,315,232.00

Table 4-1-2: Project-Level Itemized Costs Renovation/Wireless		
Cost Description	**Cost Assumption (including whether the cost is one-time investment or ongoing operational cost)**	**Total**
1. Personnel:		

Explain the importance of each position to the success of the project and connections back to specific project plans. If curriculum vitae, an organizational chart, or other supporting information will be helpful to reviewers, attach in the Appendix and describe its location.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $0.00
2. Fringe Benefits: Explain the nature and extent of fringe benefits to be received and by whom.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $0.00
3. Travel: Explain the purpose of the travel, how it relates to project goals, and how it will contribute to project success.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $0.00
4. Equipment Explain what equipment is needed and why it is needed to meet program goals. Consistent with SEA and LEA policy, equipment is defined as tangible, non-expendable, personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of $5,000 or more per unit.		
• There is no capital equipment that exceeds the cost threshold		
5. Supplies Explain what supplies are needed and why they are necessary to meet program goals. Consistent with LEA policy, supplies are defined as tangible personal property excluding equipment.		
• Ultra short-throw projection system needed to facilitate large-group instruction and student project demonstration and share-out	• One-time cost	• $1,100 each X 2 per classroom X 49 classrooms = $107,800
• Interactive whiteboard system, wall mounted, two per iPrep Math classroom to facilitate instruction	• One-time cost	• $2,100 each X 2 per classroom X 49 classrooms = $205,800
• External TV tuner, 2 per classroom to support instruction	• One-time cost	• $200 each X2 per classroom X 49 classrooms = $19,600
• Classroom sound system. Each iPrep Math lab will be equipped with a state of the art sound system to facilitate	• One-time cost	• $1,250 each classroom X 49

instruction in a large (2000 square foot) 60-student classroom with activities taking place simultaneously at different stations.		classrooms = $61,250
• Television, 1 per classroom, wall mounted, to support instruction.	• One-time cost	• $1,200 each X 1 per classroom X 49 classrooms = $58,800
• Desk computer, 2 per classroom for use by the two (2) full-time and one (1) part-time teacher for instructional planning and for secure access to student grade and testing information.	• One-time cost	• $600 each X 2 per classroom X 49 classrooms = $58,800
• Equipment for wireless network (cabling, routers, modems, etc.) for instruction and student access through the classroom laptop computers. Delivery of the computer-facilitated components of the blended-learning model will be through the use of student laptops.	• One-time cost	• $25,000 each school X 49 schools = $1,225,000
6. Contractual Explain what goods/services will be acquired, and the purpose and relation to the project for each expected procurement. **NOTE:** Because grantees must use appropriate procurement procedures to select contractors, applicants do not need to include information in their applications about specific contractors that may be used to provide services or goods for the proposed project if a grant is awarded.		
• Contractual services for classroom conversions and infrastructure installation. Each iPrep Math lab will be retrofitted into an existing middle school facility through conversion of multiple small classrooms into a single, flexible, user-configurable learning lab. These approximately 2000-square foot spaces will accommodate 60 students under the supervision and direction of three (3) teachers. Conversion will require removal of internal walls, construction, wiring, and installation of furniture, fixtures, and equipment to create a	• One-time cost	• 49 iPrep Math learning centers @ $190,000 per school X 49 schools = $9,310,000

21st century learning space. Contract awards will begin immediately upon notification of grant award to ensure that all 49 iPrep Math learning centers are in place and ready for students for the start of the 2013-2014 school year. All contracts will be awarded pursuant to district procurement policies and procedures and the procedures for procurement under 34CFR Parts 74.40 – 74.48 and Part 80.36.		
7. Training Stipends Explain what training is needed, and the purpose and relation to the project. **NOTE:** The training stipend line item only pertains to costs associated with long-term training programs and college or university coursework, not workshops or short-term training supported by this program. Salary stipends paid to teachers and other school personnel for participating in short-term professional development should be reported in Personnel (line 1).		
• N/A	• N/A	• $0.00
8. Other Explain other expenditures that may exist and are not covered by other categories.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $0.00
9. Total Direct Costs: Sum lines 1-8.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $11,047,050.00
10. Total Indirect Costs Identify and apply the indirect cost rate.		
• Indirect cost rate as approved by FLDOE	• 3.77%	• $416,474.00
11. Total Grant Funds Requested Sum lines 9-10.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $11,463,524.00
12. Funds from other sources used to support the project Identifies all non-grant funds that will support the project (e.g., external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds)		
• Salaries and fringe benefits for district personnel assigned to supervise and coordinate renovations.	• LEA	• $127,879.00
13. Total Budget Sum lines 11-12.		

• N/A	• N/A	• $11,591,403.00

Table 4-1-3: Project-Level Itemized Costs Building Local Capacity		
Cost Description	**Cost Assumption (including whether the cost is one-time investment or ongoing operational cost)**	**Total**
1. Personnel: Explain the importance of each position to the success of the project and connections back to specific project plans. If curriculum vitae, an organizational chart, or other supporting information will be helpful to reviewers, attach in the Appendix and describe its location.		
• iPrep Math Facilitators • Four (4) iPrep Math Facilitators who are content experts in mathematics will be hired to support the initial implementation in years 1,2 and 3, provide the intensive "front-load" training needed to jump start the	• Salary of position: $60,000 • Number of Employees: 4 in Years 1 -3; 2 in Year 4 • Amount of Time to be Expended: 100% Time & Effort • Ongoing operational cost	• Year 1- $202,500 • Year 2 - $270,000 • Year 3 - $270,000 • Year 4 - $168,750 = $911,250

implementation; and provide mentoring and support to school-level teams. As the project implementation matures, it is anticipated that two of the (2) iPrep Math Facilitators will remain on the project team in year 4, along with the project director, to provide ongoing training and support to school sites to facilitate dissemination of best practices and expansion of the iPrep Math model.		
• 6th Period Supplement Participating iPrep Math classroom teachers will be given an extra planning period. This will allow time for regular and ongoing data analysis, planning, reflection, and adjustment of plans based on all of these. Teachers will also be paid an extra teaching period supplement. The rationale behind this is as follows. Most of the best teachers at secondary schools teach an additional period for additional compensation. Teacher compensation is low for district teachers in their first ten years of teaching. There is significant risk that the most qualified and enthusiastic teachers who would be best suited to implement iPrep Math would opt against participation solely because they cannot afford to give up an extra teaching period supplement. This model will require a substantial level of commitment and effort in the development, implementation, and refinement of the model that needs to be reflected in the teacher compensation and the structure of the workday. These teachers will be helping to create a model that will improve middle school mathematics instruction throughout the district in subsequent years.	Ongoing operational cost	$6,650 year X 4 years X 98 teachers = $2,606,800
• Stipends for iPrep Math teachers to participate in: "front load' training and ongoing staff development in the summers and outside of regular contractual work time. Implementation of a radically new model of teaching and learning, such as the iPrep Math requires significant	Ongoing operational cost, reduced each year	Year 1: 98 teachers X 25 days X $100 = $245,000 Year 2: 98 teachers

investment in staff development. In order to minimize the impact on students and protect vital teaching and learning time, this professional development will take place outside of the contractual work schedule. In compliance with the teacher contract negotiated with the teachers' union, this requires payment of a stipend.		X15 days X $100 = $147,000 Year 3: 98 teachers X 10 days X $100+ $98,000 Year 4: 98 teachers X 5 days X $100 = $49,000 4Year total: $539,000
• Student services personnel professional development stipends. In order to ensure that students receive the wrap-around services needed to support their success, and that student services program delivery across all middle schools is in alignment with current research, best practices, and national standards, student services support team members from each middle school will participate in relevant professional development. In order to minimize the impact on students and protect vital student contact time, this professional development will take place outside of the contractual work schedule. In compliance with the teacher contract negotiated with the teachers' union, this requires payment of a stipend.	Ongoing operational cost	Year 1: 49 schools X 2 staff X 5 days X $100/day +$49,000 Year 2: 49 schools X 2 staff X 3 days X $100 = $29,400 Year 3: 49 schools X 2 staff X 2 days X $100 = $19,600 Year 49 schools X 2 staff X 2 days X $100 = $19,600 4 Year Total: 117,600
• Substitutes. In years 3 and 4, as the project matures, teachers in iPrep math schools will be provided with release time form their classroom duties to observe and work with the veteran iPrep Math teachers in order to disseminate best practices and lessons learned, and foster the implementation of personalized blended-learning strategies throughout the	Ongoing operational cost for years 3 and 4 only	49 schools X 3 days X $100/day = $14,700 X 2 years (3 and 4) = $29,400

school and change the culture of middle school instructions. Release time will be provided through the use of substitute teachers who will rotate through classrooms in order to allow multiple teachers to participate and engage in the iPrep Math classrooms.		
2. Fringe Benefits: Explain the nature and extent of fringe benefits to be received and by whom.		
Fringe benefits for: • iPrep Math Facilitators • 6th Period Supplement • PD Stipends for iPrep Math teachers • iPrep Math Facilitators • Substitutes	• Fringe benefit percentages for all personnel in the project: 15.61% • Insurance cost per person: $8,732.00 • Ongoing operational cost	• Year 1 - $161,022 • Year 2 - $192,380 • Year 3 - $188,047 • Year 4 - $181,261 =$722,710
3. Travel: Explain the purpose of the travel, how it relates to project goals, and how it will contribute to project success.		
• Travel to state and national conferences on mathematics instruction, blended learning, and instructional technology for Project Director, iPrep Math Facilitators, and selected iPrep Math teaches each year to support instruction and learn and disseminate best practices and current research, and, in the more mature stages of the project, share best practices and lessons learned.	Ongoing operational costs for years 2, 3, & 4	• 15 staff/year X 3 years X $1500/year = $67,500
• Travel to student services conferences for iPrep Math Student Services Support Staff and selected student services staff supporting iPrep Math schools, 3 participants per year to learn and disseminate best practices and current research, and, in the more mature stages of the project, share best practices and lessons learned.	Ongoing operational cost	• 3 staff/year X 4 years X $1000/year =$12,000
4. Equipment		

Explain what equipment is needed and why it is needed to meet program goals. Consistent with SEA and LEA policy, equipment is defined as tangible, non-expendable, personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of $5,000 or more per unit.		
There is no capital equipment that exceeds the cost threshold		
5. Supplies Explain what supplies are needed and why they are necessary to meet program goals. Consistent with LEA policy, supplies are defined as tangible personal property excluding equipment.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $0.00
6. Contractual Explain what goods/services will be acquired, and the purpose and relation to the project for each expected procurement. **NOTE:** Because grantees must use appropriate procurement procedures to select contractors, applicants do not need to include information in their applications about specific contractors that may be used to provide services or goods for the proposed project if a grant is awarded.		
• Contract with National Association of School Psychologist s for consultant to deliver PREPARE program to train school-site student services staff in research-based current best practices. All contracts will be awarded pursuant to district procurement policies and procedures and the procedures for procurement under 34CFR Parts 74.40 – 74.48 and Part 80.36.	• One-time cost	• Year 1 4 days X$1500/day = $6,000
• PREPARE training participant costs. All contracts will be awarded pursuant to district procurement policies and procedures and the procedures for procurement under 34CFR Parts 74.40 – 74.48 and Part 80.36.	• One-time cost	• $48/participant X98 participants =$4,704
• Contract for ASCD Model Professional development for school-site student services support tams to develop and deliver research-based, data-informed student services support programs to meet the needs of the whole child The training model selected is the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) training, as best aligned with the needs and	• Ongoing operational costs, years 1, 2, & 3	• $5,000/day X 3 days in year ($15,000) 1 + 1 day in year 2 ($5,000) + 1 day in year 3

priorities of both M-DCPS and the iPrep Math initiative in supporting the academic, social, and emotional development of the whole child. ASCA training is high-quality, research-based and aligned with current standards and practices for quality school counseling programs. .All contracts will be awarded pursuant to district procurement policies and procedures and the procedures for procurement under 34CFR Parts 74.40 – 74.48 and Part 80.36.		($5,000) = $25,000
• RAMP School Model Application and Recognized ASCA Model Program (RAMP): Putting It All Together recognition process for school student services program. Schools will go through this quality review in year 3. All contracts will be awarded pursuant to district procurement policies and procedures and the procedures for procurement under 34CFR Parts 74.40 – 74.48 and Part 80.36.	• One-time cost	• $400/school X 49 schools = $19,600
7. Training Stipends Explain what training is needed, and the purpose and relation to the project. **NOTE:** The training stipend line item only pertains to costs associated with long-term training programs and college or university coursework, not workshops or short-term training supported by this program. Salary stipends paid to teachers and other school personnel for participating in short-term professional development should be reported in Personnel (line 1).		
• N/A	• N/A	• $0.00
8. Other Explain other expenditures that may exist and are not covered by other categories.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $0.00
9. Total Direct Costs: Sum lines 1-8.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $5,061,564.00
10. Total Indirect Costs Identify and apply the indirect cost rate.		
• Indirect cost rate as approved by FLDOE	• 3.77%	• $190,821.00
11. Total Grant Funds Requested Sum lines 9-10.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $5,252,385.00

12. Funds from other sources used to support the project Identifies all non-grant funds that will support the project (e.g., external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds)		
• Salaries and fringe benefits for district personnel who will oversee professional development.	• Federal funds	• $29,492.00
13. Total Budget Sum lines 11-12.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $5,281,877.00

Table 4-1-4: Project-Level Itemized Costs Student Access and Support		
Cost Description	**Cost Assumption (including whether the cost is one-time investment or ongoing operational cost)**	**Total**
1. Personnel: Explain the importance of each position to the success of the project and connections back to specific project plans. If curriculum vitae, an organizational chart, or other supporting information will be helpful to reviewers, attach in the Appendix and describe its location.		
• Hourly Teachers In order to ensure that class-size requirements are met, and that the flexibility of the model is maintained and students have access to teacher support as they need it, a third, hourly, teacher will be hired to work in each iPrep Math classroom. Meet the week before school starts - 3 days - with iPrep Math Facilitators in order to ensure that all teachers are well-versed in the iPrep Math model. The hourly teachers will participate in 3 days of orientation with the iPrep Math faculty before starting schools and meet for 2 days with FT Teacher Partners about their role and support and plan for implementation specific to school site.	• Calculated at $23/hour – 20hrs a week	• Year 1 – 8 weeks $157,780 • Year 2 – 38 weeks $270,000 • Year 3 – 38 weeks $270,000 • Year 4 – 52 weeks $168,750 =$911,250

• iPrep Math Student Services Support Specialists In order to support the district-wide implementation of iPrep Math, two (2) student services professionals (counselors/social workers/psychologists) will be hired, beginning the first year of the project. These student services professionals will: work with feeder pattern elementary schools and senior high schools for articulation and coordination to ensure continuity of the educational program for each iPrep Math student; conduct outreach, recruitment, and orientation; provide ongoing support to the school-site student services staff; liaise with community agencies and services; and facilitate access to wrap-around support services for students in iPrep Math	• Salary of position: $60,000 • Number of Employees: 2 Years 1 – 4 • Amount of Time to be Expended: 100% Time & Effort • Ongoing operational cost	• Year 1- $90,000 • Year 2 - $120,000 • Year 3 - $120,000 • Year 4 - $150,000 =$480,000
• Overtime – Network Infrastructure Support Technicians	• Calculated at $30/hour – 30hrs per school (49)	• Year 1 – $44,100
2. Fringe Benefits: Explain the nature and extent of fringe benefits to be received and by whom.		
Fringe benefits for: • iPrep Math Student Services Support Specialist • Hourly Teachers • Network Infrastructure Support Technicians – Overtime hours included for Year 1 to ensure classrooms are operational on day one and to provide intensive support during first year of project implementation. • Substitutes	• Fringe benefit percentages for all personnel in the project: 15.61% • Insurance cost per person: $8,732.00 • Ongoing operational cost	• Year 1 - $58,663 • Year 2 - $169,900 • Year 3 - $169,900 • Year 4 - $228,208 =$626,671
3. Travel: Explain the purpose of the travel, how it relates to project goals, and how it will contribute to project success.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $0.00
4. Equipment Explain what equipment is needed and why it is needed to meet program goals. Consistent with SEA and LEA policy, equipment is		

defined as tangible, non-expendable, personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of $5,000 or more per unit.		
There is no capital equipment that exceeds the cost threshold		
5. Supplies Explain what supplies are needed and why they are necessary to meet program goals. Consistent with LEA policy, supplies are defined as tangible personal property excluding equipment.		
• Laptops for classroom use. Students in iPrep Math will use laptop computers to access the computer-based components of the blended-learning model, to conduct research, work on projects, access resources through the World Wide Web, develop presentations and demonstrations, participate in assessments, and complete assignments. The iPrep Math lab setting is highly configurable and adaptable to the needs of the teaching and learning experiences taking place at any given time. Laptops were selected over desktop computers in order to preserve that flexibility and provide the opportunity for out-of the classroom use. Each classroom setup requires a minimum of 60 laptops for in-classroom use.	• 60 Laptops @ 49 iPrep Math Learning Centers ($580.00)	• $1,705,200
• Laptops for student checkout. In order to ensure equity of educational access for participating students, a number of additional laptop computers (30 per classroom) will be available for students to take home overnight if they do not have a computer available to them at home.	• 30 Laptops * 49 iPrep Math Learning Centers ($580.00)	• $852,600
• Laptops for Classroom Teachers and Part-time Teachers to facilitate flexibility and planning in the classroom and from other locations.	• 98 Teachers and 49 Hourly Teachers ($580.00)	• $85,260
• Laptop charging carts. Each school site will require three (3) charging carts for recharging the laptop computers. These will be located in strategic spots in the iPrep Math classrooms.	• 3 per school * 49 iPrep Math Learning Centers ($1,700)	• $249,900
• Printer: Each iPrep Math lab will have a printer for teacher and student use, to support 240 students and three (3)	• 1 printer @ 49 iPrep Math Learning Centers ($500.00)	• $24,500

teachers in printing needed instructional materials and student-authored work.		
• Supplies: paper, toner, projector bulbs, electronic media (flash drives, CDs DVD, etc) to support instruction and student work.	• $1,150 49 per iPrep Math Learning Centers x 4 years	• $225,400
• Supplies for the iPrep Math Student Services Support Staff to facilitate community outreach, development of community partnerships and resources, and provision of support services to students, families, and school staff.	• General office and technology supplies • Ongoing operational cost	• Year 1- $5,147 • Year 2 - $5,000 • Year 3 - $5,000 • Year 4 - $5,000 = $20,147
6. Contractual Explain what goods/services will be acquired, and the purpose and relation to the project for each expected procurement. **NOTE:** Because grantees must use appropriate procurement procedures to select contractors, applicants do not need to include information in their applications about specific contractors that may be used to provide services or goods for the proposed project if a grant is awarded.		
• Contract for instructional resources from (b)(4) This will support personalized mathematics instruction for each participating student through (b)(4) and (b)(4) tutor. This software will be used to provide student with a rich, research-based resource of instructional materials and assessments that will support personalization of the learning environment by allowing each student to track his/her progress, and access remedial or accelerated content as needed to support his/her individual learning plan. All contracts will be awarded pursuant to district procurement policies and procedures and the procedures for procurement under 34CFR Parts 74.40 – 74.48 and Part 80.36.	• Ongoing operational cost	• Year 1- $866,300 • Year 2 - $842,800 • Year 3 - $838,800 • Year 4 - $837,800 = $3,385,700
• Instructional materials (reflex) These materials will support the personalization of instruction through technology. All contracts will be awarded pursuant to district procurement policies and procedures and the procedures for procurement under 34CFR Parts 74.40 – 74.48 and Part 80.36.	• Ongoing operational cost	• Year 1 - $152,300 • Year 2 - $152,300 • Year 3 - $152,300 • Year 4 - $152,300 = $609,200

• Algebra Content Development. Contract with an institution or institutions of higher education to provide professional development to deepen the content knowledge of secondary mathematics teachers, particularly in the instruction of algebra and content leading to algebra readiness. All contracts will be awarded pursuant to district procurement policies and procedures and the procedures for procurement under 34CFR Parts 74.40 – 74.48 and Part 80.36.	• Ongoing operational costs for years 1, 2, & 3	• Year 1 - $150,000 • Year 2 - $100,000 • Year 3 - $50,000 = $300,000
7. Training Stipends Explain what training is needed, and the purpose and relation to the project. **NOTE:** The training stipend line item only pertains to costs associated with long-term training programs and college or university coursework, not workshops or short-term training supported by this program. Salary stipends paid to teachers and other school personnel for participating in short-term professional development should be reported in Personnel (line 1).		
N/A	•	• $0.00
8. Other Explain other expenditures that may exist and are not covered by other categories.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $0.00
9. Total Direct Costs: Sum lines 1-8.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $11,651,578.00
10. Total Indirect Costs Identify and apply the indirect cost rate.		
• Indirect cost rate as approved by FLDOE	• 3.77%	• $439,264.00
11. Total Grant Funds Requested Sum lines 9-10.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $12,090,842.00
12. Funds from other sources used to support the project Identifies all non-grant funds that will support the project (e.g., external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds)		
• Salaries and benefits for Network Infrastructure Support Technicians who will provide technology support at each school site. Also includes salaries and fringe benefits for 98 iPrep Math teachers in 49 participating schools.	• LEA	• $25,462,090.00

•		
13. Total Budget Sum lines 11-12.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $37,552,932.00

BUDGET: INDIRECT COST INFORMATION

To request reimbursement for indirect costs, please answer the following questions:

1. Does the applicant have an Indirect Cost Rate approved by its State Educational Agency?

YES [X] NO [ ]

If yes to question 1, please provide the following information:

Period Covered by the approved Indirect Cost Rate (mm/dd/yyyy):

From: 07/01/2012 To: 06/30/2013

Current approved Indirect Cost Rate: 3.77%

Approving State agency: Florida Department of Education
(Please specify agency)

Directions for this form:

1. Indicate whether or not the applicant has an Indirect Cost Rate that was approved by its State Educational Agency.
2. If "No" is checked, the applicant should contact the business office of its State Educational Agency.
3. If "Yes" is checked, indicate the beginning and ending dates covered by the approved Indirect Cost Rate. In addition, indicate the name of the State agency that approved the approved rate.
4. If "Yes" is checked, the applicant should include a copy of the Indirect Cost Rate agreement in the Appendix.

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

iPrep Math

M-DCPS In-Kind Match Budget Details	Project Year				
	Year 1 12/21/12 - 9/30/13	Year 2 10/1/13 - 9/30/14	Year 3 10/1/14 - 9/30/15	Year 4 10/1/15 - 12/20/16	Total
1. Personnel					
Administrative Director (5% Time & Effort; Base Salary: $116,993)	5,850	5,850	5,850	5,850	23,399
The **Administrative Director for the Division of Instructional Technology, Instructional Materials, and Library Media Services** will serve as the M-DCPS administrator in charge of the iPrep Math project. This individual has been an instrumental part in the roll-out of the iPrep Academy high school model across the District. She served as a key member of the grant design team and will dedicate an estimated 10% time and effort on an in-kind basis. Responsibilities include but are not limited to: fiscal and implementation oversight, providing vision and leadership for the project; ensuring communication across all District departments and participating schools; and supervising the Project Director and other project staff.					
Administrative Director (5% Time & Effort; Base Salary: $122,892)	6,145	6,145	6,145	6,145	24,578
The **Administrative Director of the Office of Professional Development** will dedicate 5% time and effort on an in-kind basis to the project. She will oversee all project activities related to professional development, including those that are designed to ensure that all participating educators engage in training and COPs that support their efforts for successful implementation of personalized learning environments. She also played a key role in the design and development of the proposed project.					
Assistant Superintendent (2% Time & Effort; Base Salary: $122,718)	2,454	2,454	2,454	2,454	9,817
The **Assistant Superintendent, School Choice, School Operations** was another key member of the grant development team. It is estimated that she will spend 2% of her time and effort over the next four years supporting project activities. All magnet schools and schools of choice programs fall under her supervision.					
District Director, Division of Student Services (5% Time & Effort; Base Salary: $114,335)	5,717	5,717	5,717	5,717	22,867

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

iPrep Math

M-DCPS In-Kind Match Budget Details	Project Year				
	Year 1 12/21/12 - 9/30/13	Year 2 10/1/13 - 9/30/14	Year 3 10/1/14 - 9/30/15	Year 4 10/1/15 - 12/20/16	Total
The **District Director, Division of Student Services**, will dedicate 5% time and effort to project implementation. She oversees the department that supports the social, emotional, and behavioral needs of the participating students. The Division of Student Services has developed partnerships with a multitude of private and public partners that support students and their families. In coordination with the Project Director, she will oversee the two iPrep Math Student Services Support Specialists who support the iPrep Math project.					
Administrative Director, Design and Sustainability (15% Time & Effort in Year 1; Base Salary: $117,464)	17,620	0	0	0	17,620
Early in the grant design stage, the **Administrative Director, Design and Sustainability** was brought in to discuss the feasibility of creating an iPrep Math space in all of the traditional middle schools. Many of the schools are more than 40 years old, with several over 50, so it was critical to include this office in the design discussions. Under his leadership, and based on models used around the district, his staff developed the three prototypes (see Attachment 1). This individual will oversee the staff that lead the renovation and wiring efforts at the 49 schools.					
Director I, Capital Construction (50% Time & Effort in Year 1; Base Salary: $106,626)	53,313	0	0	0	53,313
This individual reports to the Administrative Director, Design and Sustainability and will oversee M-DCPS staff, multiple contractors and architects who will complete the renovations at 49 schools (anticipated January through mid-August 2013). It is estimated that she will dedicate 50% of her time & effort during Year 1 on these efforts.					
Senior Project Managers (25% Time & Effort in Year 1; Average Base Salary: $71,315)	35,658	0	0	0	35,658

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

iPrep Math

M-DCPS In-Kind Match Budget Details	Project Year				
	Year 1 12/21/12 - 9/30/13	Year 2 10/1/13 - 9/30/14	Year 3 10/1/14 - 9/30/15	Year 4 10/1/15 - 12/20/16	Total
Under the supervision of Title, two district project managers will oversee the renovation and wireless efforts at the 49 schools in order to ensure that all 49 iPrep Math classrooms are ready for students on August 19, 2013. It is estimated that these two individuals will spend 25% of their time and effort in Year 1 supporting the project.					
Network Infrastructure Support Technicians (10% Time & Effort in Year 1; 25% Time & Effort in Year 2; 10% Time & Effort in Years 3 & 4; Average Base Salary: $40,000)	100,000	250,000	100,000	100,000	550,000
One **Network Infrastructure Support Technician** is assigned to every two middle schools in the district. These individuals are assigned to provide support for all technology functions in the building. It is anticipated that the 25 Network Infrastructure Support Technicians will provide intensive support during the last two months of Project Year 1 (August and September 2013), with continued intensive support from October 2013 through June 2014, or Year 2. Assistance in Years 3 & 4 are reduced to 10% each year.					
iPrep Math Teachers	1,033,332	5,166,658	5,166,658	6,716,655	18,083,303
M-DCPS will cover the salaries and fringe benefits of the the 98 iPrep Math full-time teachers who are essential to the delivery of the personalized blended learning model for students for the full grant period. The training provided through this grant will provide a lasting benefit to the schools and students by building the capacity of these critical professionals to reform instruction at the middle school. Salaries have been budgeted at an average 10 month salary of $52,721 per year for 3.5 years, or $18,083,303.					
Subtotal for Personnel	**1,260,087**	**5,436,823**	**5,286,823**	**6,836,821**	**18,820,555**
2. Fringe Benefits					
	196,700	848,688	825,273	1,067,228	2,937,889
Fund Retirement (5.26%), FICA/Medicare (7.65%) and Worker's Compensation and Unemployment (2.70%). (Group health insurance covered by District.)					

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

iPrep Math

M-DCPS In-Kind Match Budget Details	Project Year				
	Year 1 12/21/12 - 9/30/13	Year 2 10/1/13 - 9/30/14	Year 3 10/1/14 - 9/30/15	Year 4 10/1/15 - 12/20/16	Total
Group Health Insurance for iPrep Math Teachers: This is budgeted at $8,732 per employee x 98 teachers	171,147	855,736	855,736	1,112,457	2,995,076
Subtotal for Fringes	**367,847**	**1,704,424**	**1,681,009**	**2,179,685**	**5,932,965**
3. Travel					
In-County Travel	3,330	17,483	17,483	14,400	52,695
Budgeted at current approved rate of .555/mile. Travel for Project Director, iPrepMath Facilitators and Counselors to travel to 49 schools to conduct project activities, attend monthly meetings and professional develoment sessions. Estimated at 50 miles/wk x 40 wks x .555/mile for Project Director, or $1,110/yr; estimated at 125 miles/wk x .555 mile x 4 iPrep Facilitators and 2 Counselors ($3,330 in Year 1 (8 weeks) $17,482.50 in Year 2 & 3 (42 weeks); $14,400 (52 weeks). Amount reduced in Years 3 & 4 with reduction in staff ($8,800). Florida school districts are county line to county line. Miami-Dade County encompasses some 2,000 square miles within one single school district.					
Subtotal for Travel	**3,330**	**17,483**	**17,483**	**14,400**	**52,695**
4. Equipment					
Subtotal for Equipment	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
5. Supplies					
Subtotal for Supplies	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
6. Contractual					
Subtotal for Contractual	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
7. Other					
Subtotal for Other	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Total Direct	**1,631,264**	**7,158,730**	**6,985,315**	**9,030,905**	**24,806,214**
8. Indirect - 3.77% of all Direct Costs excluding equipment (as negotiated with cognizant agency, Florida Dept. of Education)	**61,499**	**269,884**	**263,346**	**340,465**	**935,194**
TOTAL COSTS	**1,692,762**	**7,428,614**	**7,248,661**	**9,371,370**	**25,741,408**

XI. OPTIONAL BUDGET SUPPLEMENT

An eligible applicant may apply for additional funding (beyond the applicable maximum level provided) up to a maximum of $2 million for each optional budget supplement to address a specific area that is supplemental to the plan for addressing Absolute Priority 1. The request for additional funding must be designed as a separate project that, if not funded, will not adversely affect the applicant's ability to implement its proposal and meet Absolute Priority 1. Applications for this funding will be judged on the extent to which the applicant has a clear, discrete, and innovative solution that can be replicated in schools across the Nation. In determining the extent to which the request for an optional budget supplement meets this standard, the Department will consider—

(1) The rationale for the specific area or population that the applicant will address (e.g., strategies to assess hard to measure skills and traits such as perseverance, critical thinking, and communication; strategies for increasing diversity across schools and LEAs and within schools and classrooms; data systems; predictive algorithms; content-tagging schemes; new curriculum and online supports for students re-entering school from the juvenile justice system; or a credit recovery program design to support English learners newly entering into secondary school and the quality and feasibility of the proposal for addressing that area);

(2) A high-quality plan for how the applicant would carry out activities that would be co-developed and implemented across two or more LEAs (either participating in the full Race to the Top – District application, or not participating in the full Race to the Top – District application); and

(3) The proposed budget (up to $2 million) for each budget supplement, and the extent to which the proposed budget will be adequate to support the development and implementation of activities that meet the requirements of this notice, including the reasonableness of the costs in relation to the objectives, design, and significance of the proposed project activities and the number of students to be served.

Note, an optional budget supplement may include a proposal to utilize, across two or more districts, robust measures of student status and growth that assess hard to measure skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving across multiple academic domains and enable evaluation of group and individual learning experiences. The Department believes that utilizing these measures will contribute to the continuous improvement of personalized learning experiences and the tools and resources that support their implementation.

In the text box below, the applicant should describe its current status in meeting the criteria and/or provide its high-quality plan for meeting the criteria.

The narrative or attachments should also include any supporting evidence the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers,

including at a minimum the evidence listed in the criterion (if any), and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the applicant's success in meeting the criterion. Evidence or attachments must be described in the narrative and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.

To provide a high-quality plan, the applicant should describe, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties (for further detail, see Scoring Instructions in Part XV or Appendix A in the NIA). The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the applicant believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.

Recommended maximum response length: Four pages per Optional Budget Supplement. Applicants may submit multiple Optional Budget Supplement proposals.

Executive Summary

M-DCPS proposes to implement a comprehensive Personal Pathway program for students in grades 6-12 to plan and navigate sustainable postsecondary & career transitions, as well as to improve health & wellness and self-efficacy. The program will empower M-DCPS parents, educators and counselors to track student progress through their plans, and will engage local postsecondary institutions and employers with a stake in cultivating a sustainable, local human capital pipeline. M-DCPS currently offers an innovative, web-based postsecondary & career planning web portal to all students in grades 9-12. Key functionality and resources include:

- Postsecondary & Career Exploration
- Interests, Skills & Values Assessments and Self-Learning Exercises (*Drives Automated Postsecondary & Career Recommendations*)
- Integrated Student-Level Data from the M-DCPS Student Information Systems to Inform Automated Postsecondary, Career and Scholarship Recommendations
- Financial Aid Resources and College Cost Calculators
- Guided Planning Interface (*Multi-Year Planning Structure Linking K12, Postsecondary and Career based on Skills & Aspirations, K12 Curriculum Plans, and Postsecondary Credential Alignment to Career Opportunities, etc.*)

M-DCPS proposes to use this budget supplement to expand its existing web portal to create a comprehensive Personal Pathway planning platform ("Platform") beginning in the middle school, adding specific components described below:

1. **Middle School:** Functionality and resources to engage middle school students, including age-appropriate postsecondary & career exploration.
2. **Health & Wellness and Self-Efficacy:** Functionality and resources to support improved health & wellness and self-efficacy as critical factors in a student's ability to successfully navigate from K12 to Postsecondary to Career (*Self-learning exercises based on Q&A and integrated heuristics; Frequent, brief "pulse" surveys to gather real-time data around health & wellness and self-efficacy indicators, etc.*).
3. **Data Dashboards & Early Warning Indicators:** Data dashboards for parents, educators and counselors to track student completion of critical planning activities associated with Pathway plans, as well as to contextualize Student-Level Data (*imported from M-DCPS student information systems*) and health & wellness/self-efficacy data (*aggregated through student completion of self-learning exercises and "pulse" surveys*).
4. **Postsecondary & Employer Engagement**: Functionality for postsecondary institutions and employers to mentor students through the Platform in a structured environment, oriented to successful postsecondary and career transitions (*i.e. Program & Scholarship Recommendations, Summer Learning/Dual Enrollment/Internship Opportunities, Event Invitations, etc.*)
5. **Data Warehouse**: Robust multi-source data aggregation and reporting to measure program efficacy based on both in-the-classroom indicators (*i.e. Student Performance Data*) and outside-the-classroom indicators (*i.e. Completion of Critical Postsecondary/Career Planning Activities*).

When implemented, the Platform will enable students to explore, define and navigate integrated, multi-year pathways to postsecondary education and employment, building a foundation of health & wellness and self-efficacy that will support them through the process. Importantly, the model is both scalable and repeatable, engaging students in a common, technology-enabled planning framework that adapts to unique interests, skills and socio-emotional needs. The Platform will also augment existing M-

DCPS programs that support student success:

iPrep Math: The Platform will provide a framework to ensure that students are best positioned to apply academic skills in the right postsecondary program and career. Additionally, Student Performance data from the iPrep Math program (*including participant identifiers*) will be integrated with the Platform, enabling in-depth comparisons across cohorts.

National Academy Foundation (NAF): The Platform is directly aligned with the NAF career academy model deployed throughout the district (*44 academies*). Leveraging the Platform, students are empowered to connect their academic planning, postsecondary goals, and career aspirations within one pathway. NAF is an enthusiastic supporter of the existing web portal and proposed expansion.

Rationale

The Platform will address the following "rationale" criteria detailed in the RTT-D application:

Area	Description/Rationale
(C)(1)(a)(i)	• Guided process for students to link interests/aspirations to career goals, postsecondary opportunities, and K12 academic performance benchmarks. • Helps students understand best-practices around the goal-setting process itself, based on a variety of self-learning exercises.
(C)(1)(a)(ii)	• Guided process for students to create multi-year, goal-oriented K12, postsecondary and career plans, and then benchmark their progress against those plans. • Progress can also be tracked by parents/educators/counselors through dashboards.
(C)(1)(a)(iv)	• Contextualizes classroom learning relative to postsecondary and career

	opportunities. • Student access to postsecondary and employer mentors who can provide additional context/perspective/motivation for academic success.
(C)(1)(a)(iv)	• Vehicle for students to hone the skills of goal setting and management.
Hard-to-Measure Skills and Traits	• The Platform provides robust data to assess hard-to-measure skills and traits: (*Interests, Skills, Values, Persistence towards Goals, Health & Wellness, Self-Efficacy, etc.*).
Predictive Algorithms	• Predictive Algorithms based on Student-Level data trigger automated postsecondary, career, scholarship, health & wellness and self-efficacy resource recommendations.
Content-Tagging	• Tagging of learning resources and curriculum/content with metadata linked to student indicators enable the automated recommendations described above.

Implementation Plan

The Platform will expand on an existing web portal deployment and will be implemented as enhanced functionality to benefit students, parents, educators, and counselors. M-DCPS will employ an industry-standard implementation plan (*please see Attachment XX: Project Plan*) for a best-of-breed enterprise technology solution including rigorous usability testing to involve all relevant stakeholders before full system acceptance and go-live.

Integrate with Existing Programs & Process

Platform implementation, training and adoption activities will be integrated with existing district programs wherever possible to capitalize on existing processes and resource investments (*examples below*):

- Division of Student Services: Currently supports the existing web portal and will drive adoption of the proposed Platform
- The Parent Academy: Workshops provide parents with the tools and resources necessary to support their children's success

LEA Participation

The College & Career Planning Platform will be implemented across all M-DCPS middle and high schools. Additionally, M-DCPS is one of three participants in the City Postsecondary Success Program (CPSP), a national initiative launched in 2009 by the Citi Foundation in partnership with the Academy for Educational Development (AED) and the Public Education Network (PEN). CPSP is a collaborative network of nonprofit organizations, colleges & universities, vocational programs, school districts, businesses and local leaders who are committed to increasing availability of high-value services for students and families. M-DCPS will leverage the established CPSP framework, particularly an existing partnership with San Francisco Public Schools (*which currently deploys the same 9-12 postsecondary & career planning web portal*), to drive broader adoption of the proposed Platform. M-DCPS will continue this close collaboration, sharing best practices, resources and innovative solutions developed as part of the RTT-D program.

Performance Management

- Comprehensive data warehouse reporting enables programmatic evaluation in support of rigorous continuous improvement processes.
- Reports are configured to reflect performance against various benchmarks and facilitate drill-down and disaggregation for cohort-level analysis.

Budget & Sustainability

This proposal is based on a sustainable budget that 1) supports a thorough, efficient technology development and implementation process, and; 2) identifies a roadmap to offset recurring, long-term program costs. Additionally, in 2011, M-DCPS conducted a rigorous analysis that identified substantial operational efficiencies and cost savings for the district's Student Services function as a

result of implementing a Platform comparable to what is described herein (*additional detail to be provided upon request*). Please refer to the required budget tables and supporting detail below.

Optional Budget Supplement Proposal Rationale

Area	Description/Rationale
(C)(1)(a)(i): Engaging and empowering all learners to, "…understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals."	By participating in a guided process that links interests/aspirations to career goals, postsecondary opportunities, and K12 academic performance benchmarks, the Platform orients students to the importance of coursework relative to achieving goals. Additionally, the Platform helps students navigate the goal-setting process itself, based on a variety of self-learning exercises.
(C)(1)(a)(ii): Engaging and empowering all learners to, "…understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goals."	The proposed Platform provides a framework for students to create multi-year, goal-oriented K12, postsecondary and career plans, and then benchmark their progress against those plans. The course planner, for example, enables learners to plot out the curriculum pathway that aligns with their postsecondary/career goals. By integrating Student Performance data, the course plan is automatically updated to reflect real outcomes, and then benchmarks students against their plan (*can be tracked by parents/educators/counselors through dashboards*).
(C)(1)(a)(iv): Engaging and empowering all learners to, "…have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning."	The proposed Platform will expose learners to a long-term view that situates in-the-classroom learning relative to postsecondary and career opportunities. Additionally, students will have access to postsecondary and employer mentors who can provide additional context/perspective/motivation relative to academic success.
(C)(1)(a)(iv): Engaging and empowering all learners to, "…Master critical academic	As discussed above, the Platform serves as a vehicle for students to identify, record, and track progress against nuanced goals. In this way, students are also able to hone

content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving."	the skills of goal setting and management by using the Platform.
Assessing Hard-to-Measure Skills and Traits	The Platform provides robust data to assess hard-to-measure skills and traits: Interests, Skills, Values, Persistence towards Goals, Health & Wellness, self-efficacy, etc. (*based on goal-setting & tracking, self-learning exercises, surveys, etc.*)
Predictive Algorithms	Predictive Algorithms based on Student-Level data triggers Recommendations Engine, driving postsecondary, career, scholarship, health & wellness and self-efficacy resources to students (*based on Student-Level data triggers, and feedback gained through self-learning exercises and "pulse" surveys*).
Content-Tagging Schemes	Tagging of learning resources and curriculum/content with metadata linked to student indicators (*i Student-Level data triggers, and feedback gained through self-learning exercises and "pulse" surveys*) to enable the Recommendations Engine described above.

Optional Budget Supplement: Overall Budget Summary

BUDGET SUBPART 1: OVERALL BUDGET SUMMARY

Budget Table 1-1: Optional Budget Supplement Budget Summary

Evidence for: Optional Budget Supplement

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$1,786.00	$1,786.00	$1,786.00	$1,786.00	$7,144.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$1,014,030.00	$338,495.00	$338,495.00	$163,357.00	$1,854,377.00
7. Training Stipends	$15,000.00	$15,000.00	$15,000.00	$15,000.00	$60,000.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	**$1,030,816.00**	**$355,281.00**	**$355,281.00**	**$180,143.00**	**$1,921,521.00**
10. Indirect Costs*	$38,862.00	$13,394.00	$13,394.00	$6,791.00	$72,441.00
11. Total Grant Funds Requested (lines 9-10)	**$1,069,678.00**	**$368,675.00**	**$368,675.00**	**$186,934.00**	**$1,993,962.00**

12. Funds from other sources used to support the project	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13. Total Budget (lines 11-12)	**$1,069,678.00**	**$368,675.00**	**$368,675.00**	**$186,934.00**	**$1,993,962**

BUDGET SUBPART 2: OVERALL BUDGET SUMMARY NARRATIVE

Budget Narrative

M-DCPS has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40 - 74.48 and Part 80.36.

The proposed Optional Budget Supplement aligns directly with components of Selection Criteria C and the Competitive Preference as detailed in the Application.

Selection Criteria C

The proposed Platform fulfills many of the components set forth in Selection Criteria C (1) (a) (i-iv) (*Please refer to Attachment XX: "Optional Budget Supplement Proposal Rationale" for specific alignment detail*).

Competitive Preference

The proposed Platform promotes partnerships with M-DCPS-qualified postsecondary institutions and employers and unlocks a viable

model for long-term financial sustainability (*based on recurring, industry-standard subscription fees for high-value student engagement services*). Because M-DCPS will aggregate a concentrated community of learners engaged in academic, postsecondary and career planning, the Platform represents a valuable engagement channel for postsecondary institutions and employers who invest heavily to ensure the viability of their long-term talent pipelines. Postsecondary institutions, for example, can promote best practices associated with the avoidance of remediation (a tremendous cost burden). Employers, for their part, can share information about academic pathways associated with high-value, high-demand occupations.

Additionally, because the Platform will integrate verified Student-Level data, these institutions will be able to precisely identify cohorts for targeted messaging (*based on querying for students on a de-identified, FERPA-compliant basis requiring student opt-in*). M-DCPS anticipates that the impact of postsecondary and employer investments in the Platform will begin to reach critical mass in Year 4 of program implementation, as indicated by a nearly 50% reduction in recurring costs on the relevant budget tables. Importantly, M-DCPS will structure its partnership with the technology vendor selected to implement the Platform based on a mutual commitment to achieve this cost reduction.

- *Postsecondary Module:*
    - Postsecondary institutions have access to strategically engage students earlier in their academic career to directly cultivate a "college-ready" talent pipeline.
    - Students benefit from increased postsecondary planning resources, mentorship, scholarship and grant opportunities, and "What to Expect" information.
    - The Module supports long-term program sustainability through postsecondary licensing fees.
- *Employer Module:*

- Employers have access to strategically engage students earlier in their academic career to directly cultivate a skilled talent pipeline.
- Students benefit from increased career resources, mentorship, internship and experiential learning opportunities, and "What to Expect" information.
- The Module supports long-term program sustainability through employer licensing fees.

The Platform will also serve as a strong family and community support as defined in the application by engaging families, postsecondary institutions, and employers to support student educational outcomes.

- Systemic: Scalable, district-wide technology platform engaging students and key stakeholders in their success *(families, educators, counselors, administrators, postsecondary institutions, employers, etc.)*
- Integrated: Complementary to a broad range of district programs that support student success (*by providing a long-term planning framework that integrates critical "in the classroom" and "outside the classroom" classroom components*)
- Sustainable: Long-term financial sustainability model to offset recurring costs
- Continue through a Student's Transition from K-12 Schooling to College and Career: Multi-year planning environment linking K-12, postsecondary, career, health & wellness, and self-efficacy components

Budget Table 2-1: Optional Budget Supplement Budget Summary **Evidence for:** Optional Budget Supplement				
Project Name	**Primary Associated Criterion and location in application**	**Additional Associated Criteria and location in application**	**Total Grant Funds Requested**	**Total Budget**
Optional Budget Supplement	C (1) (a) (i-iv)	Competitive Preference (1)	**$1,993,962.00**	**$1,993,962.00**
			Total for Grant Funds	**Total Budget**

Optional Budget Supplement: Project-Level Detail

BUDGET SUBPART 3: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET SUMMARIES

Table 3-1: Project-Level Budget Summary Table: Evidence for Optional Budget Supplement

Project Name: Personal Pathway Planning Platform

Primary Associated Criterion and Location in Application: [Selection Criteria C(1)(a)(i. – iv.) 42]

Additional Associated Criteria (if any) and Location in Application: [Competitive Preference, Page 66]

Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	$15,000.00	$15,000.00	$15,000.00	$15,000.00	$60,000.00
2. Fringe Benefits	$1,786.00	$1,786.00	$1,786.00	$1,786.00	$7,144.00
3. Travel	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
4. Equipment	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
5. Supplies	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
6. Contractual	$1,014,030.00	$338,495.00	$338,495.00	$163,357.00	$1,854,377.00
7. Training Stipends	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
8. Other	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	**$1,030,816.00**	**$355,281.00**	**$355,281.00**	**$180,143.00**	**$1,921,521.00**
10. Indirect Costs*	$38,862.00	$13,394.00	$13,394.00	$6,791.00	$72,441.00
11. Total Grant Funds Requested	**$1,069,678.00**	**$368,675.00**	**$368,675.00**	**$186,934.00**	**$1,993,962.00**

(lines 9-10)					
12. Funds from other sources used to support the project	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00	$0.00
13. Total Budget (lines 11-12)	**$1,069,678.00**	**$368,675.00**	**$368,675.00**	**$186,934.00**	**$1,993,962**

BUDGET SUBPART 4: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Budget Narrative

M-DCPS has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40 - 74.48 and Part 80.36.

M-DCPS will execute a robust implementation plan to support the successful deployment of the proposed Platform. Importantly, M-DCPS is expanding an existing web portal, capitalizing on efforts to drive school adoption and utilization to date.

Implementation Plan

Please refer to Attachment XX: Project Plan for a detailed Implementation Plan.

Scalable Technology & Data Integration

- The proposed Platform is built on a scalable user adoption framework that pre-registers all students based on integrated Student-Level Data; students simply need to validate their identity when activating their account.

- Students will be greeted with a robust personal portfolio when first logging into the system, based on pre-loaded Student-Level Data (hurdling adoption obstacles associated with lengthy registration/account creation processes).
- The Platform will employ a streamlined process for parents to associate accounts with their children (based on the validation of personally identifiable information); counselors can be provisioned with accounts and assigned to students based on automated processes enabled by the integration of data from the district's Student Information System (SIS).

Training, Implementation & Success Services, and Support

- M-DCPS will implement a robust training model blending in-person and web-based modules.
- M-DCPS will employ train-the-trainer modules (to empower district educators to evangelize the Platform), as well as direct-to-end-user modules (typically web-based, topical, live/on-demand).
- Training will be augmented with an outsourced "Implementation & Success" model to be provided by the technology partner to be selected by M-DCPS. This model involves a structured planning process in support of successful technology deployments (individualized, metrics-driven school/district implementation plans based on mutual accountability to critical adoption milestones/timing; dedicated account management and follow-up).

Existing Partners & Processes

- M-DCPS will tether the implementation of the Platform to existing partnership frameworks, including National Academy Foundation (NAF) career academies (curriculum and process is strongly aligned with the Platform).
- M-DCPS will also integrate the Platform into existing district processes, including the Parent Academy.

Continuous Improvement

• Flexible data warehouse reporting will support continuous improvement processes through custom reporting configured to reflect performance against benchmarks and facilitate drill-down and disaggregation for cohort-level performance analysis.

Table 4-1: Project-Level Itemized Costs		
Cost Description	**Cost Assumption (including whether the cost is one-time investment or ongoing operational cost)**	**Total**
1. Personnel: Explain the importance of each position to the success of the project and connections back to specific project plans. If curriculum vitae, an organizational chart, or other supporting information will be helpful to reviewers, attach in the Appendix and describe its location.		
• Training Stipends and/or Substitutes Teachers and counselors participating in training conducted after regular work hours will receive a training stipend. For training that takes place during the day, substitute teachers will be provided.	• 150 Teachers & Counselors *or* 150 Daily Substitutes * $100 = $15,000 per year • $15,000 per year * 4 years = $60,000	Y1: $15,000 Y2: $15,000 Y3: $15,000 Y4: $15,000 Total: $60,000
2. Fringe Benefits: Explain the nature and extent of fringe benefits to be received and by whom.		
• Fringe Benefits An 11.9% fringe benefits rate will be applied to Training Stipends costs.	• 11.9% * $15,000 (see Training Stipends cost below) = $1,786.00 per year • $1,786.00 * 4 years = $7,144 total	Y1: $1,786 Y2: $1,786 Y3: $1,786 Y4: $1,786 Total: $7,144
3. Travel:		

Explain the purpose of the travel, how it relates to project goals, and how it will contribute to project success.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $0.00
4. Equipment Explain what equipment is needed and why it is needed to meet program goals. Consistent with SEA and LEA policy, equipment is defined as tangible, non-expendable, personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of $5,000 or more per unit.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $0.00
5. Supplies Explain what supplies are needed and why they are necessary to meet program goals. Consistent with LEA policy, supplies are defined as tangible personal property excluding equipment.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $0.00
6. Contractual Explain what goods/services will be acquired, and the purpose and relation to the project for each expected procurement. **NOTE:** Because grantees must use appropriate procurement procedures to select contractors, applicants do not need to include information in their applications about specific contractors that may be used to provide services or goods for the proposed project if a grant is awarded.		

• Technology Development & License
 	
Technology Development funding will expand the existing postsecondary & career planning web portal to include the following components to support the proposed program:
1. Middle School-Centric Personal Pathway Planning (Early Postsecondary & Career Exploration and Contextualization)
2. Contextual Health & Wellness and Social-Efficacy
	• $1,016,877.00 procurement cost
	• One-time investment
	  ○ Solution scoping, requirements analysis & definition, prototypes, development services, usability testing, enhancements
	  ○ Recurring costs anticipated to be allocated to future development of expanded Platform functionality based
		Y1: $844,030.00
		Y2: $73,495.00
		Y3: $73,495.00
		Y4: $25,857.00
		Total: 1,016,877

Resources for both Middles and High School Students (Self-Learning Modules) 3. Integrated "Pulse" Surveys to Aggregate Student Health & Wellness and Social-Efficacy Indicators, as well as Broader Engagement in the Postsecondary & Career Planning Process 4. Data Dashboards for Educators and Counselors to Track Progress Indicators associated with Student Plans, including Early Warning Indicators relative to Plan Structure, Health & Wellness, and Social-Efficacy 5. Data Warehouse & Longitudinal/Performance Management Reporting	on needs identified during ongoing implementation – including new data filters (i.e. ELL & SPED) for reporting and early warning functionality • M-DCPS has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40 - 74.48 and Part 80.36.	
• Training Services Comprehensive Training Services will include a blend of in-person and web-based sessions. M-DCPS will implement a robust train-the-trainer model, empowering district education professionals to evangelize the Platform, as well as direct-to-end-user resources (typically web-based, topical, and live/on-demand). Additionally, M-DCPS will provide a broad array of web-based self-service resources for end-users to access as necessary (including technical support case management).	• $148,750.00 procurement cost • On-going operational cost, estimated at 15+sessions; blend of web-based and in-person sessions (allocation to be finalized based on final end-user needs analysis) o Train-the-Trainer Sessions (in-person) o Direct-to-End User Training Sessions (in-person/web-based) o Self-Service Resources: User Guides, FAQs, On-Demand Video, Technical Support • M-DCPS has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40 - 74.48 and Part 80.36.	Y1: $42,500 Y2: $42,500 Y3: $42,500 Y4: $21,250 Total: $148,750
• Data Services Ongoing consultative Data Services to 1) develop and maintain automated processes to exchange, transform and load data into the Platform from all required target data sources (i.e. district student information system, 3rd-party assessment raw data files, etc.)	• $148,750.00 procurement cost • On-going operational cost, automation and maintenance of data extraction, transformation and loading (ETL) processes from multiple data sources • M-DCPS has followed the procedures for	Y1: $42,500 Y2: $42,500 Y3: $42,500 Y4: $21,250 Total: $148,750

	procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40 - 74.48 and Part 80.36.	
• Implementation & Success Planning Structured planning process in support of successful technology deployments (individualized, metrics-driven school/district implementation plans based on mutual accountability to critical adoption milestones/timing; Dedicated account management and follow-up).	• $148,750.00 procurement cost • On-going operational cost • M-DCPS has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40 - 74.48 and Part 80.36.	Y1: $42,500 Y2: $42,500 Y3: $42,500 Y4: $21,250 Total: $148,750
• Stakeholder Engagement Workshops to promote the value proposition of the Platform with key district stakeholder groups, particularly parents (web-based, in-person, etc., leveraging existing communication channels like the Parent Academy); Use the Platform as a mechanism to strengthen the connection between home and school and to provide parents with the tools and resources necessary to support their children's success.	• $148,750.00 procurement cost • On-going operational cost, estimated at 15+sessions; blend of web-based and in-person to be determined based on final end-user needs analysis and M-DCPS parent engagement schedule • M-DCPS has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40 - 74.48 and Part 80.36.	Y1: $42,500 Y2: $42,500 Y3: $42,500 Y4: $21,250 Total: $148,750
• Maintenance, Support & Hosting Standard ongoing technology maintenance, support and hosting services including recurring system/software updates, bug maintenance, and managed hosting (disaster recovery, coast-to-coast failover, SAS 70 level II security compliance, etc.)	• $242,500.00 procurement cost • On-going operational cost • M-DCPS has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40 - 74.48 and Part 80.36.	Y1: $0 Y2: $95,000 Y3: $95,000 Y4: $52,500 Total: $242,500
7. Training Stipends Explain what training is needed, and the purpose and relation to the project. **NOTE:** The training stipend line item only pertains to costs associated with long-term training programs and college or university coursework, not workshops or short-term training supported by this program. Salary stipends paid to teachers and other school personnel for participating in short-term professional development should be reported in Personnel (line 1).		
• N/A	• N/A	• $0.00

8. Other Explain other expenditures that may exist and are not covered by other categories.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $0.00
9. Total Direct Costs: Sum lines 1-8.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $1,921,521.00
Add more rows as needed		
10. Total Indirect Costs Identify and apply the indirect cost rate.		
• Standard IDC MDCPS applies a standard indirect cost of 3.77% to the total direct cost on an annual basis. (As approved by FLDOE)	• Year 1: 3.77% * $1,030,816 = $38,862 • Year 2: 3.77% * $355,281 = $13,394 • Year 3: 3.77% * $355,281 = $13,394 • Year 4: 3.77% * $180,143 = $6,791 • Total = Y1 + Y2 + Y3 + Y4 = $72,441	Y1: $38,862 Y2: $13,394 Y3: $13,394 Y4: $6,791 Total: $72,441.00
11. Total Grant Funds Requested Sum lines 9-10.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $1,993,962.00
12. Funds from other sources used to support the project Identifies all non-grant funds that will support the project (e.g., external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds)		
• N/A	• N/A	• $0.00
13. Total Budget Sum lines 11-12.		
• N/A	• N/A	• $1,993,962.00

Project Plan

Fiscal Year 2013/ Program Year 1 *12/21/2012-9/30/2013*																		
Optional Budget Supplement																		
Activity	**October**	**November**	**December**	**January**	**February**	**March**	**April**	**May**	**June**	**July**	**August**	**September**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**	**Deliverable/ Evidence**	**Responsible Party/ Parties**	**Related Section of Application**
Project Initiation and Planning																		
Refine Proposed Project Planning Documents				X												Project Plan, Staffing Plan	OI&A, IT	Optional Budget Supplement
Develop Final Project Plan				X														
Review and Approval of Project Plan				X														
Amend Proposed Staffing Plan				X														
Review and Approval of Staffing Plan				X														
Discovery: Requirements and Needs Analysis																		
Identity Management Services					X											Requirements and Needs Analysis	IT, ITS	Optional Budget Supplement
Data Exchange Services					X													
User Experience Services					X													
System Design																		

Fiscal Year 2013/ Program Year 1 *12/21/2012-9/30/2013*																		
Optional Budget Supplement																		
Activity	**October**	**November**	**December**	**January**	**February**	**March**	**April**	**May**	**June**	**July**	**August**	**September**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**	**Deliverable/ Evidence**	**Responsible Party/ Parties**	**Related Section of Application**
Technical Architecture Specification					X											Technical Architecture Specification	ITS	Optional Budget Supplement
Web Service Descriptors for all SOA Services (WSDLs)					X													
Customized Functionality Design																		
Middle School Customization						X										Specification of Custom Functionality	OI&A, C&I, IT, ITS	Optional Budget Supplement
Data Dashboard Customization						X												
Student Engagement Customization						X												
Early Warning & Intervention Customization						X												
Data Warehouse & Performance Management System Customization						X												
Development																		
Configure Ingestion of Data from the SOA							X	X								Configuration of Data Exchange, Identity	ITS	Optional Budget Supplement
Configure Bidirectional Data							X	X										

Fiscal Year 2013/ Program Year 1 *12/21/2012-9/30/2013*																		
Optional Budget Supplement																		
Activity	**October**	**November**	**December**	**January**	**February**	**March**	**April**	**May**	**June**	**July**	**August**	**September**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**	**Deliverable/ Evidence**	**Responsible Party/ Parties**	**Related Section of Application**
Exchange (M-DCPS SIS, Data Warehouse, Platform)																Management System & Product Software		
Configure Identity Management System & Framework							X	X										
Installation and Configuration of Product Software							X	X										
Integration and Testing																		
Define Test Plan Objectives									X	X						Testing Documentation, Usability Analysis	ITS	Optional Budget Supplement
Review Test Plan Template and Content									X	X								
Draft Test Case Categories									X	X								
Develop Test Case Descriptions									X	X								
Document Test Plans									X	X								
Develop User Acceptance Testing Scripts									X	X								

Fiscal Year 2013/ Program Year 1 *12/21/2012-9/30/2013*																		
Optional Budget Supplement																		
Activity	**October**	**November**	**December**	**January**	**February**	**March**	**April**	**May**	**June**	**July**	**August**	**September**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**	**Deliverable/ Evidence**	**Responsible Party/ Parties**	**Related Section of Application**
Identification of Additional UAT Scripts									X	X								
Usability Analysis									X	X								
Perform Code Base Audit									X	X								
Full System Acceptance & Go-Live																		
Full System Acceptance & Go-Live														X		Go-Live	ITS	Optional Budget Supplement
Implementation																		
Training Planning Session											X					Training Plan, Delivery of Trainings	OI&A, C&I, IT, PD, UTD	Optional Budget Supplement
Product Training Sessions (iPrep & NAF Programmatic Integration, Parent Academies, Standalone, etc.)											X	X	X	X	X			
Product Demonstrations (iPrep & NAF Programmatic Integration,											X	X	X	X	X			

Fiscal Year 2013/ Program Year 1 *12/21/2012-9/30/2013*																		
Optional Budget Supplement																		
Activity	**October**	**November**	**December**	**January**	**February**	**March**	**April**	**May**	**June**	**July**	**August**	**September**	**Year 2**	**Year 3**	**Year 4**	**Deliverable/ Evidence**	**Responsible Party/ Parties**	**Related Section of Application**
Parent Academies, Standalone, etc.)																		
Operations and Maintenance																		
Application Maintenance and Technical Support Services											X	X	X	X	X	Ongoing Execution of Operations & Maintenance	ITS	Optional Budget Supplement
Execute System Monitoring Plan											X	X	X	X	X			
Ongoing Documentation Updates											X	X	X	X	X			
Maintenance and Support Services											X	X	X	X	X			