



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0206FL-1 for School District of Clay County

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	2

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The plan offered by the School District of Clay County, The Academies of Clay, is to redesign six of their seven high schools into smaller learning communities with a career-focus. The plan will be aligned to a new Five-Year Plan developed as part of a grant through the Ford Partnership for Advanced Studies Next Generation Learning that led, in turn, to the Florida Association of Career and Technical Education Five Year Plan.

The proposal does not include a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that builds on work in all four of the core assurance areas. There is no mention of standards and assessments, building or supporting data systems, recruiting and retaining effective teachers and principals, and turning around lowest-achieving schools.

The plan does address the potential of advancing student interests through the availability of career-oriented high schools. There is no indication of whether or not students are able to select schools, however.

There is no clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning and increasing equity through personalized student support. The applicant does not address these areas other than the lack of achievement noted below.

The proposal does not provide any insight as to what the classroom experience would be like for participating students or teachers participating in these new smaller learning communities. The application includes references to research, which is generally mixed. One reference notes that no studies find higher achievement scores in redesigned high schools; this study would suggest that the move towards the proposed redesign would make no change in achievement for students and should be reconsidered. Other references are vague (i.e.. "research studies ask..." and "one study suggests...").

The vision presented is well suited for smaller learning communities but fails to meet the essence of the criteria requested for this proposal.

The rating is low.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
--	-----------	----------

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

For this application, Clay County selected six out of their seven high school as participant schools for the high school re-design. The free- and reduced-eligibility served as the final criteria for this decision, as the average for the six selected was at 43%. While the limitations of grant funding cover applications with a total 40% or higher, this was a data-driven necessity. The project, however, shows no matching funds that would support this final high school during this same period of time, leaving one group of students and teachers unserved. This discrepancy within the district results in difficulty for students transferring between schools, changes in faculty, student and faculty morale, uneven access to technology, and parent and community unrest. The process of selecting participant schools should take under consideration the end result of selecting all but one high school within the district.

The proposal includes a listing of the participant schools and other key data. Grade subjects of Math and Science are included that had not been previously mentioned; no indication is provided as to how these subject areas would be integrated into the new design or if they are already in effect in the schools. The School Demographics Chart has incorrect data in Columns E and I (needs district data here) (no points deducted for these comments).

The applicants addresses the issues within the criteria with the weaknesses noted above.

The score is high in the mid-range.

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

10

1

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal intends to redesign all seven high schools into small learning communities, building upon the success of current academies and expanding into new academies. Only six of the seven district high schools are participating in the Race to the Top-District project; the reforms will be scaled into the remaining seventh high school.

The narrative does not address if this reform will occur concurrently with the other six participant schools, how it would be considered meaningful relative to the other work, and how this particular expansion into the final high school will improve student learning outcomes for all students served by the applicant.

The sole reference to the involvement of the remaining school is the applicant's response to this criterion; it is inadequate to fully address it, as no supporting information, no data, no details, or anything on a high-quality plan is provided.

The score for the criterion is low.

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

10

5

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal includes baselines and annual goals in academic areas (Algebra, Biology, Reading) as well as high school graduation rates, college enrollment and postsecondary degree attainment. Goals are consistently between one and three percentile points - not percentages. With the steady increment of three percentage point annual gain for the end-of-course test in Algebra one for all students, the 5% (three percentage points) actually decreases each year as the percentile points remain constant, resulting in an annual slowing of the perceived increased rate.

While three percentage points would be an achievable gain over the program years, its consistency over four years would be good, if not particularly ambitious. In some cases, however, the goals are too slow: student groups still scoring less than 60% after four years of intervention are not being well-served by grant supports. In other cases, the annual goal is only one percentage (all students for FCAT Math 2.0 Algebra when all subgroups but one are expected to increase by higher percentage points) and for that same measure with low-income students. While achievable, this is not an ambitious goal.

The proposal includes goals for graduation rates and two years of baseline data. While the first year of baseline data is optional (2011-2012) for the 4-year Federal Rate, its inclusion along with the baseline for 2012-2013, and the goals for 2014-2015 would strongly benefit from some explanation. Not only does the second baseline show a dramatic drop in the high school graduation rate, but the rate does not reach the same level as the 2011-2012 until the third year of funding.

Similarly, the second subgroup, At-Risk 4-Year Rate, moves from two years of baseline data (85% followed by 72%), never returning to the original baseline level of 85% within the grant period. The increase level in graduation rate goal for the Federal Rate beginning with the 2012-2013 baseline is moderate over the years of funding, but this is an ambitious goal given the high percentage already graduating. Both rates are reasonable.

College enrollment data is included, showing the percent of high school graduates who enter college within 16 months of graduation. The goals are evenly incremental, consistent for every subgroup for every year. Given the similarities in college-going rates between subgroups, this may be a reasonable assumption, but it continues to maintain a lower level of college attendance for students with disabilities, African American students, and ELL students. Goals should accommodate the needs of these students, thus would not be ambitious goals in these cases.

The applicant addresses Postsecondary Degree Attainment. It is assumed, but not documented, that the figures represent students who have entered college following high school graduation. Increasing from a baseline of 72% to 84% after four years would be both ambitious and achievable. No plan is presented, however, that outlines how the applicant or higher education partners might achieve this goal.

The proposal includes summative assessment in key academic areas, graduation, and college enrollment goals. The goals are all positive and achievable. In some cases they are ambitious, in some cases not. The response does not address achievement gaps.

The response rates in mid-range.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	8
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal refers to its record of success in the expansion of CTE academies from 10 to 16 and the particular success of three of these academies that have earned Model Academy status from the National Career Academy Coalition. A chart provides data comparing academy versus non-academy student data, showing a higher rate of attendance (1%) for academy student, a higher GPA, and a higher graduation rate (99.5% versus 91%). Reference is made to discipline statistics, but none are provided.</p> <p>None of this information relates to the project. The plan to move six of the seven high schools into a smaller learning community school design does not align with this discussion of individual academies.</p> <p>The Academy vs Non-Academy chart includes students from all seven high schools; the six involved as program participants should be identified. When listed on the School Demographics Chart on (A)(2), each of the participant high schools was linked with math/science as the focus Gr 9-12 subjects. The areas described within this response address industry certification, culinary arts, law and emergency services, credit unions and business. A direct link to the math/science fields should be developed.</p> <p>The narrative provides four years of success for the growth of industry certifications (a factor of ten over four years). This single example, however, is inadequate to qualify as evidence of a clear four-year record of success in advancing learning and achieving and increasing equity in learning and teaching.</p> <p>The proposal did make an ambitious and significant reform in one school and provided supporting evidence. Again, only a single example is provided, not constituting a systemic approach or history of the applicant's reforms to turn around low-performing schools.</p> <p>The district already has in place, by virtue of the State's Race to the Top funds, an on-demand data system that provides performance data and classroom information to parents through a Parent Portal. While this access and availability to data will be able to increase how data can be used effectively, the proposal does not elaborate on what ways, how this can be done, and what school professionals could maximize the usefulness of this tool. More details are needed for a fully-responsive answer.</p> <p>The rating for this response to this criterion is mid-range,</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	0
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant did not respond to this criterion and the subcriteria are not addressed elsewhere in the proposal or its appendices.</p> <p>The rating for this criterion is 0.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	2
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal does not address State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements in their response, although there is a reference that legislative issues are discussed throughout the scope of the application.</p> <p>The narrative does include the Five Year Master Plan for the implementation of the CTE program. As a five-year program, it does not align to the four-years of Race-to-the-Top funds, especially those for years four and five in the CTE Master Plan, would be particularly difficult to align.</p> <p>The applicant lack of a clear plan, whether it's the CTE five-year Master Plan or a separate Smaller Learning Communities Plan, or some combination of the two, is never clear. This is highlighted by the role of separate Academies and how they might fit into Race to the Top. It is unclear as to whether the plan is to formalize each Academy as a separate SLC and, if so, to what benefit, and for what use of these funds.</p> <p>The response, while informative, does not address the criterion. The applicant has not provided evidence of successful</p>		

conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement either the Master Plan or the implementation of SLCs.

The rating for the criterion is low.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	6
--	-----------	----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes the involvement of committees with wide memberships working on high school transformation. The preponderance of these events refer to committee work related to the district's involvement with the State of Florida's Race to the Top grant proposal and not to the development of the proposal at hand. No evidence of these committee meetings is included in the proposal or appendices, but the narrative notes that the committee work "began prior to the receipt of the District's Phase I Race to the Top grant" and that, later, the top priority for the year (professional development) was completed by August of 2013.

Given the lack of distinction between some of the work of the State's Race to the Top efforts at the district level, the five-year CTE Master Plan, the plan for Smaller Learning Communities (and new Academies), and the criteria for Race to the Top-District, it is incumbent upon the applicant to ensure that the stakeholder engagement, feedback, and subsequent revisions based on that feedback, are specific to this proposal. That has not been done.

The narrative includes a list of presentation dates; it is unclear if this is for the five-year CTE program (that includes all district high schools) or just the six schools and a shortened time span.

The appendix does not include any agenda, comments from focus groups, or evidence of direct engagement and support from any teachers. Ten letters of support are included, which is positive. One is from a student; excellent. Higher education and businesses are also represented; most of the letters of support believe that the project will increase the number of Academies.

The response is partially addressed. Much is unclear and lacks evidence, as noted above, but the proposal includes letters of support and a description of community and stakeholder involvement in aligned projects.

The score for this response is low/middle.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	5

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Clay County's Race to the Top-District proposal - not their projects for either the five year CTE program or the broader State Race to the Top - does not include a clearly articulated plan that meets the definition provided in the notice; that is, complete with key goals, activities and their rationale for inclusion, timeline, deliverables, and the persons responsible for their completion. All of the descriptions for one do not necessarily fit the others.

The applicant's response to this criterion is not, in most cases, from the perspective of the student. The narrative elaborates on what the the district will do (assess students, collect baseline data), what counselors will do (follow students), teachers and guidance counselors will do (stay with the same group of students) and that teachers can be reimbursed for the costs of certification courses and tests.

The proposal does note, though, that students, with assistance from parents and counselors, will be able to identify and pursue learning in areas of their interests which will allow students of diverse cultures and differing ability levels to work together. Progressing within a given Academy, students would be expected to master critical academic content content skills and develop skills in goal setting and teamwork.

The narrative does not address the issue of students' understanding of the importance of their learning or the alignment of the work towards any academic or college- and career ready standards.

Although students would be able to select among different Academies, the proposal does not address if the actual sequence of instructional content is personalized and individually designed for each student according to learning plans. There is no discussion of high-quality instructional approaches and environments.

The proposal does not include any evidence of high-quality content. This could be as a alignment to specific standards, replicated from a research-supported model implemented elsewhere, or some other verifiable evidence. Similarly, no evidence of ongoing and regular feedback is offered.

The applicant does not address any accommodations and strategies for high-need students or the availability of any mechanisms in place to provide training and support to students to assist them in using the tools and resources they may receive.

The budget includes a 1:1 digital initiative with \$400 devices going to 17,500 students (far more than the number of participating students). There is no discussion within the narrative on how the students would be trained to maximize their use, will use these devices within their Academies, their plans and programs, and how they might assist with personalizing each student's learning.

The narrative responded to a few of the subcriteria; they are noted above.

The score is low in the middle range.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	10
--	-----------	-----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A full response to this criterion looks at the project from the teaching and leading perspective, focusing on improving instruction to increase student progress towards college- and career-readiness, high school graduation, and a personalized learning experience for students, particularly those who are high-need. Towards that end, the narrative addresses several relevant points:

- each school site will have a Professional Learning Community rooted in the classroom and assisted by trained facilitators, and
- a District Leadership Team will play a major role in developing professional development and preparing facilitators and for arranging model lessons and classrooms that may be of use to classroom teachers.

The narrative does not address high-need students specifically.

The project emphasizes, within this response, the use of PLCs for teachers, principals, and a groups for district leaders. No details are offered on the agenda of these groups - whether they will follow the same conversations, if topics will be selected by the individual schools or PLCs, if they will be dependent upon the CTE or Academies in place at (or planned for) a school, or some other criteria. As it is the substance of the work of the PLCs that is expected to have an impact on teaching and leading, the topics of that work are of significant importance. More details are needed to determine the power that the site-based PLCs might have.

The application does not provide evidence that participating educators have access to, and know how to use, all of the tools and resources that will be available to them to assist students in meeting their goals. One example is the 17,500 digital devices included in the budget for the 1:1 roll out. The narrative includes no discussion of training for teachers (or students) on how to use this device, what applications (if the device uses them) would be available and how to use them, and how to maximize its use across course contents. Given the considerable investment in this technology and its universal use, training would be essential.

Similarly, there is some discussion to indicate that school leaders and school leadership teams have the training, policies, tools, and resources to structure an effective learning environment. The applicant has a data system in place that can provide student data that could be used to serve in such an environment. Principals will use feedback tools following walk-throughs for discussions with teachers. The proposal includes a rubric (in very small print) from the teacher evaluation that is a useful tool for improvement.

The application does not have a plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and high-effective teachers and principals according to the definitions provided through Race to the Top/District. To meet this criteria, a teacher student must achieve one year of growth (one and a half for high-effective) in one year.

The applicant does not respond directly to the criteria. The score for the response is low in the middle range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score

(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	6
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative notes that the project will be led by the Director of CTE who will report bi-weekly to the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction; these are both continuing positions. A district-level Academy Advisory Committee will assist in the development and expansion of academies across the district. Leadership at the school level would come from both a School Support Team (administrators and a teacher leader who run the daily operations of the program) and a SLC Team, specific to the CTE and associated programs.</p> <p>Clay County clearly identifies the leadership and membership of the High School Redesign Team and provides a short overview of their responsibility. Teams and committees are recognized at both the district and the school level along with their primary charges and membership. The organization revealed through these descriptions offers a structure that can provide support and services to the participant high schools. The response to this subcriterion is well done and will be useful during any implementation.</p> <p>The narrative does not address if the school leadership teams will have any involvement with factors such as school schedules, calendars, personnel decisions, educators roles and responsibilities, and school-level budgets.</p> <p>The application provide no response to credit mastery or providing resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and accessible.</p> <p>The score for this response is in the low mid-range.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	3
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district and the school infrastructure supports personalized learning through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a 1:1 device initiative that provides every student with technology, regardless of income, along with the content associated with the device and the training provided by the student's classroom teacher; there is no discussion if the device is available after school hours or to non-students, and • participant students, regardless of income have access to necessary content and other learning resources related to their areas of interest through selection of Academies within the Smaller Learning Communities environment: educational choice. • teacher professional development that covers content through a personalized learning lens. <p>The narrative does not specifically address how the district and infrastructure support personalized learning ensuring a role for parents or interoperable data systems.</p> <p>The score for response throughout the narrative for this criterion is low mid-range.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Clay County will employ the Plan-Do-Check-Act Model to ensure a quality continuous improvement process for the project. They provide an outline of how this model could look, but the model is not based on the actual goals or outcomes, such as new SLCs or new Academies or even college- and career-readiness. The "do" component represents, for example, a listing of effective teaching strategies applicable to all areas; these are general responses not specific to this proposal.</p> <p>A significant portion of the response is a description of training to begin in the winter of 2014 funding by the Buck Institute for Education. While of interest, it is not relevant to the continuous improvement process of the applicant's plan. The work is, however, related to the shift towards SLCs and student readiness towards advanced skills. This funding was not included in the budget as "Funds from other sources used to support the project," where it would be expected to be (no points deducted here).</p>		

The proposal notes that the district has adopted the Continuous Improvement Model (CIM) which includes monitoring, adjusting, and refining. No details are provided on what will be monitored, what would be adjusted and under what circumstances, and who would be responsible for any refining.

The response is insufficient to adequately address the criteria. As noted above, details are missing (CIM monitoring) and vague (teaching strategies as a project goal).

The score high in the low range.

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

5

2

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Clay County has initiated a communication plan around four areas:

- the superintendent speaking schedule,
- teacher focus groups,
- the development of a Community Steering Committee for feedback, and
- use of a digital Parent Portal that provides access to student portfolios and content mastery among other data.

This plan does not meet the definition of a high-quality plan; no timelines are included, no specific deliverables or activities, or individuals (or even offices, other than the superintendent) responsible for ensuring that any deliverables are completed.

The plan does not allow for any non-English speaking families or indicate how families without a wireless home environment would be able to maximize the technologies to access the Portal. No reference is made to the district's web page, district or school newsletter, a CTE newsletter, or any other regular updates that might be available and be a part of the communications plan.

The plan, although in place, is incomplete and limited, as noted above.

The score is low/middle range.

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

5

1

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Clay County School District provided the two performance measures required for all levels, and three of the five required at the high school level. The total number of performance measures submitted, seven, is significantly below the 12-14 requested within the request for proposals. This deficit puts the response at a disadvantage.

The first two performance measures are specific to effective- and highly-effective teachers and principals. The working definition requires that students of an effective teacher achieve a year's growth within one year; one and a half year's growth for a highly-effective teacher. A parallel definition exists for an effective and highly-effective principal. The applicant's performance measures show that all principals are already highly-effective, as are 65% of the teachers. The definitions in use are not consistent. Beginning even with Year 1, the total percent of effective and highly-effective teachers exceeds 100.

The proposal includes three additional performance measures, all of which provide useful information. In each case, however, the achievable goals are not ambitious. An increase from 40% to 52% of students completing the FAFSA after four years in a program that regularly promotes and assists students with the form, and where an increase in college going is expected, is not exceptional. Similarly, in a move to Academies and Smaller Learning Communities under CTE with a 5-year CTE Master Plan, the increase of students graduating with three courses in one CTE pathway from 25% to 37% is not an ambitious goal.

As this criterion should include 12-15 performance measures and includes only three workable performance measures, the score has a low rating.

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

5

2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The evaluation plan identifies the external evaluator and:

- provides information on their high level of expertise indicating competence to do the work (although no evidence in the way of resumes is in the appendix),
- describes the model that will be used for the evaluation (distributive leadership design),
- states that the Evaluation Team Leader will serve as a member of the project core management team,
- states that the evaluation will use a multiple model, mixed methods approach that involves community participation,
- clearly articulated roles for the evaluators and the program leaders for the evaluation process for data collection and analysis, and,
- plans to run statistical tests such as anovas as t-tests to determine differences in program impact by site.

The specificity of this plan is incongruous with the lack of specificity in the overall plan that it seeks to evaluate. The evaluation plan does not relate to the shift to smaller learning communities or to the addition of new academies when six of the seven high schools are participating and there is no consistency among the schools regarding which academies are being added to which campuses.

There is no indication that the models that the evaluator has selected are appropriate or reasonable for the program within the proposal nor that the statistical tests would be of any value.

While the evaluation plan may be sound, it is a generic plan. No indication within the narrative suggests that it is specific to the proposal.

The score is in the low middle range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has submitted a budget for \$19,938,946 that covers seven projects: the six participating high schools and district-level support.

The budget does not identify funds from other sources that are used to support the project. Within the narrative, the applicant refers to support from both the Buck Institute for Education and Ford Partnership, both of which are relevant to the program and neither of which are, but should be, represented here.

The budget is not reasonable for the applicant's proposal. Specifically, the budget:

- includes over \$7.5 million in equipment, \$7 million of which is designated for individual tablets for the 1:1 project. At a cost of \$400 per unit, \$7 million will purchase 17,500 devices, almost twice as many as in all of the participant schools (9,599). The budget includes the purchase of 10,000 units in year 1 although the plan is to begin year 1 with freshmen only (approximately one quarter of the total enrollment) and purchase an additional 2,500 units each year of the grant thereafter.
- the narrative has not supported the use of a 1:1 digital device program, how it will integrate academics and CTE, or how it will assist in meeting goals, The devices will allow student access to data for assignments and monitoring and for correspondence with teachers. No training is described for students or teachers on how to maximize the use of these devices.
- includes nine full-time staff at the district level as well as five full-time staff at each of the six participant high schools; a total of 39 new positions. The description of the shift to smaller learning communities, the addition of academies, and even the introduction of a 1:1 device program do not support this level of increase in personnel. At the district level, for example, three full-time positions are included for technology integration specialists, in addition to the technology specialist added to each individual school. The narrative notes that they will be available for teacher support, training, and technology initiatives. The rationale for including these positions is insufficient to include them in the budget.
- provides funding for each of the ten district-level funded positions to attend a conference each year of the project at

a cost of \$1,500 each year. While conferences can be valuable tools for professional development, more specific information needs to be included to justify this expenditure as a regular and ongoing annual cost for every member of the district team.

- includes a laptop computer for each of the ten district staff hired through the grant for each year of the grant; only one year should be needed.
- includes costs for a student data systems upgrade for e-portfolio system: this was not addressed within the narrative.
- provides only one budget and one budget narrative for all six of the remaining projects - the six participating high schools - and each has an identical budget for every budget category for every year despite an anticipated variation in numbers of students and teachers, CTE programs and academies to be added, differing needs for teacher professional development, and significantly different start-up costs for different math/science programs.

The budget does, however, include appropriate costs for:

- training stipends, to ensure that teachers are paid for the training and other work they do beyond the school day,
- supplies that will enable project staff to more easily complete their tasks

The application does not identify which funds are one-time investments. No information is provided on the future of the 39 grant-funded positions following the end of grant funding.

The proposal includes a budget for both the district level and the remaining six projects together. The application would be strengthened by individual budgets for each project that reflected the initiatives specifically planned for that school.

The score for this criterion is low.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0
---	-----------	----------

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not address this criterion here or elsewhere within the narrative.

The score for the criterion is 0.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	6

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The School District of Clay County will continue to coordinate efforts in a partnership with Clay Action Coalition, Inc. (CAC), initiated as a community collaboration and recognized in 2007 as a National Coalition. The organization serves as an advocate for community health, youth empowerment, and policies that promote safety and progress in the county.

The narrative includes significant detail describing CAC's activities within the county, supporting its role as a provider of services for youth, training, and outreach.

The applicant identifies three population-level desired results for students: one educational and two family and community supports. Only the latter are included on the Population-Level Results and the former on the Performance Measure. All three should be on both charts. The educational desired result subgroup is labeled "poor academic performance" and followed by both a baseline and a consistent annual decrease each grant year (from 44% to 35%). No definition for poor academic performance is provided nor is the student population that it includes or the subject areas it covers. The second subgroup included on the performance measures, "lack of commitment to school." would benefit from more specificity regarding its place in the Florida Youth Survey-Risk Factors. No information is offered as to who takes the survey, if it is required, or any other relevant data.

While the narrative provides a thorough review of the supports provided by CAC, it does not include any information on how the partnership between CAC and the district (or any individual participant school) would integrate education and their services. CAC plans to expand the Safe and Civil Schools approach into targeted schools, but it is not clear if they are the same targeted schools as the participant schools in this proposal.

CAC has identified areas for improving student and family supports and regularly provides those services, in concert with school and district counselors, including supports to military families and students with alcohol or drug problems.

There is no indication of a decision-making process or the involvement of parents in such a process at the school level. These stakeholders are involved with CAC at their decision-making levels.

The score for this criterion is in the middle range.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The application submitted by the School District of Clay County does not meet the Absolute Priority. The proposal indicates little emphasis on personalized learning, evidenced by the following:

- the applicant does not coherently and comprehensively address any of the four core educational assurance areas. There is no reference to any academic standard throughout the narrative nor any specific standard for college- or career readiness. A student data system is in place and, although there are funds for a significant upgrade in the budget, there was no aligned discussion within the narrative to provide a rationale. While funds were set aside for teacher stipends to cover professional development, the proposal did not address recruiting, developing, retaining, or rewarding effective teachers and principals or placing them in high-need areas. One example was provided relative to turning around a low-achieving school; the example was from 2010.
- throughout teaching and learning, the proposal provides no emphasis on individualized learning. Even with the addition of new CTE and Academy programs, no professional development is identified specific to a program, and every budget for every school is identical for every year.
- student achievement goals and graduation goals are lockstep; every expectation for every performance objective for every annual target is similar. This does not lend itself to a personalized learning environment.
- The budget provides a 1:1 device for every student but there is no training for students or teachers and no description of how the device can be used to personalize learning, increase access to resources, integrate content areas, communicate, or other fundamental uses.
- the applicant does not apply the correct definition to effective and highly-effective teacher and principal; 100% of the principals at the six target high schools are considered highly qualified during the baseline year.

The proposal does not include a high-quality plan according to the definition provided. Personalized learning environments are not a priority.

Total	210	71
--------------	------------	-----------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0206FL-2 for School District of Clay County

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has set forth a reform vision to redesign the high schools of the district into small learning communities.

- It builds on the four core educational assurances. The district is in a state that has adopted the Common Core Standards. The proposal states that the district has a "robust assessment data management and assessment system". There will be focused on-going professional development to support the plan, which includes job embedded professional development and cross-curricular planning.
- The proposal discusses the research of how small learning communities accelerate student achievement, deepening student learning. Some of the research in the narrative includes citations, but other research is very general. An example is "According to a recent Educational Leadership article..." This does not give us the date, the issue or even the author of what they are citing.

This section does not address how the district has turned around its lowest performing schools which is part of the work in the four core educational assurance areas. Nor does it address equity through personalized student support. It does not describe what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments. Each high school already offers some academy programs so the grant is actually increasing the number of academies at six of its high schools. The seventh high school is not included because it does not meet the requirements of the grant.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
--	-----------	----------

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Six high schools in the district will participate in the proposal based on data that shows the high schools need to expand offerings of existing small learning academies. In addition, the socioeconomic status of the students at each high school was included. The names of the schools and the total number of participating students, students from low-income families, high-need students, and participating educators are included. One of the high schools is not being included because the population does not meet the qualifications of the grant. Small learning communities already exist at the high school. The proposal aims to increase the number of academies so that all students will participate. This is not a new reform proposal. It is merely expanding on what is currently in place. All of the high schools already have some small learning communities, so this is not a reform proposal. It is a scale up proposal. There is little narrative through out the proposal about how personalization of instruction would be addressed.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	5
--	-----------	----------

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

A high-quality plan is not included. There are some goals and activities included in the narrative but there are no apparent timelines, deliverables and parties responsible in the narrative or included in the appendix.

The district has been awarded the Ford Partnership for Advanced Studies Next Generation Learning (PAS NGL) which has begun to transform teaching and learning in the district. The district is building upon successful academies that are already in place. The grant wants to establish academies for all students across six of the seven high schools. Establishing additional academies is not an example of how the proposal will be scaled up. The narrative includes a statement that distinct elements must be addressed including curriculum, assessments, professional development, instruction and scheduling. It does not go into any detail how those elements will be addresses.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	5
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant includes achievable annual goals. There is no narrative that states the goals equal or exceed state ESEA targets. This section is receiving five points for the following reasons.

The performance on summative assessments is not ambitious. The summative assessments selected, Algebra I and Biology End of Course Proficiency is disaggregated according to race. Post grant, the goals state that only 61% of the African-American students will have proficiency in Algebra I, but 100% of the Asian students will. The overall goal of 74% proficient in the Algebra 1 End of Course assessment is achievable. It is not ambitious. For the Biology End of Course Proficiency, the overall goal is the 86% of the students will be proficient, post grant, but only 69% of the African American population and 65% of the Native American population.

The methodology for decreasing achievement gaps is to compare the current scores in FCAT Reading to the students in the prior year's cohort and to compare the current student result of FCAT Algebra I to the students in the prior year. This methodology seems flawed. Scores should be compared to disaggregated data to determine that all subgroups perform

similarly on similar tests.

Goals for graduation rates are included. The two subgroups uses are 4 Year Federal Rate, and At Risk 4 Year Rate. Graduation Rates for the same subgroups addressed on summative assessments and on the achievement gap are not included.

Goals for the College Enrollment rate are included for all subgroups. The end goals for Economically Disadvantaged, English Learners, Hispanics and Students with Disabilities are all under 75% at the end of the grant. It states that only 67% of Economically Disadvantaged and 67% of English Learners will attend college. These rates are not ambitious.

Data for Postsecondary Degree Attainment Goals are included.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	4
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant has a record of success in the past four years. The number of the District's Career and Technical Education (CTE) have grown from 10 to 16 over the last past years. The district is designated a Ford Next Generation Learning (NGL) Community by the Ford Motor Company Fund. Three Clay County School District Academies have earned Model Academy status from the National Career Academy Coalition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The students enrolled in the existing small learning communities are performing better than students not enrolled in an academy. The academy students have better attendance, higher graduation rated, higher GPAs, and a lower discipline rate. The narrative states that high school graduation rates and college rates have also improved, but data is not included for al of these. This information is shared in the narrative and through a table that resembles a slide from a Power Point presentation. The narrative and slide do not provide additional information. It gives us figures but the figures aren't part of a larger data set that would demonstrate a clear record of success. The reforms of one of the high schools, Clay HS, has turned the state review measure from a D in 2008-09 to receiving an A in the last two years. The plan for improvement included staffing and scheduling changes, weekly common planning time, instructional coaches for reading and science, professional development, and lesson study. "Classrooms became more student-centered and teachers, staff and administration closely monitored student progress and provided immediate interventions to address individual learning needs". Administrators and staff were assigned students to mentor. Through the state Phase I Race to the Top funding, a robust data system is in place that provides information to teachers, students and parents. <p>Although information is provided for one school and for the differences between students in academies and not, the narrative does not show a clear record of success in increasing equity in learning and teaching. The data included is only for one school but the academies are located in most of the other schools. Achievement data, high school graduation rates are only given for one high school.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	0
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant has not demonstrated evidence of a high level of transparency in the LEA processes, practices and investments. Information and data addressing this section are not included in the narrative nor in the Appendix.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	5
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>There are conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the proposal. The district and the state are both implementing the Common Core State Standards. There is a focus of increased rigor for all students. Recent state legislation provides autonomy to achieve these goals. The school district is building on state initiatives and well-established research. The narrative does not address additional reasons other than the ones just stated. These are general statements. The</p>		

narrative does not go into detail about why conditions that exist would create success of the proposal.

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

15

4

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

There is a description of how students, families, teachers and principals were engaged after it was decided that small learning communities would be established. The proposal does not include narrative on how stakeholders were engaged in the proposal, both in writing or revising based on feedback. There is no evidence of direct engagement and support for the proposal from teachers in participating schools.

There are letters of support from stakeholders. Most are from organizations that participate in existing academies from the schools. There is one letter from a student. There are no letters from the union or from teachers.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	7

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not have a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching. There is narrative around a plan and goals, activities, timelines, but deliverables and responsible parties are not included. The narrative of the application does address how personalized learning academies will improve learning and teaching. All students would participate in a rigorous course of student aligned to college- and career-ready standards.

The narrative describes how students and counselors will be engaged. It does not address parent support. The structure of the small learning academies support the idea that students could identify and pursue learning linked to college- and career- ready standards. It does not address how students will understand what they are learning is key to their success. The students will be able to be involved in learning experiences of academic interest. Students will have access and exposure to diverse cultures, context, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning. Students will be asked to master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as demonstrating independence, building strong content knowledge, responding to varying demands of audience, task, purpose and discipline, comprehend a well as critique, value evidence, use technology and digital media strategically and capably and come to understand other perspectives and cultures. It does not address mastering critical academic content and developing skills and traits such as goal-setting, and problem-solving.

Students will be involved in a personalized learning academy. The narrative does not address how students would have a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development. The narrative does not address instructional approaches and environments. It is inferred that there will be high-quality content. Ongoing and regular feedback will be provided on the data system. The narrative does not address accommodations. Another section describes the use of "high effect size instructional strategies" that will be selected by the district leadership team. There is also mention of the use of differentiation, but not how it will be used. There is no narrative around providing training and support to students to ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them. This section of the grant is structured for us to find out more about the students' learning. It is lacking that description.

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

20

4

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A plan is described in the narrative but it does not meet the features of a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. Activities, goals and timelines are listed but there are no deliverables, and responsible parties.

The district will be using Lesson Study to improve instruction and increase the capacity to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready goals. All participating educators and administrators will engage in training to support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student's academic needs. The narrative addresses the use of differentiation but does not address how it will be used nor does it address

whether content in each personalized learning academy will be further personalized to meet the needs of each student. Each learning academy will have its own content to provide opportunities for students to engage in common and individualized tasks. It does not address how the content of each academy and the assessments will be aligned to the standards. A data system will provide frequent measures of student progress. The narrative does not address how the use of data will inform both the acceleration of student progress and collective practice of educators. The use of frequent feedback will be addressed through the professional learning communities.

All participating educators will be involved. The use of Florida Educator Accomplished Practices will help educators identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests.

All of the participating school leaders and school leadership teams will have training to enable them to structure a personalized learning environment. The information from the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices rubrics and other feedback will help school leaders and school leadership teams improve teach effectiveness.

The applicant does not include a high-quality plan to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly-effective teachers and principals. It is expected that the use of the Florida Educator Accomplished Practices rubrics will improve the number of effective and highly-effective teachers.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	3
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant does not have a high-quality plan to support project implementation. Activities of the central office staff that provides support and services to the participating schools are listed. However, besides a brief job description for each staff member there are no goals, timelines, deliverables included in the narrative. All schools will be organized into small learning communities. The narrative does not address calendars, school personnel decisions and budgets. The narrative does not address whether students will be given the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery. It does address providing more time for students who need it. It does not address giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple ways. It does not address providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English Learners.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant supports personalized learning and has a plan to support the project implementation. However, the plan provided contains goals and activities and a timeline but it does not contain deliverables and the responsible parties. Therefore, it is not considered a high-quality plan.</p> <p>All participating students and educators will have access to personalized learning. Stakeholders will provide support to the students and educators in the personalized academies. The narrative does not address how parents will have access to content, tools, learning resources, and technical support.</p> <p>An information technology system is in place. The narrative does not address whether parents and students would be able to export the information in an open data format.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	4
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>There is a plan for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides feedback on progress toward</p>		

goals. It includes goals, activities and a timeline but it does not included deliverable and the responsible parties. The narrative addresses how the applicant will monitor progress and talks about public engagement but does not address how the applicant will monitor, measure and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top-District.

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

5

2

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

There is a plan for some ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders but it does not meet the features of a high-quality plan. It is more of a plan to communicate information about small learning communities and the academies that are at each high school.

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

5

1

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Performance measures are included for all students. It includes all of the required measures but they are not all broken out by subgroup. There is no rationale stated for the selection of measures. The goals are not ambitious.

The first performance measure listed is for all students and rates the number and percentage of participating students whose teacher and principal are highly effective. The data shows that, at present, 65% of all students have a highly effective teacher and that all principals are rated as highly effective. Post grant, it is expected that only 80% of the teachers will be highly effective but that all (100%) percent of the principals will be highly effective. It is highly unlikely that all principals are highly effective at the present.

The second measure, the number and percentage of participating students who complete and submit the FAFSA form, only gives data for students who receive Free and Reduced Lunch. This percentage at the beginning of the grant is 22% and post grant the percentage of low income students submitting the application is at 40%. It would make more sense if more low income students completed that application. If this population is not submitting the applications, the district should be working with the students and families to do so.

The third measure, the number and percentage of participating students who are on track to college- and career-readiness is broken out for some subgroups. It is lacking data for English Learners. The purpose of the grant is to personalize learning environments so that students become college- and career- ready. Post grant, the only subgroup that would be 100% on track are the Asian subgroup. The other subgroups vary from 61% for African-Americans, to 80% of Native Americans.

The fourth measure, is End of Course Proficiency for Algebra I, and Biology. Again, there is no data included for English Language Learners. Again, Asians are expected to almost all be on track to being college- and career-ready. Some outcomes are expected to be in the 60% range for African-Americans in both subjects. It is expected that post-grant only 74% of all students taking Algebra I would be college- and career-ready and 86% of all students on the Biology end of course proficiency test.

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

5

1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

There is a plan to evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top - District funded activities. The narrative includes the name of the evaluators, the process they will use and how the evaluation will be shared. It does not include specific goals or all the activities the evaluators would be evaluating. There is no timeline.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's budget includes all funds that will support the project. The majority for the funding is requested for Personnel and Equipment. It provides a description of how the applicant will use the Race to the Top - District grant but

does not identify any other funds that will be used to support the implementation of the proposal. One-time funding will include the wiring and installation of internet capability and the purchase of tablets for students to use. The budget supports the application but does not project funds being used past the end of the project. Since much of the budget is being allocated for personnel, it is hard to see how the grant will be sustained after the proposal.

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

10

0

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not address the sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. There will be some summer institutes available.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	5

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The Clay Action Coalition (CAC) coordinates planning processes that identifies needs and resources, sets goals and priorities, evaluates programs and practices, and measures and reports results for all stakeholders in the county. The Coalition partners with the County Health Department, Medical Center, and the Chamber of Commerce. A Youth Task Force was created to help prevent substance abuse. The Coalition works in all community sectors and with all ages. It also coordinates with other organizations in the community, including the school district.

A Comprehensive Student Support System will be implemented which will "develop a continuum of programs and services that support a school's academic, social, emotion and physical environments so that all students learn". The initiative will "utilize a three-tiered approach incorporating universal, early, and intensive proven effective strategies". The description of this system is lacking in the description of the system. It does not include measures or triggers that the system will be using. It also does not include a description of what would be included in each of the three tiers universal, early and intensive. It also does not include a narrative of what the proven effective strategies are.

The district has been using "Safe and Civil Schools" in 24 of their 40 schools and plan to include all high schools. This focuses on positive behavior support and Response to Intervention for behavior. In addition, the high school program "Too Good for Drugs and Violence" will promote "students pro-social skills, positive character traits, and violence- and drug-free norms". This program includes optional family and community involvement.

The applicant provides a description of coherent and sustainable partnerships to support their plan. There are Population-Level Desired Results for students and parents. There is one Performance Measure included which looks at the Florida Youth Survey risk factors. However, a description of how the partnerships would track the selected indicators is not included. The narrative does not address how the data will be used to target resources or how to improve results over time.

A description is included of how the partnership would address social-emotional and other services. It also describes how the partnership would build capacity of staff in schools.

There are three annual performance measures included. The student population measure is looking for a decline in the number of students reporting substance abuse. The second measure is looking to see if the parent population is increasing satisfaction with the schools. The third measure is the Florida Youth Survey where a decline of poor academic achievement is expected over the years of the grant. These measures do not go far enough to measure whether the partnerships formed or the comprehensive data system is doing a good job. The measures are achievable but they are not ambitious.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not coherently and comprehensively address how it will build on the core educational assurance areas. There are no hi-quality plans throughout the application. The proposal is looking to establish additional small learning communities or academies in all but one of the high schools. Academies already exist at all of the high school level. So this isn't a reform proposal; it is an expansion or even a scale up of what already exists. The proposal does not address specific strategies that will be used within the academies that would significantly improve learning and teaching. The proposal does not go into detail how student achievement will be accelerated and student learning deepened. Reading the proposal, these are magical things that will take place once the academies are in place. It does not address how that will happen. The proposal also does not address how each student's academic needs will be met. It is expected that the personalized learning communities and the continued look at data and student work will increase the effectiveness of educators. It does not go into detail what measures will take place for teachers who are not reflecting on the conversations of the PLCs and what alternate measures will take place if the teachers do not improve their effectiveness. The proposal does not address how achievement gaps will be closed. It does not have high expectations for all subgroups.

Total	210	72
--------------	------------	-----------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0206FL-4 for School District of Clay County

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Clay County's overall vision is both comprehensive and coherent. The vision lays out the goals explicitly.

Clay County builds on its work in four core educational assurance areas

1. Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy

- It is extensively explained how the district has increased business relationships in order to strengthen the graduation employment bond that is needed within a community. This may be seen in the Ford PAS program in which the district has been involved in since 2011. This will contribute to preparing students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy.

2. Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most

- Clay County Describes- For small learning communities to influence learning, plans for improving what takes place in the classroom must be as explicit as plans for changing the school's structure. What's missing in current efforts is a substantial investment in teachers—for example, providing opportunities to learn what it means to teach in a rigorous manner and how to achieve relevance by changing the nature of curriculum and instruction. The School District of Clay County intends to address this lesson that others have learned by assuring that professional development and the accompanying pedagogical shifts are addressed with fidelity through training, modeling and coaching.

3. Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction

- This are needs elaborated upon.

4. Turning around our lowest-achieving schools

- This will be done through the academies as done with their previous model academy, in which they "turned" one of their lower performing schools around previously by creating small learning communities in once larger schools.

Clay County 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;

- Their approach to achieve these goals is clearly displayed in their effort to reorganize their largest- need school districts into smaller learning academies. This serves to create environments that will best serve their largest achievement gap students. Data supports this target in the tables that share the districts of focus. Their research points out that the academies will serve to increase the relevance of the curriculum and then may in turn also make the curriculum more rigorous. Past experience in this area is present and the effect has been positive and because of this expansion the goal is to continue to see positive results. This will happen through supported efforts, that are described in the narrative, for both the students and the educators.

Clay County describes what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments.

- The classroom experience is described as for moving from a larger atmosphere into a smaller more personalized one. Research is presented that shows this can increase individualization for the student, while also increase graduation rates for those normally at -risk. This will increase equity through personalized student support.
- To achieve this end, the district is committed to providing teachers and students with high quality learning resources in a technology rich environment. Through this vision, and the accompanying plan for implementation and capacity building, all teachers and administrators will provide highly effective instruction to all students. The goal is that highly effective individuals will impact all students, especially in the STEM fields, and working with those students with special needs.

The goals presented by Clay County are both attainable and also rigorous, which supporting the credible and clear approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement. Deepening student learning is addressed through progressive teacher training to make their curriculum rigorous.

(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
--	-----------	-----------

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The extent to which the applicant's approach is clearly described, showing the process that the applicant used to select schools to participate. There is a list of schools that is to be included, along with the participating students and the sub-groups required. Specifically, the data from the high schools was carefully reviewed as to looking for the area of greatest need. This began with the socioeconomic status of the student populations and was further filtered with by the free and reduced lunch population.</p> <p>The response clearly states that the district will support high-quality LEA- level and school level implementation through focused, on-going professional development, time allocation for cross-curricular planning for all teachers involved in the project, job embedded professional development, and activities to build and sustain community and community stake holders. Most importantly there is also a vision to adapt to differences in the sites. They are planning on customized, unique site-based implementations.</p>		

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
----------------------------------	--	--

The following are found after analyzing other areas of the grant. A3 may not be specifically found.

The high- quality plan includes taking the successful academies and expanding its programs annually while safeguarding to keep numbers regulated. This should affect the over-all district positively by lowering drop-out rates as well as raising scores as described in the goals that are highly set, yet attainable.

The master plan is also organized around the Ford PAS which would serve to positively affect the district's full student body. The Ford PAS is designed to transform teaching and learning, redesign high schools and includes civic leadership components. The district shows a strong relationship with this program and the program is in continuation.

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

10

6

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's vision is likely to result in improved student learning. Specifically, it lays out how they intend on decreasing achievement gaps, increase graduation rates, and increase college enrollment with the smaller school models. More detail could be given as to how they plan to increase performance on summative assessments.

Continuing, the district will tackle these issues with more focus on the teachers. High quality learning resources and a technology- rich environment will be implemented to all teachers involved in the district through professional development and PLCs.

Performance on summative assessments decreasing achievement gaps graduation rates, college enrollment rates are listed in this section as requested by A4.

I believe the goals to be ambitious yet achievable because the percentage of goals aiming for are comparable to percentage climbs they have seen in their previous data gathering from Clay High School.

Evidence for decreasing achievement gaps is seen in A4b where they define the specific methodology for determining achievement gap, specified for each assessed grade in reading or language arts and in mathematics. More elaboration could be done on this aspect to make items clearer.

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

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Clay County has demonstrated a clear record of success in the past 4 years. The academies have been crucial to the rise in learning outcomes and in closing achievement gaps. Data collected from the students who are in the academies has been shown to be higher than those that are not in the academies.

An Academy vs. Non-academy table displays that the attendance rate is 1.3% higher in the academy group. The GPAs are additionally showing a trend, notably the graduation rates in the academies is nearly 8% higher in the academy students. Almost 100% graduation rate. These show that they have achieved ambitious and significant reforms in the academy targeted schools.

In order to provide parents with increased communication the district is providing parents access to performance data and classroom information via a Parent Portal. This provides timely and ongoing progress of the students within their classrooms.

Additional trend-line information is provided for Clay High School communicating graduation of at- risk students, acceleration participation and performance, and reading and math readiness. This shows steady improvements from 2009-2011. Impressively they have also moved Clay High School from a D grade in 2008 to an A ranking by 2011 and then have remained steady from there. These grades were given by the Florida School Grading System.

Clay county has achieved ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools or in its low-performing schools. This is described In addition to the existing track record of our CTE academies, the district has demonstrated its capacity to turn around low performing schools. In 2008-09, Clay High School earned the letter grade of "D" under the Florida School

Grading System. In reference to Clay High School, there had been a decline in the Florida state school grade over the past two years, with the school receiving a "C" in the prior year, and a "B" in the year preceding that. After the implementation of the academies, in just one school year, Clay High successfully implemented their success plan, and received that letter grade of "B" that following year. In addition, the reforms that were put in place were continued, and for the past two years, Clay High has earned the letter grade of "A".

The quality of the response impressed upon me the impact their academies could have on low-performing schools and should be seen as a model that is continued as to repeat this effect.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	0
---	----------	----------

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

B2 cannot be found.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	8
--	-----------	----------

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The personalized learning environment described by Clay County is driving toward implementing the Common Core State Standards, increased rigor for all students. Within the development of the individual student's career plan each student is placed in the most appropriate learning community for that student. Part of this will be achieved by continuing to use a new data gathering system which tracks and monitors student progress for school and district improvement. The data is used to differentiate instruction and address gap issues. Additionally, they survey to get reports to match individual interests and then transfer this to their potential career match. In extension they also inventory the business community to find where needs lie to help direct future needs with future graduates. The extent as to which the district is striving to implement a personalized learning environment even addresses teachers needs and interests as to match them to their best suiting also.

Extension upon how they will specifically address the STEM areas and the 21st century skills is mentioned for students briefly.

The successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal is described that all students will learn within an individualized learning community that is focused on a field of interest. Its state context indicates that the district move forward toward the implementation of the Common Core State Standards, increased rigor for all students, and will take into account implications of recently enacted legislative initiatives.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	10
--	-----------	-----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Stakeholders were involved in the process and proposals starting in year one to focus on the professional development that the teachers and school leaders would need even before the small learning communities could be established.

In 2012, stakeholders visited The Academies of Nashville to observe their successes within their academies that are set up similarly to those in Clay County. The visit focused on communicating the Ford PAS Next Generation Learning Initiatives.

Upon return staff went back and debriefed and plans were made for a second cohort visit to Nashville in order to best obtain needed and wanted information from Nashville to the best of their ability.

Ten future stakeholder meetings are already scheduled to be conducted to add more community engagement.

There are also student focus groups that are being organized to capture student voices and interests. All of which promote meaningful stakeholder engagement.

For LEAs without collective bargaining representation, at a minimum, evidence that at least 70 percent of teachers from participating schools support the proposal. Evidence is not given on this aspect.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	16

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Clay County's 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. Clay County's high quality plan includes the following items:

- Student assessment using the district's progress monitoring this seems to be ongoing and in depth--
 - The support of parents and educators and all students are areas of detail that should be elaborated on although it is understood that they will have access to the data systems in place
- Remedial coursework for students to keep them on their academic and career pathways this helps to cover an approach to learning that engages and empowers all learners, in particular high-need students
 - This also shows that accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students that will help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements
- Mentors, counselors, and educators will stay with the same groups of students throughout high school
- Implementation of the common core state standards and anchor standards for college and career readiness which indicates a rigorous and relevant curriculum
- Creation of student learning plans that will guide them on their pathways showing they are able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest as well
 - as showing a mastery of critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving
 - and showing 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
- Students will be placed into small learning communities throughout their high school career
- Students will be monitored and tracked according to ability and interests
 - This presents the 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.
- Clay County's career academy example schedule was also used as an artifact. On observation it applies equity while at the same time it challenges all levels of students. The bottom portion of the academy pathway study includes postsecondary structure and sample career pathways. It presents exactly how deep learning may occur.

Areas to be extended upon:

- Details about strategies for high need students
- Accessing and exposing to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning can be elaborated upon as well

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

20

17

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Clay County's approach to teaching and leading that helps educators to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards is as follows:

All participating educators engage in training, and in professional teams or communities, that supports their individual and collective capacity to:

- The professional development has shifted from a passive participant learning to active participant participation.
- They began structuring and focusing their professional development into Professional Learning Communities
- The PLC design will support principals and their leadership teams in using the teacher evaluation system to improve the teacher performance
- The district leadership team shall participate in a PLC focused on research- based instructional strategies and leadership including professional reading, webinars, and book readings. The district leadership teams will then bring the information back to the district PLCs.
- The district will be providing a lesson study update for all trained facilitators to further build skills and abilities
- One of their main focuses is on working on appropriate instructional shifts and practices that are called for from the Common Core
- Their training models will consist of live research lessons
 - This shows that all participating educators engage in training, and in professional teams or communities, that supports their individual and collective capacity
- Student data will be scrutinized in order to make this experience rooted in the classroom and connected to students
- Their professional development will be centered on high effect yield strategies, instructional rounds, data analysis,

- and on shifts in instructional practice from the common core
- PLCs will meet on a bimonthly basis
- The schools will establish model classrooms, these model classrooms will focus on the Common Core.
- From this model lessons will take place for training and feedback will be given based upon the area of need

All participating educators have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements should be elaborated upon. As described above.

All participating school leaders and school leadership teams 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 or college- and career-ready graduation requirements. As described above also.

The extent to which the applicant has a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching are listed above. The plan works to personalize 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.

Additional supplement material could be included upon:

- What high-quality learning resources will be used, including digital resources, as appropriate, that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirement, and the tools to create and share new resources.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	11

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Clay County's policies and structure to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure for every student, educator, and level of the education system with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed follows:

- Additional staff will be needed in order to support these new programs

Organizing the LEA central office, or the consortium governance structure, to provide support and services to all participating schools is described below:

- The Career and Technical Department and other supports from other departments will be in charge of the deliverable content within their application

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

- All parties involved in this process will have a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities, timelines and project goals and outcomes.
- There will be a High School Redesign team will visit school sites weekly to support classroom instruction and ensure fidelity of the design elements and will provide regular updates to the superintendent and senior staff
- At the district level there is a district leadership team that will meet bi-weekly to monitor progress and provide needed support
- The Academy Advisor Teams exist at each school site and will be involved in all planning meeting and serve as expert voices in the community
- The Secondary Administrator PLC will provide training and support for the PLC work
- The School Support Teams will supervise the day to day operations and meet weekly to evaluate implementation, collect and analyze data, and will also identify professional development needs
- The Small Learning Community Team will meet bi-weekly to plan for learning projects, to evaluate lesson effectiveness. They will also be monitoring student progress
- All academy teachers, staff and administrators will have an individualized professional development plan based on the needs of the students they are assigned

Giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic and giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways both need elaborated upon

Providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners needs elaborated upon also.

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

10

7

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Clay County intends to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed the following ways:

- There will be technology based professional development
- All academies will have sufficient facilities
- A marketing and communication plan will be in place to all segments of the community
- A rigorous and relevant curriculum will be in place to prepare the students to be college and career ready.
- Project based learning will be a big part of the instruction
- Assessment will drive teaching and learning
- Additionally, there will be supports for business engagement and support, parent and family involvement, post-secondary connections, and student supports

The items intended all seem to present but the above lack details exactly how this will happen just more that they will happen. This includes a lack of information for fulfilling the criterion for using information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format as well as for ensuring that LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	13

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Clay County's plan 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 is as follows:

- In order to be prepared for ongoing changes Clay County will be implementing the Continuous Improvement Model (CIM) along with aspects of the Barksdale 8-Step Model and Deming's Plan-Do- Check- Act Models
 - Plan- Regular Data disaggregation, instructional calendar development
 - Do- Directing the instructional focus
 - Check-Assess the targeted skill
 - Act- Remediate and enrich
- The above will cover curriculum and assessment and classroom instruction (21st Century Digital Age Literacy, Workforce Readiness, Educational Technology Standards, College Readiness, Adult Literacy, and Cognitive Science)
- The work on many of these items will be done in PLCs during paid summer work
- Additional work will be done in administrator training
- Additional work will be done with ongoing communication and stakeholder engagement

Clay County's plan seems prepared for rigorous improvement as they have multiple check points and ways in which they plan on continuously improving their model. Using the three different models to ensure continuous improvement continuous will work well if the information taken from these assessment techniques is heeded and carried through.

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

5

4

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The additional work being done with ongoing communication and stakeholder engagement is described as the following by the Clay County.

- The district has begun the process of community engagement through the superintendent's speaking schedule, and through teacher focus groups. This process will be continued as the district moves forward.
- A steering committee will be in the plans to be established. The purpose of the steering committee will be to review data, correlate progress to timelines, make recommendations for adjustments in the scope of the program, and to provide feedback of community perception.
- At the student level, the district has implemented a student data system from which students and parents have 24/7 access to student data via a parent portal.
- This web-based system allows parents timely information about student performance. The parent portal provides the district another means for improving school to home communication.
- Through the implementation of the one-to-one student device initiative, digital student portfolios are going to be implemented so that parents will have access to more detailed information on the level of work their child is completing, and will be able to see growth over time.
- The portfolio system will follow the student from 9th grade through graduation, thereby allowing for longitudinal monitoring of student progress. Mastery indicators, aligned to college and career readiness, will be imbedded, allowing students and parents to follow progress, and highlight any needs for adjustment in learning paths that may need to occur.
- This is stated to allow for greater student control over their educational pathway, and will assure higher engagement and ownership of their program, individualizing to meet their specific goals and needs.

The applicant has the components of a high-quality plan because the ongoing and continuous stakeholder communication and engagement appears to be well developed and proven over time.

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

5

2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The candidate has all applicable population shared.

The first documented are all participating students with highly effective teacher and principal percentage per pupil and effective teacher and principal per pupil percentage.

The number and percentage of participating students who complete the FAFSA form is the second data group presented.

The number and percentage of participating students who are on track to college- and career- readiness based on the applicant's on- track indicator is the third data group analyzed.

The third group shares at least one measure of career-readiness in order to assess the number and percentage of participating student who are on track or are career ready.

The fourth is a performance measure of 9th-12th grade African American, all, and White sub groups on the Algebra 1 EOC and Biology EOC.

The rationale for selection was not clear as the reason for choosing it has not been elaborated upon. The above listed appear to be rigorous and timely, formative assesment descriptors are not elaborated upon. The absence of this information hinders a higher score as it is not meeting the criterion for a-c as listed as needed for the performace measures.

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

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Clay County plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities, such as professional development and activities that employ technology is detailed below.

- There will be an external evaluation team from Health-Tech Consultants, a minority founded independent research and evaluation firm with more than 25 years of experience
- The evaluation will use a community based participatory research evaluation model
 - it will provide best practice research, data, and addressments to compare the latest local data and programming to national models to guide program design, implementation, refinement, and expansion
 - this ensures effective communication between key stakeholders, implementation of school-wide curricular

strategies and to monitor program fidelity

- primary goal of the evaluation will be to enable the project to meet reporting requirements, provide feedback to staff for program improvement, and to validate program objectives
- Assigned district staff will conduct quarterly reviews, collect semi-annual data, administer specific instruments, and will get specific data to the evaluation team
- The evaluation team will develop data collection procedures, surveys, interview guides, focus group protocols, will conduct data analysis, and provide on-going feedback and progress reports
- A statistical t-test will be used to determine differences in program impact by site, gender, age, and method of program delivery
- Qualitative data will be used in a thematic approach
- At the end of each school year a comprehensive summative evaluation report and presentation will provide the statistical analysis, statistically significant changes and information about the performance indicators

All of these described appear to be a clear part of a high quality plan as described by the district. This is due to the clear outline of the professional development and use of technology that will be used as a part of this plan.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicants budget sketches out where funds will be distributed. This budget is described for all 6 of the schools with one lead administrator. Additional they will higher 3 full time curriculum specialists, 2 guidance department heads, 3 technology integration specialists. There will be associated professional development designated for these new employees. Each will need laptops. There will also be contracted professional development for project-based learning, curriculum integration, and PLC development. Summer institutes will provided for planning of the integration of the curriculum.</p> <p>The plan also calls for 12 FTE with an English?LA backgrounds and and STEM backgrounds.The will be doing the modeling and coaching for the other instructors. There will also be an additional 6 FTE whose jobs will be helping to make shifts brought upon by the Common Core and 21st Century learning. Job specific professional development will be needed for all of these. Salaries are described for all and they are acceptable and reasonable in amounts.</p> <p>The remainder describes specific equipment and technologies that are needed to implement all programs and are tools for the initiative.</p> <p>The budget seems feasible although I would expect more variability between one school to the next as the amounts for all districts are the same, although equal allotments could be done.</p> <p>It is stated that there will be some customization of purchases depending on the 6 site needs.</p> <p>The details of the budget are well detailed, even down to printer needs, carts, hubs, and wiring infrastructure.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Little information is found about the estimated budget for the 3 years after the term of the grant. It is difficult to see a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant because of the lack of elaboration and details on this topic.</p> <p>The following 2 items were mentioned but the plan needs to also include support from State and local government leaders, financial support, and a description of how the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use this data to inform future investments. Such a plan may address how the applicant will evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes to inform a post-grant budget and this is not found.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The summer institutes will be of smaller scale following the initial 2 years • Budgetary considerations are in place to replace or refresh the technology as each new cohort of freshman enter the school 		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

To meet this priority, Clay County discussed 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. Their main resource for this is the CAC (Clay Action Coalition). The CAC will:

- will serve as a partner with the school district to help link all stakeholders to articulate the vision of their educational system.
- will make efforts to ensure volunteer leadership and execution of coalition strategies

Additionally they have set a goal of promoting students' success through building positive relationships and creating supportive environments. This will happen with:

- parent, family and community engagement
- safe and civil schools through the integration of pbs (positive behavior support)
- S2S (Student 2 Student) initiative to ease transition of military families into the school district

Data provided:

- Florida Youth Survey Risk Factors and poor academic performance and lack of commitment to schools decrease to 32% and 25% for target year
- FYS hope of a steady decline of drug use for each year receipt of grant
- Greater parent satisfaction with the school via the Climate Survey for each year receipt of grant

The district does a clear job of describing their competitive preference priority. Including its coherency and sustainability. More details on the ambitious yet achievable performance measures could be included.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The personalized learning environment is epitomized in the sections in which Clay county shared its example of the individualized learning plan as well as Clay county's vision for the academies.

Total	210	155
--------------	------------	------------