



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0155FL-1 for The School District of Osceola County, Florida

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 applicant provides information about the context of their RTT-D reform efforts and indicates that their district goals, beliefs, and values represent the reform vision of RTT-D. However, the proposal is deficient in not describing (1) how the applicant addresses four core education assurance areas and (2) how their district goals on student learning can be achieved through personalized student support grounded in student academic interests. In addition, the proposal is mostly non-responsive to the criterion of describing the classroom experience of personalized learning environments.		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant provides sufficient explanations of their approach to implement their proposal. The applicant states that the criteria for selection of district schools to participate in this grant should have free/reduced lunch rates over 50% and those that didn't meet annual measurable objective targets in one or more subgroups of students. The applicant's data indicates that more than 55,000 students are participating and about 40,000 students are from low-income families. The applicant's data also shows the total number of high-need students and participating educators. The data make the case well that the proposal clearly describes the process of school selection. However, it is noted that 4 schools do not meet the RTT-D eligibility requirement that at least 40% of participating students should be from low-income families.		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: The application states that they use a theory of chance called Logic Model with 4 stages (Input, Process, Short Term Outcomes, and Long Term Goal) to guide their efforts to achieve outcome goals. In addition, the applicant is thorough in its presentation of their transformation programs, activities, processes and PD activities from 2009 to present. The bulk of the programs and activities does reflect personalized learning environments and strategies and seems relevant to key components to enable the RTT-D reform efforts. However, the narrative does not present a strong articulation about how their reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support change beyond the participating schools. For example, the applicant states their professional learning communities (PLCs) provide teachers with opportunities to collaborate to identify student strengths and weaknesses to increase student learning. The applicant also states they implements a program called Core Connections Writing that resulted in significant increases in writing proficiency from 2008 to 2011. However, there is not enough overarching rationale about how these programs and activities are interconnected and coordinated. The narrative does not provide details as to the key elements of a high quality plan such as the appropriate timeline, the deliverables, and specific parties responsible for implementation.		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	5
(A)(4) Reviewer Comments: The applicant states that they use Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0, Reading, and Mathematics to set annual goals on proficiency, student growth, and closing achievement gap and include other goals such as graduation rates, college enrollment rates, and postsecondary degree attainment. The applicant uses methodology for determining growth in compliance with Florida's Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). A description of how		

the calculation is made is presented well, and the target goals seem very specific and achievable; however, the application is lacking important details on the information that helps to evaluate whether/how the goals are ambitious yet achievable. For example, the applicant provides the table for 'Decreasing achievement gaps' with a list of subgroup and comparison group, but there is insufficient explanation how the baselines are set and how the target goals for each subgroup was proposed. Additionally, it is unclear what constitute significant gains in student outcomes.

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	7

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides evidence of a track record of success. For example, the applicant contracted to have an external reviewer to conduct an official review of the school district and gained positive outcomes. To highlight a few, it was recognized that the applicant has a rigorous standards-based curriculum, research-based instructional strategies, and a comprehensive assessment system, and that the district has successfully met the class-size amendment. The applicant also states that all high schools in the district earned A's or B's for the 2010/2011 school year with the grading formula taking account of Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) performance in reading, math, writing, and science, SAT/ACT/PERT, and Participation in AP, Dual Enrollment, and IB, and Graduation Rate/At-Risk Graduate Rate. The applicant data also include their 2012-2013 NCLB School Grades in which the bulk (78%) of the schools received a B or C. In addition, the applicant asserts that the percentage of students scoring at grade level or above on the Math and Reading FCAT has increased over the years.

However, the overarching concern is that there is limited evidence as for a clear record of success in the past four years for advancing student learning and increasing equity. This section is quite weak in their analysis and the detail of clear evidence attesting that the applicant has improved student learning outcomes and closed achievement gaps. For example: the applicant states 2013 FCAT Writing test scores for Grades 4, 8, and 10 indicated that their students and teachers were commended for scoring or equal to or above the state average. What remains unclear is how the performance indicators were in 2009 to 2012; and the comprehensive data to demonstrate the broader and consistent pattern of excellence is missing.

The same concern continues regarding how the applicant achieves ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently low-achieving schools. The applicant lists notable achievements and areas of improvement. However, the narrative is lacking in their description of how they have achieved reforms in lowest-achieving schools. The applicant mentions Celebration High School, Poinciana High School, and Gateway High School, but there is little information on how they were performing in the past and how the turn-around process has been for last four years. The applicant adds that about 40% of their schools did exceed the 2012-2013 State Recognition program and were awarded monies to be used in their building. This remains somewhat irrelevant to making a case to demonstrate the applicant' ability to turn around low performing schools.

The applicant states that they have made student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation and instruction. Currently, the applicant uses Parent Internet Viewer so that students and parents have access to the data. Applicant also states that teachers are required to use data and evaluate learning outcomes to improve teaching, and their PLC meetings support the assessment data analysis. For educators, the applicant uses the Osceola Data Management System (ODMS) so that educators have access to student demographics, attendance, and assessment results. With respect to using assessment data to inform instruction, it is noticeable that the applicant has a systematic approach in which standardized tests are administered, student performance data are collected, and appropriate analysis is conducted. However, no detail is provided as to how the applicant supports for teachers to use assessment data in curriculum planning and interventions.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states that all state, county and municipal non-exempt records are open for personal inspection and copying by any person, and that the school board policy documents, rules, and regulations are publicly available. Other publicly available information includes the annual budget, previous budget, and financial reports. However, it

was unclear as to the extent of how the applicant ensures that actual personnel salaries at school level for teachers and staff and the actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level are publicly available. Therefore, it is inconclusive whether the applicant has a high level of transparency in their processes, practices, and investments by making key expenditures public.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant indicates that Florida adopted the Common Core and the state remains committed to college and career readiness by playing a key role in developing PARCC's proposal for next generation assessments. What seems implicit in the narrative is that the applicant wants to make an argument that robust principal and teacher evaluation systems and stable/efficient infrastructure including technology and database can serve as evidence as for the successful conditions to implement the RTT-D reform efforts. Indeed, they play an important role in creating the successful conditions. However, there is insufficient explanation for how the applicant benefit from sufficient autonomy under regulatory requirements to implement the RTT-D reform efforts. Also lacking in the narrative is the articulation about how the aforementioned evaluation processes contribute to the RTT-D implementation to achieve the personalized learning environments. Although the narrative asserts that the applicant has access to the good conditions, equally important to articulate is how State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements ensures sufficient autonomy so that the applicant can enable personalized learning environments, which is not thoroughly addressed in the narrative.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	3
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant asserts that their planning involved extensive participation of various committees and community organizations. In brief, it is stated that a large and diverse focus group of district-level, school-level, charter school, teacher's union, and other stakeholders were involved in the development of the proposal; community organizations, and local institutions of higher education will collaborate with the applicant on RTT-D initiatives. The applicant also provides excellent details describing how information associated with the RTT-D implementation will be disseminated to all stakeholders in the students' education. Nonetheless, what is missing from any of the discussion is how the proposal was revised based on feedback and whether/how the applicant secured support for the proposal from teachers in the district. Additionally, it is unclear how the letters (found in the appendix) of support from aforementioned stakeholders are solicited and describing the extend to which the applicant demonstrated meaningful stakeholder engagement.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	4

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant states the district supports the unique learning path with a reflection of the student's needs, strengths, and interests. It asserts that their Teacher Effectiveness System (TES) can enable their teachers to see the impact of their instruction on student learning within students' personalized learning paths. Additionally, the applicant makes a case that it uses a wide range of projects, which can yield data and analyze the assessment data to inform their personalized learning strategies. The applicant also (1) articulates the nature of children's learning, (2) emphasizes that the personalized learning environments and experiences requires change in practice, and (3) implies that learning can be achieved in different forms and strategies. However, the proposal is mostly non-responsive to the criteria of the section and lacking important descriptions and details in how the applicant implements instructional strategies for all students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned with college- and career-ready standards and accelerate his/her learning through support of the needs. There is no evidence to support the applicant's plan by which students can achieve meaningful personalized learning and have access to quality teaching and support for their learning needs. Further, the applicant provides no details or examples as to how they ensure that mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students so that students understand how to use the tools and resources to track and manage their learning.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	9
---	----	---

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a plan for improving learning and teaching by providing opportunities for personalized learning environments. It is credible that their plan has the potential to increase their educators' capacity for implementing personalized instruction and to have access to data and tools for improving student learning. For example, their technology project details about methods and tools to achieve personalized learning and the applicant's commitment to provide teacher training and using systems such as Teacher Evaluation System so that teachers can have the assessment-based cycles of improvement or both teachers and students.

In this section, the applicant starts with describing their existing projects such as Career and Technical Educational programs, Career and Professional Academies, College and Career Planning programs, Improvement Plans, Learning Management System, and many more. In the second half of the section, the applicant proposes 7 projects in order to provide students with personalized instruction. Each project includes goals, deliverables, and details about their activities. The applicant provides an excellent and detailed narrative clearly describing their STEM education initiatives with a focus on personalized learning and their College and Career Readiness with the use of the Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) system so that the applicant can provide opportunities for personalized instruction for college and career readiness for at-risk students. Other projects include Math Solutions, Literacy, Technology, and Educator Quality programs. Overall, the applicant provides a plan to provide personalized instruction for students. However, the narrative provides limited evidence to support the high quality plan that address the required criteria. For example, the applicant's existing projects were described and the narrative does not articulate how these projects inform their RTT-D reform efforts. The narrative actually states that an integral component of the RTT-D grant includes monies to continue many of these programs," but the applicant does not describe how the existing projects are in line with the RTT-D initiatives and how the applicant has ensured that school leadership teams have training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable teachers and staff to structure and provide an effective learning environment. Additionally, the applicant is not consistent in describing their proposed projects to make a case that they have a high quality plan. Some projects address key goals and deliverables but do not include the timeline and the parties responsible for implementing the activities. For example, it is commendable that their math project (i.e., Math Solutions) has a plan to provide PD opportunities. Such training, the applicant states, will increase teacher understanding of how children learn mathematics and strengthen teachers' content and pedagogical knowledge. Yet, the narrative about the project provides little information on how teachers will measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards and how such projects can provide recommendations, supports, and interventions as needed for improvement. Their last two projects (Educator Quality and Grant Management and Sustainability) do address (1) using student data and feedback to inform and improve instruction and (2) providing leadership on the implementation and evaluation of the grant projects. However, the narrative is such that the descriptions are not integrated into proposed projects in order to illustrate their approach to teaching and leading that helps educators to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward enabling the full implementation of personalized learning and teaching for all students with a focus on meeting college- and career-ready standards. What is also missing from any of the discussion is the evidence as for how the applicant plans to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals in hard-to-staff schools, mathematics and science, and special education.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	6

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides limited evidence as for their practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning. The narrative does not provide clear information about the key elements of a high-quality plan such as goals, activities, and the rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the responsible parties for implementing the activities.

First, the applicant has the central leadership, the Deputy Superintendent who is responsible for all aspects of the school district business operations and their leadership team includes the Deputy, 4 assistant superintendents, 4 chief officers, the public information officer, and the executive director of the foundation. Also, the applicant states that each RTT-D project will be coordinated and supervised by someone within the Instructional Divisions, and the RTT-D supervisors and staff will report to the Grant Coordinator. However, the applicant provides little information on the central leadership and its structure specific to the RTT-D projects to provide support and services to facilitate personalized learning. Second, the applicant articulates the functions of leadership in a few categories such as facilitating, articulating, coordinating, participating, and assisting. The

applicant also explains about their district-based leadership team, which guides school-based teams with direct support systems for each school. Also, it indicates that each school assisted by School Advisory Council develops an individual school improvement plan for each building. This implies that school leadership teams have some autonomy over school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities. However, the applicant's narrative is weak in providing details about how school leadership teams have sufficient flexibility and how they develop school schedules/calendars and school-level budgets. Third, the applicant demonstrates that they are committed to increasing graduation rates. For example, the applicant uses the Plato computer based credit recovery programs. There are ACT/SAT prep programs, extended learning opportunities after school and Saturdays for remediation. In particular, the applicant clearly states that students in exceptional student programs are promoted based on the successful completion of the state standards. The applicant provides extensive information on their Progress Monitoring Plan in which those who do not meet the levels of performance must be provided with additional tests to determine the students' difficulties and needs. This may imply that students progress based on demonstrated mastery. Nonetheless, the narrative doesn't directly indicate that all students have the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic. Regarding the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways, the applicant asserts that students with significant cognitive difficulties can benefit from the Florida alternate assessment, and it is clear from the narrative that students can demonstrate mastery of state standards through portfolios at targeted grade levels or courses, and assessments. The applicant assures that special education students are taken into consideration through the RtI process. However, the narrative does not make clear how the applicant makes sure that all students in the district have the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways. Lastly, the applicant states that they provide learning resources and instructional practices to students with disabilities and English learners. For example, the applicant indicates that students are taken into consideration through the RtI process. However, the narrative is not presenting a cohesive or focused plan or a system in which instructional practices especially for English learners are adaptable and fully accessible. The applicant lists a plethora of programs and learning tools, yet these do not seem to be interconnected and contribute to the common goal of building practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant identifies their infrastructure that supports personalized learning. However, the applicant does not provide clear information with regard to key elements of a high-quality plan such as key goals, activities to be undertaken and the rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementing the activities.

The applicant ensures students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders have access to content, tools, and other learning resources to support their RTT-D implementation. For example, it is noticeable that the applicant invests in building a strong infrastructure for wireless connection preparing the intensive use of multiple wireless devices. Their Media Centers will also provide appropriate levels of technical support. However, the narrative does not provide clear evidence how the applicant prepares a wide range of strategies such as peer support, online support, or local support to deliver appropriate technical support. It is clear that the applicant remains committed to using information technology systems to allow parents and students use the data in various electronic learning systems. For example, the applicant mentions multiple electronic learning resources such as Discovery Education, Britannica School, Florida Electronic Library, and TeachingBooks.net. Still what remains unclear is the ways how the applicant ensures that parents and students export their information in an open data format. The applicant provides some explanation of their interoperable data system to be implemented with the support of RTT-D funding. However, the narrative lacks some technical details about interoperable data system of human resources data, student information data, budget data, and instructional improvement system data all together, which adds little to making a case that the district is fully prepared for a streamlined data sharing system with strong infrastructure to inform and improve personalized instruction.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	5

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a plan to implement a rigorous improvement process to monitor, measure, and have continuous and ongoing discussions about progress of the RTT-D activities. The applicant states that the planning coordinator, grant coordinator, and budget analyst will monitor improvement efforts. In particular, the applicant uses cost-benefit analysis to make a sound investment/decision and estimate program effects. However,

the narrative is lacking important details on how the applicant ensures there is timely and regular feedback on progress of the RTT-D efforts. Additionally, what remains unclear is how the applicant plans to publicly share information on their investment. It seems that there shall be multiple meetings to discuss progress, but the narrative is weak in providing a high-quality plan as defined in the application notice to demonstrate that the applicant is implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
--	---	---

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. The applicants states that they will create and maintain a new Race to the Top school district website with links to access all written reports, proposals, evaluation and expenditure for the public. Other press outlets include School Building newsletters, faculty newsletters, and all district wide communications throughout the calendar year. Equally important to articulate is how the applicant enables ongoing communication and engagement guided by their high-quality plan. For example, the applicant implies that there is currently active involvement of stakeholders through RTTT-State management plan since it requires all stakeholders' involvement through comprehensive and purposeful means. But the applicant remains unclear about how their RTT-D reform plan can infuse with the communication and engagement with the RTTT-State grant, and perhaps more importantly the applicant does not provide clear information on the elements of a high-quality plan.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
--	---	---

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not have the required number of performance measures and presents less ambitious target goals. The performance measures include FACT 2.0 Reading and Math, Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (PERT), Algebra I EOC, Geometry EOC, Biology I EOC, and the Number of Unaccountable Absences/Tardies. Although the applicant provides the tables of performance measures, but the tables provide no information about subgroups; further, the tables set 2% as the annual increment, but there is no explanation on the rationale behind the target. Additionally, the narrative is lacking important details on the applicant's rationale for selecting a performance measure, the specific ways each measure can provide formative information, and some concrete directions on how the applicant will review and improve the measure when the measure is not appropriate to measure their implementation progress.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a thorough plan that they evaluate the effectiveness of RTT-D funded activities. For example, the applicant uses both formative and summative analysis of program effectiveness based on both qualitative and quantitative data. The applicant states that they contract an external evaluator and those involved in evaluation include administrators, staff, and teachers. The applicant also indicates that their Research, Evaluation, and Accountability will play a major role in the assessment and evaluation. It is impressive that their design of evaluation includes multivariate analysis of student growth or PD outcomes, and the data collection involves tools such as student performance scales, state value added measure, and qualitative surveys. Nonetheless, there is a lack of clarity about the actual forms and formats of products of the evaluations and the responsible parties for implementing evaluation. It is impressive that there are multiple parties involved, but as they are many offices and experts are involved it becomes more essential to have a clear description of responsibilities and expectations with specific timelines.

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 identifies their budget categories and funds from other sources. However, the information provided does not constitute a clear budget proposal of expenditure items with reasonable amount of details. In the table 2-1, the applicant provides a more detailed budget proposal for each project with some explanation; however, projects budgets are inconsistent in details. There is no clear description of all of the funds and does		

not identify one-time investments versus ongoing operational costs. The rational for investments is at best unclear.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant explains that they have sustainability of the project's goals. The applicant indicates that they are committed to continuing the RTT-D reform initiative by integrating district resources. For example, Title II-A funding will be used to support their PDs on effective teachers and principals, and Title I and School Improvement Grant funds will provide PDs on curriculum for college and career preparation programs. Other collaborating fund sources include Perkins, Career and Technical, Enhancing Education Through Technology, and Erate funds. The applicant also asserts that the current list of their partners and sponsors from the community and Florida should serve as evidence as for their capacity for sustainability. In addition, the applicant provides a list of successful factors that contributed to sustainability of other grant activities and implies that the same level of successful sustainability should be made when the applicant stays on the path.

It is clear that the applicant remains confident about sustaining their RTT-D programs after the term of the grant. However, the applicant does not present a high-quality plan in part because there is limited evidence about how they solicit support from State and local government leaders, and the narrative is lacking in describing how the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and use this data to inform future investments. Indeed, they provided the lessons learned from the past grant activities, but the narrative is weak at explaining how such lessons can help address how the applicant evaluates improvements in productivity and outcomes and inform their post-grant budget. What is also missing from the narrative is an estimated budget for the three years after the term of the grant that includes budget assumptions, potential sources, and uses of funds.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:		
The applicant provides no response.		

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:		
Overall, the applicant does not meet Absolute Priority 1 based on the application. The applicant does not provide strong and specific details on how they build on the core educational assurance areas. Throughout the application, there is limited evidence as for how the applicant adopts college- and career-ready standards and assessments; how they provide data systems in which teachers, students, and parents have access to data in order to inform and improve teaching and learning; how they develop and reward effective teachers and principals; and how they have turned around low-performing schools. The applicant indicates that they remain committed to providing students with personalized learning environments and strategies. However, the application, overall, provides limited evidence as for their strategies in line with the RTT-D implementation for expanding student access to the most effective educators, decreasing achievement gaps across some student groups, and preparing students for rigorous study in college. With these reasons, it is concluded that the applicant does not meet Absolute Priority 1.		

Total	210	77
-------	-----	----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0155FL-2 for The School District of Osceola County, Florida

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	3

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In Section (A)(1) the applicant presents a description of the demographics of the district: 73% minority, 70% eligibility for the school lunch program, 26% English language learners, 17% students with disabilities. Within the section there is a discrepancy regarding the number of languages spoken by the students (170 vs. 97); Appendix A15 does not support either number.

The reform vision is vague and very general, only minimally addressing building on the four core educational assurance areas. Discussions of adopting standards and assessments that prepare students for success in college and the workplace, of data systems to measure student growth/success and to inform staff, or of turning around lowest-achieving schools are incomplete and underdeveloped. Except for attending professional development, the recruiting, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals is not addressed. Appendix A05, not cited for this section, contains some information about standards, assessments, and teacher recruitment.

The goals included in this section are not specific or measurable; thus, there is no clear approach to accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing student support.

No discussion of personalized learning environments or the classroom experience for participating students and teachers was evident.

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

10	6
----	---

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Sixty-one of the district's sixty-five schools were selected to participate in the grant. Participating schools were selected based on free and reduced price lunch rates (greater than 50%) and/or failure to meet annual measurable objective targets by one or more subgroups. While links to web-based information were provided, evidence of lunch rates greater than 50% and schools failing to meet annual measurable objectives was not included in the application. The table of participating schools including required numbers and percents of educators and participating students by category is included in the narrative. Subsequent section A4 includes baseline and projected Annual Measure Objectives by subgroup for the district. The web-based spreadsheet "Annual Measurable Objectives for Florida's Schools, Districts, and the State" (not included in the application) provides information by subgroup for each participating school.

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

10	3
----	---

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Section A(3) lacks a high-quality plan including clear and measurable goals, activities with rationale, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties describing how the reform (for example, the Poiciana High School project to improve and expand career and professional academies) will be scaled up to support district-wide change, how the applicant will reach its goals,

and how it will determine the extent to which the goals are met. The relationship between this proposal for district reform, RTTT Subgrant Applications (Appendix A11), and the Race to the Top State Grant (Appendix A12) is mentioned but not explained. The Theory of Change Continuous Improvement Model is mentioned in general terms, but specifics of how it will be used by the district to reach the goals of this proposal were not found.

The Logic Model discussion suffers from lack of specificity. For example, data use is mentioned; yet no details are included. The concept of Lesson Study is described, but no implementation plans are mentioned. No details are included for creating highly-effective teachers or for enhancing existing programs such as Advanced Placement. Information about if/how High School Career Academies, Certiport industry certification, and Pinnacle grading/scheduling management program would be expanded was not found. Existing Parental Choice Options are described, but no specific information about expanding them to include other schools/students was found. Lesson Study, Professional Learning Communities, and partnership with the Orlando Science Center are proposed professional development strategies, yet no plan to coordinate them is included. The college readiness system, Advancement Via Individual Determination, is described, but it is unclear if/how it is/will be used by the district.

Appendix A04 details the district's professional development procedures but contains no information about the content of the professional development or its connection to the goals of the proposal. Appendix A05 is a series of about 70 slides depicting the before (time unstated), current, and projected status of the district in several areas including curriculum, instruction, nutrition, technology, school climate, and resources. While it supports the status of and plans for district improvement, it is not sufficient to convey the district's progress toward individualized education change across the district; specific detailed narrative within the proposal would present a clearer picture of the district's accomplishments and plans. The Continuous Improvement Model proposed in general terms in Appendix 08 is sound. However, little information about how staff would be trained to use the model and how the model would be implemented by the district was found.

The data systems available to district administrators, parents, and students seem appropriate. The district participates in an alternative certification program for teachers and supports Individual Profession Development and Individual Leadership Development Plans and continues supporting contracted professional development and teacher evaluation service providers. It is unclear how the Marzano professional development will be implemented.

The narrative includes viable "pieces," but the focus, expansion plans, and impact on student learning outcomes are unclear.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7
(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:		
For performance on summative assessments, the applicant uses the state's ESEA targets for LEAs per the state's ESEA waiver. How the targets were determined is clearly explained.		
There is no explanation of how the achievement gap decreases were determined.		

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	6
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
(a) The application requests four years of data; the applicant provided reading, mathematics, science, and writing student achievement data for grades 3 through 10 for only three academic years (2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-13). Changes across the three-year span were small, some improving and some declining. No indication was made regarding the significance of the changes.		
No gap analysis was found. Table B08, included in section (b) gives disaggregated data for the required reporting subgroups, but no gap analysis was provided.		
High school graduation rates were provided in Appendix B04 for 2010 through 2012 (three years). Ten of fourteen schools had increased graduation rates. The district average rose 1.7 percent over those years.		
No information regarding college enrollment was found.		

(b) No information regarding low-performing schools was found. Information was provided about three high schools that failed to make Adequate Yearly Progress. All three improved academically in mathematics, science, and reading from 2009 to 2012.

(c) Student performance data are available to students, educators, and parents via the yearly calendar, district websites, and state websites. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) can access and use data to improve lesson effectiveness. No indication of the impact of the PLCs was given. Teachers and administrators have access to the Osceola Data Management System which provides information for use in classroom instruction. How the data inform and improve participation, instruction, and services was not discussed.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
The applicant describes various dissemination strategies including websites, written and electronic documents (available upon request), social media, email, electronic and paper newsletters, and in-person meetings. No evidence of these was included. Nor was it explained how the public is made aware of these opportunities to obtain information or any information about actual usage. The applicant states that budgets and financial reports are available as PDF downloads; no links were provided. Items contained on the Finance Department website are listed, but no evidence is presented. It is unclear whether the website contains the salary and non-personnel expenditures information at the school level required by (B)(2).		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)		
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:		
The applicant seems to have in place the conditions to support successful implementation of its proposal. These include being an active participant in the state Race to the Top grant. The district has met the requirements for the implementation of the Common Core Standards and two of the six Digital Learning and Media requirements. It plans to implement the remaining four of these with funds from this grant proposal. The district has adopted the Florida Department of Education teacher evaluation system and has participated in the available trainings. Other supports for staff include work with Learning Sciences International, teacher mentors, and iObservation Academy online courses. Principal and superintendent evaluations are in place. The district will implement the Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) assessments along with end-of-course assessments in several content areas. Data and technology systems seem appropriate. No mention of autonomy under state legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements was found.		
Because the applicant has not clearly articulated a comprehensive and coherent reform vision supported by measurable goals, timelines, and an implementation strategy as required in other sections of the proposal, it is not possible to evaluate whether the described conditions are adequate for successful implementation.		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	4
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:		
The proposal states that a "large and diverse" focus group comprised of district, school, teachers' union, and other stakeholders was engaged in "project execution." Their role is uncertain, and no supporting documentation was found. Other advisory committees were listed but their roles were not described and no supporting documentation was included. It is unclear whether the stakeholder engagement occurred during the development of the district or state RTT proposal. The purpose of most activities described in the narrative is to disseminate information to the various stakeholders rather than engaging them in the development of the proposal.		
(a) No description of how students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools were engaged in the development of the proposal or how the proposal was revised based on their engagement and feedback was found. Involvement of the teachers' union was mentioned briefly, but no supporting evidence was found.		
(b) Sixteen letters of support are included in the proposal. Senders include business, community, and educational agencies; contractors; and corporations. Letters of support from parents, parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, tribes, civil rights organizations, and advocacy groups were not included.		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	4
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>This section requires the applicant to present 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. The high-quality plan must contain key goals, activities, rationale for the activities, a timeline, deliverables, and responsible parties. No such plan was included. Rather, the applicant presents a vague description of its school improvement model, its Teacher Effectiveness system (its effectiveness to be evaluated at the end of the project period), a list of over 50 projects and activities that the district has begun planning and/or implementing over the past five years, and a description of today's "digital learners." No approach to implementing instructional strategies that enable all participating students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards and college- and career-ready graduation requirements and accelerate his or her learning through support of his or her needs was found. In section (C)(2) The applicant provides some insight into activities intended to improve student learning by personalizing the learning environment. However, there is still no plan presented.</p>		
<p>(a) No information was found that addresses the five elements of section (a).</p> <p>(b) Except for the projects and activities listed with no details of their purposes, audience, or intended use, no information was found that addresses the five elements of section (b).</p> <p>(c) There is no evidence that 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.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	10
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>Finally, in section (C)(2), the applicant sheds some light on the activities for which funding is requested. A listing of existing and planned projects with some description is presented, although it is difficult to discern existing from planned activities and the extent of existing implementation (which schools, grade levels, numbers of students/staff included). These projects are related to career and technical education, literacy, college and career planning, school improvement plans, online tutoring, instructional software, a learning management system, professional development, professional learning communities, Lesson Study, and the Marzano Institute. For only a few projects, research demonstrating effectiveness is cited. There is no high-quality plan; and goals, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties are not included.</p> <p>Section (C)(2) also includes narrative related to seven proposed project areas: STEM, College and Career Readiness, mathematics, literacy, technology, educator quality, and grant management and sustainability. Each area includes one or more projects intended to improve teaching and learning.</p> <p>A high-quality plan to tie the numerous projects together is lacking, making it very difficult to determine the applicant's comprehensive and coherent reform vision. With the exception of "Learning Sciences International," no mention of any linking or alignment to the state-adopted Common Core State Standards is evident. While professional development seems to be an integral part of the adoptions of the various programs, no specifics are given.</p>		
<p>(a) The applicant includes professional development (training, professional learning communities, attendance at state and national conferences, Instructional Resource Teachers) in the six projects for which it is relevant.</p> <p>(b) The applicant includes general information about educator access to and knowledge about related tools, data, and resources for each project. Again, the discussions are general.</p> <p>(c) Throughout the discussion of the projects, the intention to provide training, policies, tools, data, and resources to educators to enable them to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs is evident. Again, few specifics are found.</p> <p>(d) No plan is included for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	6
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
No high-quality plan is presented in this section to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of education system with the needed support and resources they need when and where they are needed.		
(a) The applicant provides the district's organizational structure and states that the RTT-District Project activities will be coordinated and supervised by "someone" within each of the Instructional Divisions. It is unclear who these "someones" are and how they will work with district leadership. The proposed management structure sounds like the activities proposed in the grant application are separate from other activities rather than being an integral part of the instructional program. It is not stated that the LEA central office will provide support and services to all participating school.		
(b) The proposal states that the School Board authorizes the establishment of a School Advisory Council (SAC) in each school to "assist in the enhancement of school site decision making," serve in an advisory capacity to the principal, and assist in the development of the educational program and in the preparation and evaluation of the school improvement plan. Literacy Leadership Teams are also described. It is unclear whether either of these groups serve as school leadership teams. Further, the degree of flexibility and autonomy over school schedules, school calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities, and school-level budgets is not mentioned.		
(c) The district has multiple mechanisms in place designed to give students support and opportunities to progress based on demonstrated mastery.		
(d) Students are given the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of the standards at multiple times and in multiple ways - portfolios, district-wide formative assessments, and state assessments. The comparability of these options was not discussed.		
(e) The proposal states that specialized personnel, adaptive equipment, information in English and Spanish, and Simulcast Talk Systems are in place to assure equitable access for all students.		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	3
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
The application contains no high-quality plan 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.		
(a) The application states that all district electronic resources are also available in hardcopy. This makes sense for static documents. However, it is doubtful that this can be the case for dynamic web resources. How to access the hard copies was not addressed. The "Bring Your Own Device" initiative is being implemented in the district high schools, with intentions to move it to middle and elementary schools. No timeline was given. Neither the application narrative nor the Appendix address providing devices for students who cannot afford them. Access for parents, educators, and other stakeholders was not addressed.		
(b) The applicant discusses student, teacher, parent, and community access to online resources. Technical support for these stakeholders, however, was not mentioned.		
(c) Using information technology systems that allow parents and students to export information in an open data format and to use the data in other electronic learning systems is not addressed by the applicant.		
(d) The applicant states that the Osceola Data Management System, Pinnacle, and Data Director are interoperable systems.		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	5
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		

The applicant provides narrative related to continuous improvement, but it is imprecise and fragmented. There is no high-quality 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.

The applicant refers to spending, attendance, and participation reports as well as student data and in-service summaries, but no discussion of precise data collection procedures, content, or format of these reports was found. Quarterly reviews including project meetings with staff and the evaluation team (unspecified) to review and respond to issues are mentioned. Again, details are sparse. For example, without performance indicators, it would be difficult to identify problems and measure change. No mention of how findings would be dealt with, how intervention strategies would be developed, or how effectiveness of the interventions would be measured was included. A Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) is described, but it is unclear how it coordinates with the continuous improvement process.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
---	----------	----------

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

It is not stated who would have access to the district's to-be-developed Race to the Top website. Proposed content is links to all written reports, proposals, evaluation, expenditures, advertisements, and information. Simply placing all documents online does not constitute a high-quality plan for ongoing communication. Insufficient detail is presented about the proposed newsletters; it is not stated where the advertisements for future implementation will be posted. District fidelity visits, regional visits and "constant communication" with district schools were mentioned as strategies; however, supporting details were not included. The proposed strategies for involvement of stakeholders are more like ways to tell the public what is transpiring than viable ways to engage them in the processes. All strategies depend on the stakeholders willingness to access the information; little outreach was proposed. Defined roles of contributing groups and actual plans for involving them were not found.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
---	----------	----------

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The requirements of (E)(3) are not satisfactorily met. No performance measures were found that relate to numbers and percentages of students served by highly qualified or qualified teachers. Data for required subgroups (Whites, Blacks, Hispanics, Native American, Asian/Pacific Islander, and multi-ethnic; Economically Disadvantaged: Students on free or reduced-price lunch; Students with Disabilities: Students with IEPs; and Limited English Proficient students) or an explanation for any omissions were not found. Achievement levels from the FCAT 2.0 state assessments are used for measures of academic growth. No discussion of how the adoption of Common Core State Standards and related assessments would impact the use of FCAT results. For the non-cognitive measure of growth, the applicant proposes reducing unaccountable absences and tardies. Numbers were provided for baseline and targets; percents, necessary to account for anticipated student population growth, were not provided. It is not clear the applicant's leading indicator of successful implementation of the plan. No explanation of how targets were calculated was found.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
--	----------	----------

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

In section (E)(4) the applicant provides narrative listing many viable options for evaluating the effectiveness of the RTT-District funded activities. The narrative, however, lacks the components, detail, and specificity of a high-quality plan. Items like "relevant data," "project staff," "internal outputs," and "baseline data" need to be clearly defined, identified, and listed.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	3
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		

(a) The budget summary and individual project budgets do not meet the specifications of section (F)(1). Amounts are presented by the required categories, but the budget narrative is insufficient to explain how the funds within categories will be spent. For example, it is not stated which schools and how many students will be served by project 1 (STEM), how many and what types of personnel will be paid by the grant funds, whether the personnel are new hires, what travel is planned, what supplies will be purchased, what contractual services are covered, and how the training stipends will be used. Project 2 (college and career readiness) includes only \$14,400 for personnel and almost \$92,000 for travel. The relationship between these expenditures and college and career readiness is uncertain. Similarly, the types, frequency, focus, and numbers of staff to be involved in the professional development described in projects 3 and 4 (mathematics and literacy) is not given. Further, it is not clear how this professional development and that described in project 6 (Educator Quality) is related.

(b) Because of the vagueness of the proposal, the lack of a high-quality plan, and the unidentified expenditures, it is not possible to determine if the budget is reasonable and sufficient to support development and implementation.

(c)(i) The proposal lists sources of several allocated funds that the district has utilized since 2008 along with total annual amounts received. Appendix F01 lists specific funding sources and amounts by year since 2008-2009. It is unclear which funds will be used to support the implementation of this proposal.

(c)(ii) There is no identification of funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	3
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
While the applicant offers assurances that it will continue the RTT reform initiative by integrating district resources and identifies funding sources that may be used in the future, no high-quality plan for sustainability of project goals after the term of the grant was found.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:		
The applicant did not address the Competitive Preference Priority.		

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:		
This proposal does not adequately address how the applicant will build on the core educational assurance areas (standards and assessments, data systems, effective teachers and principals, turning around lowest achieving schools) to meet Absolute Priority One. It contains excellent ideas and strategies that would likely, if implemented in a defined and organized way, contribute to the creation of a personalized learning environment that would meet the needs of all students, increase educator effectiveness and access, decrease achievement gaps, and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. However, while the applicant's ideas are sound, there is no discernible plan, high-quality or otherwise, evident in the proposal. Rather, the applicant presents random thoughts and ideas that one would be hard-pressed to implement in any cohesive way. Goals, timelines, and responsible parties are often unclear or missing entirely. Activities are not specific enough to be implemented with fidelity. Evaluation and continuous improvement strategies are vague. The current proposal is more brainstorming than a plan. The applicant is encouraged to take the underdeveloped strands and ideas and weave them together into a fully developed plan complete with quality objectives, specific measurable goals, well-defined activities with rationale, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties; to create a roadmap that one could follow to achieve the goals of Absolute Priority One.		



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0155FL-3 for The School District of Osceola County, Florida

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- a. The applicant builds on each of the four assurance areas. Area 1 is targeted through participation in a Florida RTTT state assessment grant. Area 2 is built through analysis of several data points including state assessments and the use of a software program DataDirector that is utilized to inform instruction. Area 3 is developed through plans to improve teacher behaviors through professional development and coaching and participation in the Marzano frameworks of instruction that works. Area 4 is developed by documenting the history of low-performing schools. It was very difficult to identify the four target areas as they were inferred and not directly identified.
- b. A grant mission statement was identified for the project; personalized instruction that emphasizes STEM developing higher level skills with digital tools, career and college preparation, and empower teachers and administrators with professional development.
- c. The general mission of the proposal is supported through the implementation of seven projects. There is not a clear description of what classroom experiences will be like for students. The projects are described in general terms.

The lack of clear and concise descriptions of specific activities prevents this section from receiving full points. This section earns a score of 7 out of 10 possible points.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
---	----	---

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes to serve all schools and all grade levels in the district.

- a. All district schools will participate in the project. There is no explanation of how it was decided to include all schools.
- b. A list of each school involved in the project is included.
- c. Populations are identified in table format.
 - a. 100% participation for all 56,187 students
 - b. Low-income percentage ranges from 37% - 100% with a majority of the buildings in the 70% - 90% range.
 - c. A total of nearly 4,000 teachers are involved.

Lack of explanation of how it was decided to include all schools and all grade levels prevent this section from receiving full points.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has a clear theory of change by embracing a continuous improvement model. Plan, Do, Assess, Act are the four steps to the process. However, the applicant does not clearly articulate a high-quality plan.

The process was originally identified in 2009 and has been the model utilized to date.

The plan lists eight action steps but the presentation of the elements in the plan is disjointed and difficult to follow. STEM, Lesson Study, Standards and Assessment, Parent Choice, International Baccalaureate, PLCs, Extended Learning Opportunities, Instructional coaching and mentoring, and Marzano Frameworks are all discussed but are not presented in a clear and concise manner.

The lack of a clear plan prevents this section from receiving full points. This section scores in the medium score range.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has clearly articulated performance goals for student growth.

- a. Summative assessment goals are based on the Florida's Annual Measurable Objectives Tests. A moderate growth in performance is targeted ranging an average of four points per year.
- b. The targets for each content area target a decrease in achievement gap each year. The gaps are identified per sub-group.
- c. Graduation rate targets increase each year with final rates ranging between 60 and 100%. These rates demonstrate a 40-point gap between students with disabilities and the Asian sub-groups.
- d. The baseline data indicates a current college enrollment of 43% targeting 58% by the end of the grant.

The target performance measures and gaps seem reasonable and attainable but they are not ambitious. There is no clear explanation of how the targets were calculated or if they were based on previous growth measures.

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

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does demonstrate some success in student learning and achievement.

- a) An official external review of the district was conducted in 2012-13 and provided several highlights concerning growth.

Student growth was demonstrated increased math scores for grades 4 in most buildings. Reading scores in grades 8 – 10 increased.

Graduation rates for the district are higher than the state average.

- b) Not all schools identified as schools in need of improvement have met AYP, however scores are increasing as much as 6% growth per year.

Student performance data is available to students and parents through a Parent Internet Viewer (PIV). Additional district data is available through on-line postings. Teachers and administration access student data through Pinnacle and Data

Director.

The district seems to have multiple ways to access data as developed through their participation in the RTTT state assessment grant. Multiple data points are utilized and it appears as though teachers have access to all the data. It is not clear, however, if students are able to make informed decisions about their own learning paths based on the Pinnacle on-line grade book system. This section earns a high level score due to the multiple sources of data available to teachers. Full points cannot be given due to lack of explanation of how data informs students.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
---	----------	----------

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

There does not appear to be a high level of transparency in the LEA process. Much of the information identified in the criteria are not provided in the narrative. However, the applicant provides copies of all public documents per request.

- a. The district website contains a link to salaries and salary schedules.
- b. Salaries and salary schedules are posted to the district website. Board finance reports are provided each month as a matter of public record.
- c. Salaries and salary schedules are posted to the district website
- d. Non-personnel expenditures at the school level are not posted.

The applicant follows state rules and regulations concerning open records, which include financial records. Salaries and salary schedules are posted to the district web site. While the narrative indicates salaries are posted to the district web site, there are no supporting documents to review in the appendix. Therefore, the applicant does not receive full points for this section based on the lack of information in the narrative as well as it not being provided openly without a specific request.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The district participated in a state RTTT assessment grant that required them to adopt specific rules including the Florida system of improvement, implementation of sunshine state standards, curriculum frameworks for grades 9-12, adult education and state k-20 education priorities. Within those frameworks, the district was allowed to develop their own plan.

The applicant does not explain if state rules concerning seat time, units of instruction, or content delivery models are governed by the state or if the district can set those parameters on its own. It appears as though the current method of delivery is teacher-centered with normal attendance and credit requirements of traditional schools with the exception of some of the academy schools where the curriculum focuses on specific career areas including the arts or engineering.

Information presented in this section seems to address the issue of autonomy for the district in a basic way. There is little evidence of how personalized learning environments will be provided.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does a poor job of including stakeholders in the proposal development.

- a. Advisory committees were involved in the development of the RTTT-D application but there is no indication of parent or student involvement in the process. There are no survey results indicated. In addition, there is no mention of meeting minutes or sign in sheets in the appendix for advisory meetings that included discussion and planning of the proposal.

- i. The LEA has collective bargaining representation. The president of the teacher's union signed the application.
- b. Letters of support are included in the appendix of the application. Letters are from corporate sponsors.

The lack of survey responses and supporting documentation (meeting notes, participant sign in sheets, etc.) as well as the exclusion of parents and students in the planning of the proposal keep this section from receiving full points.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	4

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

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

There is a significant absence of a high quality plan. The applicant does not articulate a robust approach to learning in this section. However, the following section includes information that supports Learning as well as Teaching and Leading. Evaluation of both C1 and C2 were necessary to find the information necessary to evaluate this section.

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

- (i) The applicant incorporates a multitude of approaches to address all levels of learner. The district recognizes that students are digital natives and require multimedia, creativity, and visual learning.
- (ii) The district will expand the AVID program to include more schools. In addition, career and technical education is highlighted. Elementary through high school students will explore career pathways and students have access to the state's FACTS advising and academic support system.
- (iii) The district supports several academy schools as well as supporting a whole host of on-line resources for student use.
- (iv) The demographics of the district itself allows for interaction with diverse cultures. Again, a wide variety of on-line resources help facilitate virtual experiences for students. However, there is no mention of specific strategies for connecting students through video conferencing opportunities to other cultures or locations.
- (v) The implementation of several on-line planning systems such as FACTS and involvement in AVID provide opportunities to develop critical academic skills.

(b) With the support of parents and educators (as defined in this notice), each student has access to—

- (i) The district supports a wide variety of on-line resources for students. However, there is little explanation of how the resources are utilized to specifically personalize the sequence of instruction for individual students.
- (ii) Again, the district offers not only academies, but also access to several on-line and virtual instructional resources allowing for a variety of approaches. However, the lack of a high-quality plan or explanation of exactly how these resources will be used makes it difficult to clearly understand how exactly these resources will be used.
- (iii) Yes, there is evidence of several on-line digital learning resources at all grade and instructional levels. They are listed in the C2 section of the proposal. Again, however, there is no clearly defined implementation plan.

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

- (A) Data is available within the individual student resources. The district lacks a centralized comprehensive data system that would allow for single sign on and prescriptive resource assignment.

(B) Within the context of some of the available on-line resources, students would have access to personalized learning recommendations. There does not appear to be one central system that evaluates all potential resources and provides students a variety of choices.

(v) Within the context of the current resources, high needs students are supported through both personnel and on-line resources.

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

While the applicant provided several resources, the narrative was extremely difficult to follow. The criteria was difficult to identify within the narrative. This lack of continuity in the narrative prevents this from being a high-quality plan and earns a low score. The resources are in place, however, there is no clear plan on how they will efficiently be integrated and maximized for high impact in student learning.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	8
--	----	---

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

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

The applicant fails to deliver a high-quality plan for improving teaching and learning. This entire section was dedicated to the project goals and included information that was more applicable for the previous section. There was little information concerning actual teacher and principal behavior and practices.

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

(i) Support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student's academic needs and help ensure all students can graduate on time and college- and career-ready; The applicant provides seven separate projects; STEM (with three goals) College and career readiness, Math, Literacy, Technology, Educator Quality, and Grand management & sustainability. Each separate project lists goals, however, the plan is extremely difficult to navigate and there is no clear picture of how one goal works with the others. There is little reference to exactly what personalized learning environment strategies will be supported.

(ii) Adapt content and instruction, providing opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches (e.g., discussion and collaborative work, project-based learning, videos, audio, manipulatives); The applicant does provide lists of several resources and opportunities but again, the narrative is disjointed and it is difficult to understand how any of it will be implemented. It appears as though the entire system is disjointed and random. There are no specific timelines for implementation, no benchmarks or evaluation strategies. There is no explanation of which resources will be used in which grade levels or which buildings.

(iii) Frequently measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice), or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice) and use data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators (as defined in this notice); and Within each of the listed resources or strategies, student data is available. However, there is no explanation of how those systems will all work together and how student progress will be monitored. The statement "most of these programs include performance management systems.....teachers are able to customize and individualize the delivery of specific tasks...." This does not address how all data systems will be linked together to build a complete picture of student needs. There is no explanation of how each resources is assigned to students or if the resources are available district-wide or only at specific buildings. There is no systematic approach that could support district-wide continuity.

(iv) Improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback provided by the LEA's teacher and principal evaluation systems (as defined in this notice), including frequent

feedback on individual and collective effectiveness, as well as by providing recommendations, supports, and interventions as needed for improvement. Project 6 is focused on Educator Quality. The district subscribes to a system called iObservation. There is little explanation of how the system is utilized but that it includes elements of the Danielson Frameworks, Marzano, and Douglas Reeves' standards-based dimensions for leadership performance. The narrative suggests that the system provides on-line access to information but does little to explain the process in enough detail to fully grasp what it offers.

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

(i) Actionable information that helps educators (as defined in this notice) identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests; The applicant does little to explain how each of the resources and suggested learning approaches will be supported and how student data will be used to inform decisions. Again, within each of the programs and resources mentioned, there are reporting features; however, the applicant does not explain how all the resources and information available will be used.

(ii) High-quality learning resources (e.g., instructional content and assessments), including digital resources, as appropriate, that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice), and the tools to create and share new resources; and The applicant has provided an impressive list of resources. However, the lack of a high-quality plan that specifically identifies which resources will be used and when or how mean that there is no clear understanding of how they will support individualized instruction. There also is a lack of information concerning the ability of students to access the resources. Single sign on and federated search engines are not discussed.

(iii) Processes and tools to match student needs (see Selection Criterion (C)(2)(b)(i)) with specific resources and approaches (see Selection Criterion (C)(2)(b)(ii)) to provide continuously improving feedback about the effectiveness of the resources in meeting student needs. Again, the lack of a high-quality plan makes it difficult to understand how tools are matched to student needs. There are no processes identified to determine what resources will be used with which students and why.

(c) All participating school leaders and school leadership teams (as defined in this notice) have training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and accelerates student progress through common and individual tasks toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice). The training, policies, tools, data, and resources must include: The applicant does mention the iObservation tool. In addition, each of the seven projects have some type of professional development associated with them. However, there is not a clear understanding of how each of the projects will work with the others. This is due to the lack of a clearly articulated plan.

(i) Information, from such sources as the district's teacher evaluation system (as defined in this notice), that helps school leaders and school leadership teams (as defined in this notice) assess, and take steps to improve, individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate, for the purpose of continuous school improvement; and As the applicant only provided a short paragraph about the iObservation system, there is little evidence to support this criteria. The district does utilize several quality practices for improving teacher and school leadership including professional learning communities but does not provide a clearly articulated plan with timelines and action steps to fully understand how the process works within the district.

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

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

The applicant does not deliver a high quality plan. The section does provide some glimpses into some of the district's resources and practices for teachers in terms of professional development. There was little mention of principal evaluation

and training. There was also little discussion concerning special needs students. As STEM as well as Math are two of the seven projects listed, there are plans for specialized professional development in those hard to staff subjects. The lack of a high-quality plan and the disjointed nature in the explanation of the projects earn this section a medium range score.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	10

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

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

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

- (a) Organizing the LEA central office, or the consortium governance structure (as defined in this notice), to provide support and services to all participating schools (as defined in this notice); The applicant provides a clear explanation of the district governance. There appears to be sufficient central office personnel to carry out the management of the project.
- (b) Providing school leadership teams (as defined in this notice) in participating schools (as defined in this notice) with sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and noneducators, and school-level budgets; The applicant does describe the leadership structure, however, there is no indication that the teams have the autonomy to make decisions without board or administrative approval.
- (c) Giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic; The applicant provides several processes to support students at risk of failure and include using PLATO systems for credit recovery, the RtI model, 504 plans, and etc. What the applicant did not express, however, is if ALL students have access to on-line or alternative forms of instruction that would allow them to earn credit through non-traditional teacher-led instruction. There is no evidence to support this type of leaning. There is no explanation if students are moved on after mastering a kill or if they are to remain with their class at all times.
- (d) Giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways; and The applicant does provide for some on-line opportunities, however, this section describes use of the Florida assessments and classroom assessments as the means to demonstrate mastery.
- (e) Providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners; and The applicant states that adaptations and requirements are provided per ADA law and that information is shared in both English and Spanish.

The applicant does not provide a high-quality plan to support instructional needs. There is little explanation of how instruction is delivered other than traditional teacher-led classrooms. In some cases, credit recovery and special accommodations are provided for students in need of interventions but there is no plan to address ALL students and how they access content and curriculum that may be available in formats other than teacher-led classroom instruction. The failure to provide explanation of supports for ALL learners earns this section a mid-range score.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	3
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

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

The LEA and school infrastructure supports personalized learning by—

(a) Ensuring that all participating students (as defined in this notice), parents, educators (as defined in this notice), and other stakeholders (as appropriate and relevant to student learning), regardless of income, have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation of the applicant's proposal; There is very little discussion aside from supporting wireless connectivity. The narrative states that each program has the responsibility of providing appropriate written and electronic forms of resources for students. It does not address how students of low-income will access information and resources outside of school. In fact, the project proposes a bring your own device project which could be difficult for low-income students.

(b) Ensuring that students, parents, educators (as defined in this notice), and other stakeholders (as appropriate and relevant to student learning) have appropriate levels of technical support, which may be provided through a range of strategies (e.g., peer support, online support, or local support); The applicant indicates that there is a help desk but does not explain the level of technical support available. The section included information about on-line resources available to students which is off topic for this criteria.

(c) Using information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format (as defined in this notice) and to use the data in other electronic learning systems (e.g., electronic tutors, tools that make recommendations for additional learning supports, or software that securely stores personal records); and

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

The applicant combined sub-sections c and d. The district claims that the Osceola data management system, pinnacle, and data director systems but does little to explain how the systems work together. There is no mention if budget data and instructional improvement data are part of the system or if it is exclusively student data.

The applicant does not deliver a high quality plan to support implementation of the project through a robust infrastructure and support system for all involved. There is little explanation of how the help desk system works. It is not clear if the help desk is open to students and parents or just school personnel. There is no explanation of how parents and students are supported or trained in using the data management tools. As the applicant indicated there is a high level of low-income and non-English speaking families, there is little explanation on how those families will be supported to use on-line resources. The lack of this information earns this section a low level score.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	13
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
Because the applicant's plans represent the best thinking at a point in time, and may require adjustments and revisions during implementation, it is vital that the applicant have a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve its plans. This will be determined by the extent to which the applicant has— A high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. The plan must address how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top – District, such as investments in professional development, technology, and staff;		
The applicant does an adequate job of explaining the processes that will be put in place to monitor the project. The responsibilities of everyone involved are explained and the process of how reporting will transpire is also articulated. The plan can be considered a high-quality plan for the information it is gathering. Yearly evaluations will be presented and published in a variety of ways. The plan would be stronger if there was an explanation of how each project would be evaluated in addition to the entire project. This section earns a high-range score.		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:		

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

A high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders; and

The applicant proposes to develop a new RTT-D website. All reports will be posted to the site. Social media will also be utilized to disseminate information about the project. Local media will be notified as well as direct e-mails to patrons of the district. There is no mention of public forums or open houses to highlight project activities. In addition, there is no mention of how to provide information to parents or stakeholders who may not have access to computers or the on-line world. The plan meets the criteria for being a high-quality plan. The section earns a high –range score.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup (as defined in this notice), with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures. For each applicant-proposed measure, the applicant must describe—

The applicant has provided reasonable performance measures. The measures, however, are presented as whole grades and not in sub-groups.

- (a) Its rationale for selecting that measure;** The rationale for each measure is articulated at the top of each chart.
- (b) How the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern; and** The applicant is expecting an approximate 2% growth rate per year.
- (c) How it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.** No discussion is available concerning how the measures will be reviewed over time.

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

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

The applicant meets the minimum requirement for addressing performance measures by whole grade for all grades with the exception of grades K-2. There are no assessments available for grades K-2 but the applicant did not include information on what other non-state required measures could be used. The growth rate of 2% per year seems low for a large-scale project implementation. There is no information concerning closing of achievement gaps due to lack of subgroup information. For these deficiencies, this section earns a mid range score.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

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

A high-quality plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities, such as professional development and activities that employ technology.

The applicant does not build a case for a high-quality plan that supports the projects and specific goals and deliverables of this project. There are strong activities in general evaluation mentioned, however, the plan lacks any tie to the actual projects listed in previous sections of this application.

Standard proficiencies are identified in a table format and appropriate assessment measures are included, however, the proficiencies are not the same items as listed in the projects. (STEM, technology, etc.)

The applicant does a good job of explaining quality evaluation processes, however, fails to apply those measures to the specific aspects of the proposed plan. This lack of organization earns this section a mid-range score.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

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

(a) Identifies all funds that will support the project (e.g., Race to the Top – District grant; external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds); The applicant overviews other funding sources in the narrative portion of the application, however, the only additional funding source identified were in-kind funds from the local science center.

(b) Is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal; and The expenses seem reasonable, however, the budget has very large expenses for contracted services and lots of funding for substitute teachers for training in language arts.

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

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

All funds are identified. A majority of the funds are from the grant.

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

One-time investments are identified. Most of the one-time investments are technology in nature.

The budget seems adequate to support the project as it is presented. Salaries and rates seem in line with job descriptions. The applicant earns a high-range score for this section.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	6
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has a high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. The plan should 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 include an estimated budget for the three years after the term of the grant that includes budget assumptions, potential sources, and uses of funds.

The sustainability proposal appears to be adequate. The district is proposing to continue professional development activities through Federal Title II – A funds. Some of the buildings qualify for School Improvement Grants (SIG) which will also support on-going professional development.

There is no discussion to what will happen to positions created through the grant, especially in the network operations area. The plan mentions that local and regional foundation funds will be used but fails to identify exactly which foundations will be supporting what things within the district.

The plan is not high-quality due to the items mentioned above and scores in the mid-range.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
--	-----------	-------

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: No information was presented in this section. No score given.		

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: The applicant does not meet absolute priority 1 – personalized learning environments. The district has several excellent resources and process in place but this application did not provide evidence of a high-quality plan that articulated exactly how personalized learning environments will be provided to students. The section where student learning was to be identified and explained was void of any project goals, student outcomes, or tangible processes to support personalized learning. There is no systematic approach to how anything is done throughout the district. It appears as though there are nearly 40 plus individual schools with little attempt to articulate a common goal. The presentation of seven different projects within the plan may be accomplished only if there is a strong emphasis on collaboration.		

Total	210	113
--------------	------------	------------