



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0115FL-2 for The School Board of Polk County, Florida

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Builds on 4 core educational assurance areas and expands on each of these features using AMP</li> <li>(a) no clear understanding of AMP and how it would be implemented even though there is mention of AMP connecting to the core educational assurances</li> <li>(b) Methods are listed as to what approach will be taken but with no connection to how these will help achieve student improvement</li> <li>(c) Classroom experience is described with some connection to the program and how it drives what is seen in the classroom</li> <li>(c) clear description of the school campuses and how they will participate</li> </ul> <p>This plan is not given in a linear fashion and was difficult to decipher except as a whole reading</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) selection of the District's cleanest feeder pattern is confusing and this statement needs to be clarified by the applicant.</li> <li>(a) school has been selected and meets the requirements of this application</li> <li>(b) list of participating schools is available</li> <li>(c) Table shows number of participating students from low-income families, high needs students, and participating educators</li> </ul>		
<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>This application is weak to the extent that it does not describe how the proposal will be scaled up or translated into meaningful district-wide change. This application does not include a high quality plan and does not describe how the reform proposal will be scaled up. There is a reform listed for district-wide change but no specifics as to how this program will reach its goals. There is mention of upgraded services and access to data but not a clear method of implementation. There is no mention of student learning outcomes and how they would relate to this vague program.</p>		
<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) (b) (c) tables and charts are broken down with growth goals but no implementation of how this plan will connect to that growth. In these criteria there were goals listed with numbers on a table that had no explanation which lacked connection to the plan.</li> <li>(d) missing data for college enrollment weakened this applicant.</li> </ul>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>
<p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>This applicant demonstrated a strong record of success with a lack of specific details which weakened this applicant for this criteria.</p> <p>(a) The applicant shows improved high school graduation rates as well as college enrollment by offering dual credits which is a strength of this criteria</p> <p>(a) 600% increase in high school career academies speaks to raising student achievement and gives details on how this applicant improves student learning.</p> <p>(b) Charts and poverty levels show growth for those students living in poverty, however, there is no connection to school reform or low performing schools which weakens this application.</p> <p>(c) parent access to student information is clear and concise with various ways and means to access the information and meets the criteria</p> <p>(c) educator access to students testing scores as well as other information is available and meets the criteria</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>(a) (b) (c) (d) salaries are available through state web sites and by request from anyone to the superintendent</p> <p>(d) no mention of non=personnel expenditures</p>		
<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>This is an adequate plan with missing criteria which weakens this applicant for this criteria.</p> <p>There is a mention of extended days and extended years as being condoned with no mention of any other implementation of personalized learning environments. The conditions and sufficient autonomy are not clear and not sufficiently mentioned in order to meet this criteria.</p>		
<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>This application lacks meaningful stakeholder engagement for this proposal.</p> <p>(a) (i) a meeting was mentioned with no clarifying evidence of engagements from teachers in participating schools and the support these programs would receive.</p> <p>(a) (ii) a list of issues that have arisen are given with not clear path to how this affects implementation</p> <p>(b) letters of support were a mixture of short paragraphs and several pages. The support was evident from the few who submitted them.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>6</b>
<p><b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p>		

(a) (i) no connection with the plan to students connecting their learning with research being quoted. The project speaks to creating deliberate learning connections with no plan or explanation of how that follows from this program. Providing students with choices discusses activities with materials but lacks specifics. Possible programs are suggested but not connected specifically. This program implementation speaks to various ideas such as early college classes and credit recovery with no specifics on how to obtain these for students.

(ii) There is research quoted with teachers having autonomy around what is being implemented. There is a lack of specifics around how and what exactly is being implemented into this project and then there is a lack of connection to student outcome.

(iii) This speaks to NGSs and PBL with no real clear vision of how that takes place and how this is going to connect to student learning or outcomes. UbD is mentioned with no real implementation plan in place for connecting this to student learning or teacher improvement.

(iv) This application has broad, overarching comments and does not tie this to how or what is going to happening exactly and how this program impacts diversity and cultural experiences.

(v) Talking about AVID means this program includes an AVID component with no connection to how students will access this program and what pieces will be implemented in order to improve instructional strategies.

(c) There is a lack of information around providing training and support to students that will ensure they know how to use the tools and resources being implemented.

<b>(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

(a) (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) There is little connection to this program and educator improvement or connection to ensuring educator success. These sections are vague with research driven data that has been published but not linked to this program.

(b) (i) (ii) (iii) There is a mention of training that does not link to anything in their program. There is a plan in place for summer meetings and meetings to exchange ideas as well as analyze data. There is not plan in place to specifically connect to this program.

(c) (i) There is a model in place for Local Instructional Improvement System for teachers to be evaluated based on their effectiveness. Explanations are vague as to how this will be connected to their program.

(c) (ii) Specific meetings are planned to implement common core and standards with no connection to their specific program or how this will improve students growth or close the achievement gap. Professional Development is charted with no connection to this program and so is vague and lacks evidence of student improvement.

(d) There is no high quality plan in place for this to increase students who receive instruction from effective teachers or prinicipals.

**D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

With no high quality plan in place there is a lack of evidence for supporting services to all schools. With the chart of the leadership team there is a vision of what the leadership model could look like but with no connection to a program or decision making. Various curriculum is listed with no connection to a program or to students in order to have students obtain mastery around any given topic. "Looping" as a method of having students get information is mentioned with no clear vision of how each student will use "looping" in order to be connected to their learning or how this will improve student progress.

<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2</b>
---	-----------	----------

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

(a) (b) (c) (d) - There no evidence of students and all participating stakeholders having access to necessary content tools.

Technical support is not mentioned around student, parent, or educator access and there is nothing here that connects this program to information for anyone to access. Data systems are not mentioned such as how students, parents, and administrators will track progress or test scores or any other pertinent data.

### E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b> With no high quality plan or any implementation specifics, there is no data given or a plan given for goal driven improvements. There is dialogue mentioned with no clear vision of what that dialogue looks like or how it will address continuous improvement. There is no plan given for taking data with any subgroups or any groups at all and how that data will be disseminated in order to ensure student growth.		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b> Communication is clear as to how and who will be involved with this program (even though I'm not clear what the program is). There is lack of clarity on some of their communication which entail partnering with community organizations with no clear idea of who those organizations would be. Public Service announcements around specific data or information is lacking.		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b> This is a weak plan with a lack of information supporting the criteria for continuous improvement.  There is missing data around subgroups in all areas with data being filled in later per grade level, which creates a vague vision of the data. Lack of data from the 9-12 grade level group and having no baseline for any of the 9-12 or subgroups weakens this application for this criteria.		
<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b> With no high quality plan in place it is vague how it will be evaluated. There is an attempt to look at surveys and academic progress for the students. Teachers and administrators will be interviewed in order to assess the program which is vague and does not directly tie to student achievement.		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b> This budget is clear and concise and supports a project that is sustainable.  (a) This budget identifies all funds that are supporting the project which strengthens this application by meeting this criteria (b) The budget is vague and lacking about specifics on some monies such as personnel and equipment which weakens this application (c) Rationale for expenditures is lacking and vague which weakens this application which weakens the score.		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

There is no high quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals. The school board has supported the superintendent by reallocating some funds to support this program. There is lacking evidence of the use of data to inform future investments or any expenditure.

**Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

None of the above was addressed in this application. Lack of specifics on any of the criteria for this section and the fact that there is no high quality plan makes this applicant's response weak.

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Not Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

There is a lack of a high quality plan and how this plan would be implemented. There are no specifics around how this plan will address the core educational assurance areas or how this plan would impact the learning environments. With no clear plan there is a lack of evidence around personalizing strategies or tools to support students or educators. Accelerating student achievement was mentioned with a lack of how this was tied to this plan. Effectiveness of educators and decreasing the achievement gap was lacking in data and evidence of a plan for this program.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>75</b>
--------------	------------	-----------



**Race to the Top - District**

**Technical Review Form**

**Application #0115FL-3 for The School Board of Polk County, Florida**

**A. Vision (40 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>

**(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has cited research and given details about what has already been done or is being done in the schools to turn them around. The reform vision does not provide evidence of the following required elements:

(a) the four core educational areas are not adequately addressed - nor is it apparent how they will all be addressed through the vision

(b) there is no approach, clear or credible, to goals of accelerating student achievement or deepening student learning.

There is no evidence of how the vision will increase equity through personalized student support and there is no evidence that students are asked about their interests.

(c) The classroom experience was only stated for PreK-K and did not include secondary school at all. It appears that the PreK-K classroom experience was addressed, but it is very difficult to determine.

It is not clear what the project is trying to accomplish, or what its goals are, and how it will all be tied together to address the four core educational assurance areas. Specific goals are not stated so it is not possible to assess their affect on accelerating or deeping student learning and achievement.

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

**10**

**2**

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant fails to fully address the implementation approach. There is no description of the process that will be used, and the number of participating students and participating educators is not complete.

(a) there is no clear evidence of the process that was used, if any, to select the schools. The applicant goes into great detail about Frostproof Elementary, including the community demographics. However, there is no evidence of how it was selected to participate. The other two schools were not discussed. The participating schools' enrollment in table (A)(2) does not total the requisite 2,100 student required.

(b) There is a complete list of schools that will participate

(c) In the required template the totals do not match - column B. lists "Raw Data: # of participating students as 1,913. Column F lists "Raw Data: # of participating students" as 1,841

The applicant's approach to implementing the proposal is not clear and is incomplete. There is no evidence that the schools were selected based on any criteria and it is not clear if the 2,000 student minimum requirement has been met. The applicant does a poor job of addressing this criteria.

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

**10**

**2**

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

The application is missing a high-quality plan. There is no logic model or theory of change presented. Since there is no coherent reform vision, it is very difficult to see how it would be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform. There is no discussion or evidence on how the lessons learned would impact district-wide change. The application lacks evidence of how the plan would impact all students in the LEA.

The plan will allow the current technology systems to be upgraded to provide more detailed data to inform instruction and operational practices. However, the application does not state how it would be tied to LEA-wide reform and change.

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

**10**

**2**

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

State ESEA targets for the LEA are not given as part of the proposal. Therefore it is not possible to determine if their goals and performance outcomes are equal to or exceed these state targets.

(a) performance on state assessments is very ambitious, but more than likely not achievable. For example:

- increases for reading proficiency for English Language Learners is 32% for Frostproof Middle/Senior high and 21% for Students with Disabilities from year 1 to year 2. These are ambitious goals yet more than likely not achievable.
- increases in math for Black/African American students - the percentage goal is 32% from year 1 to year 2 This is ambitious yet more than likely not achievable.

(b) the evidence provided for closing achievement gaps is inconclusive and does not make sense. The achievement gap is defined in the criteria as the difference in the performance between each subgroup. Achievement gap data is not provided.

(c) graduation rate goals give evidence of being ambitious and achievable

(d) college enrollment criteria is non responsive

There is no evidence of how the applicant will attach all of these performance measures and the improved performance to student outcomes. Since the overall vision and plan are incoherent and inconclusive, it is not possible to tie the performance outcomes to the proposed project.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>There is no evidence of a clear track record over the past four years. The applicant's response to this criteria is weak and fails to show any clear track record of success.</p> <p>Strengths are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is some evidence that the LEA has worked with other organizations to enhance student learning</li> <li>• The applicant describes the demographics with the LEA's communities</li> <li>• student performance data is available to educators and parents</li> </ul> <p>The weaknesses of the responses are as follows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the performance data presented is only from the 2012-13 school year - not a four year period</li> <li>• The evidence that the LEA has worked with other organizations to enhance student learning to the vision nor does it give evidence of how student outcomes were affected</li> <li>• No evidence of reforms for the lowest-achieving schools was presented</li> <li>• There is no evidence that student performance data is available to students</li> <li>• There is no evidence of how the availability of this data has helped in the last four years in advancing student learning and achievement</li> </ul> <p>The applicant failed to fully respond to the required criteria and the responses are not tied to the vision of the plan.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>There is evidence that the LEA has a high level of transparency in its processes, practices and investments. The LEA publishes information on its website, and all information regarding expenditures is available to the public:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actual, school-level expenditures are available to the public at request and are approved in open school board meetings</li> <li>• Actual personnel salaries for instructional staff, teachers and instructional and support staff are available through two websites and available upon request from the public</li> <li>• Actual non-personnel salaries are available at the LEA's website as well as upon request</li> <li>• All expenditure information is communicated to the public through open comment periods for the budgeting process on an annual basis</li> </ul> <p>The applicant has fully responded to the criteria and shows that the level of transparency is high. The applicant's approach to transparency is high quality.</p>		
<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant has provided evidence that the LEA has autonomy under state law to (1) extend the school day and year , (2) establish multiple opportunities for student participation and (3) deliver courses by virtual offerings:</p>		

These state statutes are presented and quoted. However, the statutes and autonomy are in no way tied into how they would help to implement the personalized learning environment. The criteria states that there must be demonstrated evidence of how these regulations would help to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal. The personalized learning environments have not been described in a coherent manner, so it is not possible to determine if this criteria has been addressed.

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

**15**

**4**

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

There is no evidence that students, families, teachers and principals in participating schools were involved in the grant application process. There is no evidence that feedback, other than the required feedback from mayors, was solicited or that these groups were given the opportunity to provide suggestions.

Strengths:

- The applicant's response to this criteria cites statistics and demographics for the area and LEA
- There are letters of support from key stakeholders

Weaknesses

- There is no evidence that teachers are supportive of the proposal
- The applicant's response does not directly address the criteria of how the stakeholders were involved in the design of the project
- The letters of support from key stakeholders do not strongly support the project
- The applicant does not provide evidence that stakeholders were engaged or that communication was present throughout the process with stakeholders

The applicant has failed to address the criteria fully, and the responses that were given are of a minimal quality. There is no evidence of stakeholder engagement and support at a high level.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>5</b>

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The response to this criteria is not a high-quality plan in this criteria. It lacks rationale, activities, timelines and deliverables. There is no evidence that parents and educators will provide the support for the goals to be accomplished.

Although students will have access to the student portal to track their learning and progress toward goals, there is no evidence of parent and educator support to accomplish this.

There is no evidence that students will be able to identify their goals and learning *as the relate to college-and-career ready standards*. Although they will be able to see their progress, there is no evidence that the progress is tied to college-and-career ready standards or career-ready graduation requirements.

Students will be involved with academic areas of interest through developing their personalized learning, but there is no evidence that the learning will be deep or that it will be beyond the state and federal common standards.

Access to diverse cultures is proposed to be accomplished through the integration of all culturally diverse populations of students that already attend the schools. This is not sufficient.

The need for students to learn to set their own goals and develop non-cognitive skills is addressed, but no plan to achieve this is given

AVID strategies will provided to some participating students, but not all

There is evidence of a personalized sequence of instruction, but no mention of how parents and educators will support the student

There is no evidence of a variety of high-quality instructional approaches, but rather only the approaches that are already required by state and federal mandates

While there is evidence of digital learning, it is not clear whether or not it is aligned with college-and-career standards

No evidence of Accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students

There is no evidence that students will be trained to use the tools available to them to understand their progress toward goals.

There is a lot of research cited, and a lot of ideas presented, but no evidence as to how they will be implemented.

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

**20**

**5**

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

There is no evidence of a high quality plan in this criteria.

Cultural awareness training is addressed, but there is no evidence of how it will improve instruction or the attainment of college and career ready goals.

The criteria that are presented are done so as program implementation. However, there is no indication as to how they are not tied to teaching and leading. There is no evidence of how professional development will be provided to educators to prepare them to implement the program. Policies, tools, and training are not clearly stated.

Teachers will receive a 4-day summer training to learn about common core curriculum and other practices, but there is no evidence of how this will be tied into a personalized learning environment.

There is no evidence of a high quality plan to increase the number of students who receive instruction from highly effective educators.

Overall, there is no evidence to show how the ideas and initiatives in the proposal would tie into or be dependent upon the success of educators.

**D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

There is no evidence of a high quality plan.

There is no evidence of the LEA's central office's organization or that it has practices, policies and rules that will facilitate personalized learning

School schedules, calendars, personnel decisions and staffing models are not mentioned

Although student opportunities to progress and earn credit, opportunities to demonstrate mastery and learning resources are mentioned, they are not in the form of a high-quality plan and are not presented in the context of how practices, policies and rules would facilitate their implementation

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

**10**

**2**

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant's response to the criteria is lacking in evidence that all of the users will have technical support, be able to export their data into an open format, and that the data systems are inter operable.

Strengths:

- All participating students, parents and educators have access to student data

Weaknesses:

- There is no evidence that the student data that parents, educators and students have access to includes content or

- other learning resources outside of school
- There is no evidence of technical support for the users of the student data
- There is no evidence of information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in any format, let alone an open format
- There is no evidence of inter operable data systems
- There is no evidence of a high quality plan to implement this criteria

The applicant has failed to provide compelling evidence of comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator and parent with resources and tools that they need. Specifically, there is no evidence that student data will be available to students, educators and parents or that they be able to export it into an open format. No evidence of inter operable data systems, and also there is no evidence of a high quality plan to implement the criteria.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant has failed to fully address the criteria. There is not sufficient evidence that continuous improvement processes will be implemented, that feedback will be used for making ongoing corrections and improvements.</p> <p>Strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will be reports on project progress delivered to stakeholders</li> </ul> <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence of a high quality plan</li> <li>• There is no evidence that investments will be evaluated, or return on those investments</li> <li>• it is not evident that there will be any feedback allowed for ongoing corrections and improvements</li> </ul> <p>The applicant has failed to provide a high-quality plan for stakeholder feedback and an evaluation/assessment approach. There is no evidence, other than reports on project progress reports, that show how the applicant would provide for continuous feedback and improvement.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>There is no evidence of a high quality plan for stakeholder communication and engagement.</p> <p>Although there is narrative to describe communication and engagement with parents, other external stakeholders are not mentioned.</p> <p>The ongoing communication is not linked to continuous improvement of the project but rather specifies how communication with parents will increase without regard to soliciting feedback or other evaluative information from the project, and thus is not considered a high-quality plan.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
<p><b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The applicant was non-responsive to performance measures for ALL students for (a) and (b) as required on the table template.</p> <p>The performance measures for Pre K- grade 2 are presented. However, there is no evidence of its rationale for selecting this particular measure; In addition, the requirements state that the performance measures should be presented for grades</p>		

PreK - grade 3. There are no performance measures for grade 3.

The applicant was non-responsive to performance measures for grades 9-12 for completing the FAFSA.

The other performance measures required are submitted in a table format. However, there is no justification for the selection of these measures;

The performance measures for grades 4-8 are presented and are achievable but not necessarily ambitious. However, there is no justification for the rationale for selecting that measure;

There is no evidence of how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information.

There is no evidence of how the measures are tailored to its overall proposed plan and theory of action.

There is no evidence of how the applicant will review and improve the measures over time.

It lacks sufficient evidence of how implementation progress will be tracked.

The applicant has failed to fully respond to the criteria. Required performance measures were not included in the application, and the performance measures that were presented were weak and not concise. There is no evidence of a high-quality plan. There is no evidence of how the applicant will measure success toward meeting any of the performance measures.

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

**5**

**1**

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

There is some evidence of an external evaluation plan that would evaluate the effectiveness of the program toward meeting goals. There is no evidence that this evaluation program would evaluate the return on investment. There is also no evidence of a high-quality plan for this criteria. The applicant has failed to fully address the criteria for a high-quality evaluation plan. Limited evidence of an evaluation plan is presented in the response.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The following required element is included as a strength:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is evidence of a budget that will support sustainability by including evidence of external funding sources</li> </ul> <p>The following required elements were not included in the response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The budget includes some external funds but does not identify where they will come from</li> <li>• There is no evidence of a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities.</li> <li>• There is no identification of funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operation costs</li> </ul> <p>The applicant has failed to fully address the criteria by providing a thoughtful rationale in the form of a narrative to justify the expenditures. One-time investments were not indicated and although there is some evidence of sustainability the source of these external funds is not discussed.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

There is no evidence of a high-quality sustainability plan. The applicant only discusses recent changes within the LEA and fails to address any type of sustainability of the proposed project. The applicant has been unresponsive to this criteria.

**Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant has proposed a partnership, but the proposal is not truly a partnership as these services are already available to the students and families regardless of whether or not the project is funded. There is no evidence of an agreement, formal or informal between the LEA and partners and it is not clear what services would be provided other than those already available. Therefore, the applicant does not meet the criteria.

The partner organization, a Full Service Schools Team, currently does not exist and won't exist unless the grant is funded. These teams would supplement services already in the schools. In fact, the partner would be created from grant funds. The staff or resources for the Full Service Schools Teams would not come from any existing external partners. There is no evidence that a partnership with a public or private organization would exist or does exist to create these teams.

The Parent Center that would be created also does not yet exist. As in the above paragraph, there is no evidence that any public or private organizations would be included in the center.

The CARED program is already serving the schools and the evidence does not show that any additional services would be provided as a result of a partnership.

The services being developed by United Way for dropout prevention are listed, but there is no evidence of a partnership or how that partnership would increase student services.

There is no evidence of how the partnership would be sustained or evaluated.

The same applies to the feeding program - these services are already available to the students, and there is no evidence that a partnership would increase the services already provided.

The applicant has failed to provide evidence that private or public resources will be integrated into the project. Programs that are already available to students and families are proposed. However, there is no value added by utilizing these resources as students and families already have access to them without the creation of the partnership.

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Not Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

There is no evidence of how the applicant would build on the core educational assurance areas. The project's vision is unclear and ambiguous. The goals and objectives of the project are not possible to evaluate effectively due to the vision being unclear. The applicant did not provide a high-quality plan for the criteria where required, making those responses incomplete and not comprehensible. The effectiveness of educators was not addressed. An example of this is how the number of highly effective educators would be increased. The overall project is not presented in a coherent manner, very unorganized and incomplete. The research and ideas are presented without regard to their implementation plan or evaluation, therefore this absolute priority is not met.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>56</b>
--------------	------------	-----------



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0115FL-4 for The School Board of Polk County, Florida

### A. Vision (40 total points)

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

**(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

(a) Applicant clearly described the process and progress of the district's adoption of the state's RTTT requirements that align with the four core educational assurance areas.

- District is following Florida's schedule for transitioning to the CCSS by implementing formative assessments focused on individual standard mastery PreK-12 and advanced coursework and dual enrollment in secondary.
- District's in-house data capacity is being enhanced by integrating the state's 9 LIIS components allowing teachers access to credible student data and teacher linked effectiveness.
- District has adapted the Marzano Model as its teacher evaluation system in line with the state's RTTT process. The district is using the system generated information for high-stakes employment decisions and educator professional development supports.
- District recognizes the need for a districtwide model where improvement is not a one-time success, but maintained as part of the culture.

(b) The District states a clear vision that is supported by a credible approach with goals for creating a PreK-12 personalized learning approach in the three participant schools. For example:

- Multi-aged looping that measures progress by proficiency rather than seat time;
- Student access to electronic devices to support grades 6-12 blended learning
- AVID instruction in grades 3-12 focused on high expectations
- Engaging parents in providing support for school readiness and support
- Year-round schools (209) days with extended day
- Personalized learning with students choosing topics of study

(c) Applicant describes in detail the classroom setting and activities for Pre-school and elementary classrooms. The activities and classroom are age-appropriate and take into consideration ELL student needs for additional support via conversation, listening and language skills. The elementary program will offer interest-based learning experiences in multi-age classrooms with two year looping with the same teacher.

**Weakness**

It is projected that over half of the participating students are enrolled in grades 6-12, yet there was no description of their classroom experience or the role of their teachers.

<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
--	-----------	-----------

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The county has 38 schools designated as "turnaround schools" which has motivated the superintendent and Board to

implement a plan to build increased capacity in the classroom, with school leadership and the district infrastructure to support improvement. Negotiations are underway with teachers to emphasize human capital through professional development, monetary recognition for turnaround work. The county has identified a cluster of 3 high need schools to serve as a demonstration model for scale-up across the district. This approach to implementation has a high potential for success.

(a) Polk County is ranked the nation's 31<sup>st</sup> largest district and the eighth highest in poverty between 5-17 years. The Frostproof feeder pattern is a manageable size to achieve success and model the project. The district is isolated, rural with the schools often serving as the community "connector" providing space for service providers and offering residents (student families) organized and supplementary academic services.

(b) Three schools in a PreK-12 feeder pattern with a total enrollment of 2,100 students and 134 faculty by grade span were listed. All students are designated as high need and greater than 40% listed as low income.

Note: Not clear if the district meets minimum student enrollment totals of 2000. Table A2 on 1913 students in participant schools with notes as to anticipated enrollment from teachers transferring their own children, conversion to year-round schools will attach students from a local charter school?

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

**10**

**2**

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

Applicant states that the Mass Insight turnaround model, a credible model, will influence and guide their reform work with the Polk County schools. Lessons learned from the project will influence district policy and school operations. They will use the RTTD resources to upgrade their technology to deliver better data to inform instruction and operational practices.

**Weakness**

Not clear if Mass Insight strategies are currently in place or if Polk County intends to initiate if AMP is funded.

No requisite high-quality plan (as defined in the notice) was provided that outlined how the project initiated reforms would be scaled beyond the 3 schools or assist in reaching project goals of improving student learning. Neither was a logic model that depicted how the district's vision would be operationalized.

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

**10**

**3**

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

Applicant provided FCAT reading and math results for the grade spans it covers (tables and appendices). Graduation rates and achievement gap data was also included with state data provided as the comparison. Examples of early learning success were included in the appendices for Nemours Brightstart.

**Weakness**

Since only 2012-13 data was presented in the tables it is not possible to discern any trends. The annual goals as presented are ambitious, but not likely to be achievable. A 31% gain for AA in reading from one year to the next is unlikely given the RTTD project would be just getting started and teacher capacity still in nascent stages. Equally, a 33% gain in math for elementary SPED students in the project's first year is highly unlikely. ESEA targets overall and by sub-group were also not provided.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The Polk County district has a demonstrated record of success and evidence of their ability to scale up reforms that have advanced student learning for at-risk students, increased equity and graduation rates and advanced career and college readiness. For example (a and b):

- In 2012-13, 90% of Lincoln Avenue Academy students scored proficient in all subjects on state assessments with a minority enrollment rate two thirds higher than the 100 top performing elementary schools in the state.
  - District's dual enrollment credits increased from 1,885 to 3,603 in two years.
  - Polk, over four years, has increased the number of school career academies from 8 to 50, a 600% increase. There are 28 middle school pre-academies to encourage earlier interest.
  - The district has been successful with numerous federally funded grants whose initiatives they state have been sustained post funding: Teaching American History, AP Incentive Program, NASA K-12 Education grant.
  - A magnet school assistance program that established 7 magnet schools that successfully recruited a diverse student population. With targeted professional development, data driven instruction, curriculum revisions, the students higher performance on reading and math assessments than the district or state.
  - The district has been recognized as a national leader for both expanding access to AP courses and improving exam performance for under-represented minority students scoring 3 or better on at least one exam.
  - Polk County students, the majority of whom live in poverty, consistently exceed state averages (grades 3-10 on reading tests – Polk a 6 point gain, the state 2).
- (a) The district sustains a data management and reporting system that is accessible to students, parents, teachers and district personnel.

- Parents, through the Parent Portal can access class schedule, course history, discipline, graduation progress, teacher assignments, learning plan and grade reports.
- Students access source inform and resources for class assignments, grades, course history, and everything a parent sees.
- Classroom teachers and district administrators access longitudinal data on each student, demographic data, progress monitoring, conduct, assessments (FCAT, AP, SAT, PSAT, FL EOC).
- Parents without access to computers at home may use those in the proposed Parent Center in the elementary school.

Weakness

(a) Even with all the reforms and apparent success, acheivement gaps are still prevelent and college enrollment or post-high school success was not discussed. Even though it appears data is readily available, no discussion was offered as to how students and parents would be provided support to know how to use the data to inform and improve both instruction and service access. A key aspect of this grant is creating opportunities and support for students to "own" their learning and achievement.

<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
---	----------	----------

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

Under the Florida sunshine law the finances of Polk County Public Schools are available at the district and school level. Ten years of financial and audit reports are available on-line school-by-school for 10 years and cost per student for four years. Salary policies and ranges for union, non-union and school administrators that meet the criteria's requirement. The public can request salary of an individual employee and a staff member whose role is to respond to any public request for information (except student records).

<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

Applicant provides evidence that the state allows district autonomy to extend the school day/year for virtual instruction, including blended learning, to operate virtual schools and independent or personalized learning opportunities.

The State's Differentiated accountability system allows districts to create turnaround plans.

Weakness

The applicant did not discuss how the district will utilize the state flexibility to implement personalized learning

environments. Merely having the ability to extend the school day does not sufficiently address the other strategies previously described.

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

**15**

**6**

**(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant described how a school-based planning team was convened to consider the potential of a RTTD project. A detailed stakeholder wish list was generated that included such suggestions as::

- Computer lab, classroom space and staff for a drop-out prevention program,
- Substance abuse intervention through a community organization as an alternative to suspension
- College and career counseling for students and their parents through a college and career center,
- Enhanced access to technology,
- More flexible and convenient accommodations for teen parents,
- A district wellness program to address community and youth health issues and offer enrichment and recreational opportunities not currently available.

Individualized letters of support were provided by potential partners.

**Weakness**

The applicant failed to provide information as to how stakeholder feedback helped to refine the proposal. Several ideas on the wish list did not later appear as a strategy or intervention in the proposal.

The proposal, as presented, appears to be " district-centric" meaning the voices of students, parents and especially teachers is not apparent.

Also, not clear from the statement if "signing bonuses, in exchange for work agreements" truly signifies agreement or support from teachers.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>8</b>

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

The approach to learning, as described by the applicant, does include research-based strategies for creating personalized learning for students toward the achievement of college and career ready standards.

- A school turnaround focus,
- Partnerships to provide essential services, and
- School-based flexible programming

The envisioned aligned instructional system that will be put into place does meet the RTTD criteria that enables students to receive supports to pursue a course of study that would potentiall prepare them for either college or a career. Supports such as:

- A different structure to the learning environment thru an extended school day and year to optimize learning time, multi-age classrooms with looping, and access to more digital resources.
- Anchor instructional units in big ideas, essential questions with deliberate scaffolding of activities and experiences to create deliberate learning connections.
- Use of project-based learning based on interest and aligned to the Common Core Standards from age 4 on. Projects will be selected and designed to provide opportunities to both explore diverse ideas and perspectives as well as increase interaction among a diverse student body.

- Middle and high school students will have opportunities to included blended learning, digital tools, on-line courses for credit recovery, career academy choices and college duel enrollment to personalize their schedules that accelerate and motivate them to graduate and be better prepared for either college or career.
- The AVID program will be embedded in the elementary daily routines to reinforce behaviors and beliefs for success. At the high school level, AVID will be an elective course for students who need support to develop the skills, attitudes and focus toward high school graduation and beyond.
- High school students will have access to a personalized learning coach who will oversee both the student's academic programming and their experiential internship, independent study and progress toward college or career goals.
- By accessing their student portal based learning plan, students will self-monitor their progress through a data notebook, assessment results, communicate with teachers, turn in assignments, report on project status and access digital tools, resources and MOOC courses.

The applicant intends to establish a parent center that will provide educational opportunities for both parents and the community and allow easy connection and access to family support and community service organizations. Parents will be encouraged to engage with their students to design their learning plan, monitor progress and attend student led conferences each semester.

**Weakness**

Without the presentation of a high quality plan as required by the criteria, it is difficult to determine if the applicant has the wherewithal to successfully implement all the ideas, strategies and improvements they described.

Also not addressed was how the district would provide:

- adequate accomodations for high-need students to ensure they were on track,
- training and support to be sure students understood how to use and access the tools, resources and freedom to self-direct their learning, and
- support students to develop skills and traits critical to achieving success within personalized learning environments such as goal-setting, perserverence, critical thinking, communication and problem-solving.

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

**20**

**8**

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

Polk County has or will engage strategic partners to support their approach to teaching and leading that helps educators to improve their instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress. Specifically, they:

- Address individual needs through the use of Multi-Tiered Support System that strives to accommodate 15% of students with interventions built into school routines and only 5% addressed through specialized services. A pilot program, Success for Boys of Color, for grades PreK-3 offered after-school programming, mentoring teacher PD and family engagement.
- Redesigned schedules will allow teachers to provide extra support to students, enriching community learning events and the student data systems will save teacher time with record keeping.
- Curriculum maps will continue to be refined to align with state provided Common Core instructional resources and uploaded onto the digital curriculum platform enabling teachers to create and share standards-based maps infused with digital, print and targeted student instructional units and activities.
- The Dana Center will be engaged to enhance teacher capacity to teach with inquiry-based methods, use formative assessments to differentiate and personalize their instruction, work in teams to study vertical and horizontal alignment of standards and use of goal setting and monitoring tools to diagnose student learning needs and teaching practice.
- Common planning periods across teams and grades will be established allowing teachers time to examine student work and focus on effectiveness of teaching and student learning.
- Cambridge Education has provided principal training and observation calibration to ensure that principals are certified to conduct valid and reliable teacher evaluations.
- The Dana Center, in addition to working with teachers, will support the district to reshape both district and

school cultures through change management facilitation, building a common commitment to equity and access for all students, training to conduct ongoing gap analysis to identify system issues such as alignment of curriculum, instruction to standards with professional development and resource allocation.

**Weakness**

Without the presentation of a high quality plan as required by the criteria, it is difficult to determine if the applicant has the wherewithal to successfully implement all the professional growth ideas, strategies and improvements for teachers and principals they described.

The connection to building educator capacity to refine and reform their instruction to support students to be successful in a new personalized approach to learning was not discussed. No mention of how principals will be trained or observation rubrics revised to accomodate for the "new or revised" instructional frameworks and the information from observations to support teacher growth and improved practice.

**D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>(a) Applicant presented the Comprehensive Aligned Instructional System that the District Leadership team in collaboration with school staff will support student achievement. They state this system will ensure that reform efforts move from policy to classroom practice and horizontally across district divisions.</p> <p>Four regional superintendents will direct and oversee staff and evaluate principals.</p> <p>The district described in detail their Turnaround model that is designed to increase instruction time in core areas, follow a rigorous standards-based curriculum and offer instruction intervention strategies to match the students served.</p> <p>(c and d) Approaches to assessment design, both formative and summative will be used to determine progress and needs against standards mastery.</p> <p>e) Looping and multi-age groupings is described as the strategies that will best support ELL students and encourage a sense of community among parents, teachers and students.</p> <p><b>Weakness</b></p> <p>(b) The Turnaround model, as described, did not discuss how school leadership teams in participant schools would have flexibility and autonomy over decisions, staffing, roles for educators, non-educators and school budgets. Rather, the model and strategies proposed appear to be strongly district managed and directed.</p> <p>This section provides the applicant the opportunity to describe how the RTTD project will provide support to teachers and particularly provide students opportunities to demonstrate mastery through personalized learning in multiple ways. While formative assessments were discussed in detail, they appeared to be more focused on traditional rather than non-traditional strategies to assess student mastery and not connected to college or career attainment or personalized learning approaches the district hopes to implement.</p> <p>No high-quality plan that described project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provides every student and educator with the support and resources they need was provided.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

(a) (b) In Section C the student and parent data portals were described that afforded on-line access to content, tools and learning resources both in school and during an extended day/year.

**Weakness**

The remaining sections of this criteria were not addressed. Specifically, that students, their parents and other appropriate

stakeholders have access to technical support, that data can be exported in an open format and software that securely stores personal records. Finally that the district's data system is interoperable by linking student data with teacher and principal effectiveness data, with student course and resources recommendations and educator professional growth progress.

Again, no high-quality plan was provided for this section as required.

### E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Polk County district plans to establish progress indicator dashboards the will “at least” biannually report to stakeholder groups. The dashboards will compile <u>three</u> information sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Expenditure reports that track procurement and payroll</li> <li>· Student achievement that show aggregate progress similar to the state report card for each school</li> <li>· Third party evaluation reports.</li> </ul> <p>They further describe a systemic process to incrementally measure progress – first collect and analyze data, then report it and finally discuss the findings at various stakeholder meetings.</p> <p>Weakness</p> <p>A high-quality approach for a continuous improvement process was not presented. The collection and occasional reporting of data is but one component of establishing a comprehensive process by which the district’s investment in professional development, technology, staff, curriculum design and assessments are monitored for quality, and achievement of interim and project outcomes. Had the applicant created and presented the high quality plans (as required by the criteria) that included specific goals, measurable objectives, rational for the identified action or strategy, specific activities, accomplished within a timeframe with designative responsible parties, then it would be possible to establish a continuous improvement process that combined the individual project plans into an overall comprehensive process for monitoring and reporting fidelity of implementation related to progress, processes and results.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The district intends to include strategies from the Head Start program that requires parent empowerment to make policy decisions and participate as activists in their children’s education. Secondly, by engaging the School Advisory Councils, parents will be active in school activities, decision-making and operate the Parent Center as well as complete the annual school improvement plan.</p> <p>A rudimentary communication plan was provided that included a goal, objectives, messages and strategies.</p> <p>Weakness</p> <p>The plan did not include all the components required to be rated high-quality (measurable objectives, a timeline, and responsible party) and that would assist the district and AMP staff to determine the extent of the outreach and effectiveness of getting the intended messages conveyed to the designated audiences.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
<p><b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Performance measures were provided for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Grades 1-2 reading and absences</li> <li>· Grades 4-5 reading, writing and absences</li> <li>· Grades 6-8 reading, expanded algebra and geometry and discipline referrals</li> </ul>		

- Grade 9-11 reading and behavior referrals

Growth targets appear reasonable

Weakness

The total student participation is listed at 1,855, short of the 2,000 required minimum.

Not sub-group data was provided. Further the applicant did not address the criteria as stated – applicant must describe:

- Rationale for selecting the measure
- How the measure will provide rigorous, timely and formative information tailored to their proposed plan and theory of action, and
- How it will review and improve the measures over time.

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

5

1

**(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

Polk County will engage the services of RAND as their external evaluator for RTTD to assess formative and summative project outcomes. Four research questions for the evaluation are posed with a table showing the indicators and possible data sources to inform the questions. The evaluation design as described is to include a descriptive implementation analysis during years 1-4. In the fourth year, a quasi-experimental method to examine reform effectiveness in improving student outcomes.

Weakness

No reference was made as to how the evaluation would assess the extent to which the RTTD four core educational assurances (1. adoption of standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed and college and the workplace, 2. Building data systems that measure student growth, success and inform educator effectiveness, 3. Recruiting and retaining educators to high-need schools, 4. Turning around low performing schools.

No high-quality plan, as defined in the RTTD notice, was provided. A rigorous evaluation plan for a project of this scale is necessary to monitor and report to stakeholders progress toward objectives and goals as well as to regularly inform continuous improvement modifications to program delivery.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>

**(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:**

A budget showing the project overall and then by the five district management functions that would have responsibilities for implementing the project activities related to their role and functions.

Rational, cost per unit or salary rates were included to provide an estimation of reasonable and sufficient to support the project.

Indicated that approximately \$4.3 million from other sources (e.g. United Way, Catholic Charities, Title I and II) would be used to support the project.

The district shows less dependency on the RTTD grant in year 4 and indicates, in some cases how local or state funds will be reallocated or that district capacity has been improve enough to no longer need the contracted support.

Weakness

The statement that teacher salaries will be adjusted as needed during the four year period – does not indicate from where potential salaries increases would be allocated. Not clear that the union agrees to this approach for teacher compensation.

Not explicitly stated – which funds are one-time investments versus those that will be used for on-going operational costs.

<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>
---	-----------	----------

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:**

The district reasons that their proposed AMP RTTD project will be sustained by:

- Aligning district accountability planning with school improvement plans to the superintendent's strategic plan,
- Redeployment of title I and Title II funds to support school-based coaches, extra time teacher pay and professional development,
- Upgrade instructional technology with classroom digital tools and resources,
- Performance measures that stakeholders can monitor through on-line reports

**Weakness**

The strategies proposed by the applicant do not address this criteria. Missing is a high quality plan (as defined by the notice). Also not provided is a description of how they will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use the data to inform future investments. Nor was a process defined for how the district would evaluate improvement to inform post-grant budgets. A budget post grant was not provided.

**Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)**

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant addressed sub criteria 1 and 4 of the Competitive Preference Priority by providing a detailed description of the community and contractual partnerships that will provide wrap-around support services to the AMP school students and their families. The description included both educational and other outcomes. (4a) The district, through various sources, identified these needs as barriers to improving education and family supports and (4b) for improving education and community supports.

(1)

- Full service schools teams will supplement district services by providing mental health assessments, early warning for students at risk and teachers needing support, health screening and referral, and school climate assessments.
- The new Parent Center (provided through the RTTD grant) will offer parenting skills, recruitment of families, create two-way communication with parents between school and home computer lab) and assist in coordinating resources for families.
- Identified community needs such as access to health care, transportation, translators, early child development and financial security have been addressed by forming partnerships with a local health care facility, agreements with the county's public transit system, support from the Dana center to plan for building bi-lingual staff capacity and programming from United Way Success by Six. And, finally, Catholic Charities Family Empowerment program.

**Weakness**

Not included in this description was:

- 2a,b,c – a method to track selected indicators that measure results at the aggregated level for all children, use of data to target resources, and strategies to scale the model beyond participating students and communities in the LEA.
- 5 a,b,c – Build the capacity of staff with tools and resources to assess the needs and assets of students, create a decision-making process and infrastructure to select, implement and evaluate the supports – the school board does not have the time or function to provide the fine-grain monitoring and oversight of endeavor of this size with this many participants, partners, etc.
- 6. Ambitious, yet achievable performance measures were not identified.

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Not Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The applicant did not coherently and comprehensively address how it will build a build upon their current turnaround model to address the RTTD core educational assurances. Many of the proposed strategies, assistive partnerships and intent were in line with the core assurances, but the specifics as to “how” and to what extent defined outcomes would be achieved was missing through the lack of high quality plans.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>91</b>
--------------	------------	-----------