



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0234FL-1 for Washington County School District/PAEC

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>To the greatest extent possible, the proposed project Empower UP: Engage, Enable, Excel (E³ RTTT-D) clearly illuminated an achievable, ambitious, convincing, coherent and detailed vision. As evidenced in the documentation this vision focuses on leveraging resources to impact more students through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests.</p> <p>The proposed reform vision builds on its work in four core educational assurances geared at ensuring high school graduates are prepared for post-secondary education by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace as well s to compete in the global economy 2. Building data systems 3. Recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most 4. Turning around lowest-achieving schools <p>The evidence further purports to build a system of high expectations, rigorous curricula, challenging assessments and meaningful accountability. Specifically the goals are to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accelerate student achievement--by utilizing personalized learning environments to improve students' academic proficiency in core subject areas 2. Deepen student learning--by increasing their participation in advanced placement, dual enrollment, and industry certification programs among underrepresented subgroups 3. Increase equity through personalized student support--by offering support to underrepresented subgroups and increase participation in advanced placement courses 4. Reduce achievement gaps--By increasing the number of students who are taught by effective or highly effective teachers, increasing high school I graduation rates for all subgroups, increasing college enrollment among graduating seniors <p>To the full extent possible, the evidences provided in (A) (1) demonstrate that a comprehensive and coherent vision was articulated. Thus satisfying the criterion. It is based on these evidences that the E³ RTTT-D project earns the full points having satisfied all the requirements.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

A careful assessment of E3 RTTT-D initiative revealed a high extent to which the applicant's approach to implementing its reform will be accomplished. A detailed timeline for project implementation also was provided. This speaks highly of the sound approach that has been used in this proposal.

(a) The supported description was provided of how the participants were selected for this initiative. This is evidenced by having 60% of the population served in this area classified as economically disadvantaged. Coupled with the economic disadvantage is the fact that 50% of the total school population is comprised of minorities. Hence, the Madison County schools meet the eligibility criteria for high-minority school. In addition, 7 of the 38 participating schools are classified as low performing schools.

(b) A list of the schools that will participate in the reform initiative was provided with the grade bands identified as well

As outlined in the demographic information a total of 38 schools will participate in this Initiative. In addition, the school demographics table presents the raw data indicating the fact that these schools do have a high needs population evidenced by 60% of students classified as low income or economically disadvantaged status.

(c) The total number of participating students was cited as 13,628 participating students with 50% of the students identified as minorities. Approximately 75% qualify for free and reduced lunch based on the fact they are from low-income families. In addition, 42.9% of the students as classified as being at risk for academic failure, with 19% having Limited English Proficiency. a total of 609 education also were identified.

Finally, in this criteria addressing applicants approach to implementing, strong descriptions were provided to show that this category has been fully answered. This was inclusive of the total number of students and educators participating in this initiative. Thus, the response was one of high quality earning a ranking in the high range. Full points were not earned only because no mention was made of students with disabilities, a valid minority group, that are or will be served by this initiative.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

It is to a great extent that the applicant addressed LEA-wide reform and change.

The E3 RTTT-D reform initiative provided a high-quality plan describing how the project will be scaled-up. Key to the scaling-up of this initiative is building on current initiatives to achieve substantive, sustainable, and positive reform. A consortium-wide learning initiative costing about \$1,990 per pupil is to help make a difference between dropping out and staying in school. The theory of change illustrated in the logic model provides evidence for achieving outcome goals and improving student learning outcomes. Anchoring the logic model is the underlying assumption that "all students can achieve at the levels necessary for accomplishing . . . post-secondary educational and career goals."

Based on this underlying assumption, the logic proposed is to have activities to deepen student learning and ultimately reduce the achievement gap--the focus being on minority sub-groups. Evidences to make this happen include: proper staffing, adequate resources, higher education partners articulation agreements, performance assessments. Multiple outputs were identified and linked with participants--that is impacted by external factors such as statutory graduation criteria, elected school superintendents, logistic challenges, and availability of common core assessments. These all lead to specific impact as it relates to knowledge, actions, and conditions of individual students. As a means of leveraging these impacts evidence were provided to support student learning, teacher professional development and community involvement to establish the learning logic model.

In sum, evaluation of this criterion indicated all aspects accounted for leading to earning of full score.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Improving student learning and performances are clearly articulated in this initiative. The goals and objectives outlined are both ambitious and achievable: Goals include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To improve student's academic proficiency in English/Language Arts (ELA), Math and Sciences 2. Increase participation in advanced placement and dual enrollment classes among students in underrepresented sub-groups 3. Reduce achievement gaps between our highest and lowest-performing subgroups 4. Increase the number of students who are taught by effective or highly-effective teachers 5. Increase the consortium-wide high school graduation rates 6. Increase college enrollment among graduating high school seniors <p>Success of the E3 RTTT-D reform initiative will be determined by each student's mastery of academics. Each goal outlined is directly correlated with the requirements for this criterion. The methodology for determining status and growth added value to the narrative.</p> <p>Finally, the evidence provided supported the requirement to a high extent. The overall plan for impacting performance on summative assessments; addressing the achievement gaps; graduation rates and college attainment were all addressed adequately to satisfy this criterion. As a result, this category has earned a high-range score.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	15
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>It was to a great extent that Florida's LEA has demonstrated strong evidence of a track record of successes:</p> <p>In general, this narrative has indicated pride in prior successes for this LEA. Evidence has shown a history of firsts for multi-district services (1) having a Professional Development Center to track staff development; (2) having a nationally broadcasting channel of staff development; (3) reducing costs for managing student information services; (4) utilizing multi-district risk management program; (5) creating a cooperative bidding/purchasing system ; and (6) writing award winning grants for additional instructional support in the district.</p> <p>Together these services strongly indicate the ability of this LEA to provide, implement , evaluate services and disseminate information effectively.</p> <p>Specifically, strong evidences has been provided inclusive of appropriate descriptions, charts, graphs, raw student data, and other evidence that demonstrates the applicant's ability to: improve student learning and close achievement gaps, achieve ambitious and significant reforms, and indicate student performance data to improve participation, instruction and services —</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The LEAS in this area demonstrated Improvement of student learning services leading to a reduction in the achievement gap over the last 4 years as evidenced by 81% of the schools having a strong rating of A and B with only 6% obtaining a ranking of D or F in 2011. Schools grades outlined in Appendix 7 also corroborates this evidence. In addition in the last 4 years all 8 member districts have maintained or improved the percentage of students in reading, science and math as measured by the FCAT assessment. This evidence clearly shows that the measures in place have impacted student learning. Many of the schools have high rankings based on US News and World Report. 		

In closing the achievement gap evidence was provided indicating that from 2010-2011, 66% of the migrant students demonstrated learning gains. This was tracked by the consortium wide Migration Education Program (MEP) available evenings, weekends, and summers. Thus, students achievement has increased also impacting high school graduation rates and college enrollment. Between 2009-2011 student performance data illustrated districts efforts to close the achievement gaps whereby 7 of the school districts made record gains of 25% or more in reading and mathematics. Low performing schools also made incremental gains.

(b) As demonstrated in the narrative, significant reform initiative in its persistently lowest-achieving/performing schools showed incremental improvements. Teachers met together to develop a plan that was supported by parents. For some students, after school intervention led to improved student learning outcomes. For other students assigning a mentor helped them succeed. Other benefited from intensive classes to assist them in the learning process. Another reform issue was the partnering with the Public Consulting Group(PCG) that helped low-performing school to "Turn Around" the lowest performing school by building capacity

(c) With the strong data management systems in place that measure student growth and success this constantly available data was used formatively and summatively. Teachers and principals used this data to improve instruction. The Progress monitoring and Reporting Network facilitated instruction and tracked students performance. Information also is provided to parents from this network. The parent and teacher portals are accessible to administrators for scheduling and state reporting as well.

In sum, focused and convincing evidences were provided to support the LEAs track record of success. This criterion was supported to the greatest extent possible. Achievable programs are in place that have improved student learning; achievement gaps were shown to have been reduced; a strong data management system has been in place and student performance data are made available to administrators, educators, parents and students in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. As a result, the strong evidences in all areas fully satisfy this criterion leading to the full high-range score.

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

5

5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

It is to a **great extent** that the LEA has demonstrated evidences of transparency. Specifically, evidence was provided (a) indicating that school-level expenditures from the state and local funds are all available on the Florida Department of Education. (b) By selecting district and school the actual salary of instructional staff will show up. (C) Actual personnel salaries for teachers and teacher aids will pop-up. (d) Non-personal expenditures are available as materials and supplies. School and district functions and annual financial reports also are available for the public to examine on the state's website.

Clear evidences were provided that revealed thorough transparency with regards to actual personnel salaries at the school level, instructional staff salaries, teacher salary and non-instructional expenditures. Because of the full narrative provided, this criterion earned full points with a score in the high range.

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

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

It is to a **great extent** that this LEA has demonstrated evidence of a strong and workable implementation plan, that is illustrative of autonomy under the various regulatory bodies.

First, a workable context for implementation has been set out, with regards to the E3 RTTT-D reform building on previous successes. Evidence has shown a formalized governance structure as well as a strong strategic planning process in place.

Second, the PAEC is operated with much transparency and in compliance with all Florida Statutes and State Board of Education Administration Rules.

Third, a wide range of effective services are provided and already in place to support implementation

Fourth, digital learning systems are integrated in all schools

Finally, every student will have access to high-quality content aligned with college/career ready standards as well as graduation requirements.

In sum, it is to the full extent that the E3 RTTT-D reform proposal has provided clear evidences that implementation can be successful and sustained. This ability has been demonstrated that there is sufficient autonomy for implementation with appropriate resources and personnel; checks and balances are in place to improve student learning as well as increase graduation rates over time. The evidences listed above support the full score (high-range score) achieved for this criterion.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7
--	-----------	----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

It is to a **medium extent** that the Florida LEA has demonstrated evidence meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal from the outset.

(a) A complete description was provided of how students, families, teachers, and principals were engaged from the start in the development of the proposal. Evidence revealed a needs assessment in the form of surveys administered to students, parents, principles, and school board members.

No evidence was provided indicating whether or not the LEA is a collective bargaining union. In addition,

No evidence was provided indicating at least 70 percent of teachers from participating schools support the proposal

(b) 9 letters of support from key stakeholders such as the business community, civil rights organizations, advocacy groups, local civic and community-based organizations, and institutions of higher education, Department of Education and City Council were provided.

Missing were letters of support from parents and parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, and/or tribes.

In sum, responses to the criterion was of medium quality because evidence was missing indicating whether or not the LEA was a collective bargaining unit. In addition, letters of support were not obtained from some key stake holders such as parent groups. These groups were surveyed, therefore these letters could be obtained to support this documentation. It is because of the missing evidences that a medium range score was earned.

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

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Praise worthy is the fact that it is to **a large extent** that the LEA demonstrated evidence of a high-quality plan for an analysis of current status, logic and needs gaps as they impact this reform initiative.

The evidences provided were clearly in line with the goal of the E3 RTTT-D to positively affect student learning outcomes and decrease gaps. This LEA had successfully demonstrated the ability to be autonomous in implementing personalized learning environments. The logic advanced includes:

1. Increasing student access to digital learning devices
2. Providing additional training and support for teachers to utilize the digital learning devices for the greatest support for student learning
3. Improving contact between high needs students and adults in the school setting through mentoring
4. Increasing academic rigor in order to improve college and career readiness
5. Constantly assessing the interests and aptitude of students starting as early as 8th grade
6. Revising the section of courses

- 7. Improving teacher proficiency in differentiation of instruction and assessment through professional learning communities
- 8. Providing greater access to digital tools
- 9. Increasing professional training for teachers
- 10. Modifying instructional practices
- 11. Assisting struggling students in low-performing schools
- 12. Upgrading technology for efficiency

Finally, the evidences provided clearly indicate that the E3 RTTT-D reform initiative is fully geared at implementing a personalized environment that will impact student learning outcomes. The logic advanced includes having a track record of success as well as the autonomy and a high quality analysis of the needs that exist. Needs and gaps that do exist were identified. Workable strategies were indicated as to how these gaps could be closed so more students will be college/career ready. Because of the full description provided in the narrative, this criterion earned full high-range points.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	17

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Learning was accomplished **to a great extent** in this narrative

In this crucial part of the narrative, applicants were expected to present an approach to learning that engages and empowers all learners, in particular high-need students, in an age-appropriate manner. The evidence provides indicated the extent to which this was accomplished as it relates to:

(a) Support of parents and educators for all students—

(i) Understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals, evidenced by: the training and mentoring they will receive

(ii) Identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards and how to measure progress toward those goals;

- Students knowing how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order for them to track and manage their learning
- Students broadening their understanding of post-secondary education
- Increased number of students pursuing rigorous coursework for deep understanding
- Students having the knowledge and skills and abilities for post-secondary success in college and career with no remediation

(iii) Providing opportunities for students to be engaged in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest; evidenced by

- Enhanced links to community resources
- Parent outreach programs
- Implementation of a personalized academic learning support system to link high need students to advisors

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

- The diversity of cultures in the school district
- Video-linked global classroom

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

- Providing students with concrete examples and experiences in areas of personal interest

(b) Supporting parents and educators with workable strategies to ensure that each student has access

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

- Implementation of the Multi-tier system of support (MTSS) to ensure efficient use of resources etc

(ii) Having a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments; evidenced by

- Expanded digital learning options
- Implementation of blended learning options
- Provision of tablet computers for all students and
- Installation of interactive technologies in all classrooms

(iii) The provision of support outlined above will ensure high-quality content, including digital learning content appropriate and aligned with college/career-ready standards college/career-ready graduation requirements. Evidence provided include the fact that each teacher at Washington County School District will be furnished with an iPad for data collection. There are process for a valid assessment and feedback mechanism on student learning. These assessment procedures are aligned with the college/career readiness standards.

(iv) Ongoing and regular feedback is a corner stone of how the applicants will communicate with internal and external stakeholders.

(A) Based on the evaluation plan, frequent updates regarding individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards will be examined

(B) Furthermore, the personalized learning recommendations based on the student's current knowledge and skills will help to shape the content

(v) Accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students including students from minority groups and students with disabilities.

(c) i Based on the evidence provided, there are 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. This is evidenced in the proposal. .

ii. There are doable training systems and practices in place for continuous improvement as Washington County School District progress towards goal achievement. In the narrative many hours will be devoted to professional development which is very important in preparing the teachers to teach the students in this school district.

In sum, the account provided in this narrative allowed this criterion to score in the high range. A high quality plan for increasing effectiveness in Washington County School District was evident. The goal is clear; relevant activities are outlined; there is a realistic timeline; and the deliverables are in keeping with the outlined goals. There is substantial evidence that learning will indeed take place.

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

20

17

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

It was to a **great extent** that a comprehensive approach to teaching and leading was provided in a convincing manner. How this approach will further help teachers improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress college or career readiness also was outlined. These approaches, if implemented with fidelity will ultimately enable effective implementation of personalized learning and teaching for all marginalized students in this district who will be impacted by the E3 RTT-D initiative.

(a) individual and collective capacity were substantiated by the following

- Support indicative of the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that will help each of the students be fully prepared to graduate on time and be college/career ready.
- Clear indications of how the content and instruction will be adapted in order to provide students with multiple opportunities to become actively engaged in common and individual tasks based on each student's
- Individualized learning for students. Evidence provided allows students will be engaged with collaborative work
- As evidenced in the proposal, student progress toward meeting college/career readiness will be used frequently to measure success. Each year this data will be compiled and used as a benchmark standards to evaluate students performance and acceleration to graduation
- Furthermore, graduation data also will be utilized both formatively and summatively for teachers and principals to improve practice and effectiveness. This will be coupled with using feedback obtained from evaluation systems to monitor teacher effectiveness, provide recommendations for areas of supports, needed interventions and improvements as the needs arise. All this will be coached and consistent with the broader Common Core State Standards adopted by the state of Florida.

(b) All participants have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college/career readiness inclusive of...

- Implementation of college preparatory and career development curriculum
- The processes and tools outlined in this proposal to match student needs and to provide continuously improving feedback about the effectiveness of the resources in meeting student needs. This feedback mechanism will be done formatively (during the initiative) as well as after the initiative (summatively)
- As mentioned throughout the proposal, there will be high-quality learning resources.

(c) A reasonable case has been made for all participating school leaders and school leadership teams to have training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment in their E3 RTTT-D classes. Such evidence has been provided in the following areas:

- Data to be obtained will serve to help school leaders and school leadership teams identify strengths and weaknesses and by extension take steps to improve, individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate, for the purpose of continuous school improvement; and
- Furthermore, training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps

(d) Whereas the applicant has proposed a strong high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who will receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals, no evidence or mention has been made regarding the inclusion of hard-to-staff schools. Furthermore, the information has not been disaggregated out with regards to hard-to-staff subjects (such as mathematics and science), and specialty areas (such as there are high-quality learning resources available special education).

In sum, it is to a great extent that the applicant provided strong evidence of high-quality teaching and learning activities in place. As a result the area of teaching and leading scored in the high range. Full points were not earned because there was data missing to address how hard-to-staff schools and hard to staff content areas would be taken care of.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	15
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>It is to the full extent that this narrative has demonstrated evidences showing clearly that this criterion has been fully satisfied. In evaluating this aspect of the proposal, very solid and complete information was provided.</p> <p>(a) A strong case was made of hoe the E3 RTTT-D reform initiative would impact student learning outcome. Clear and substantive evidence were provided addressing how the central office, or the consortium governance structure provide support and services to all participating schools</p> <p>(b) Supported evidence was made of participating schools having sufficient flexibility and autonomy over school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non -educators, and school-level budgets</p> <p>(c) Extensive evidence was provided addressing students given the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on content mastery. Evidence showed multiple options available for them to compete coursework that captures the students interest and imagination</p> <p>(d) Giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards in multiple comparable ways also was addressed in the narrative. For example Algebra 1 and Biology 1 are offered a minimum of 3 times per year. students can take these exams multiple times. Students also have the option to demonstrate mastery through oral reports, presentations using digital technology, written reports, group reports and laboratory activities.</p> <p>(e) To a very large extent, an innovative method of providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and accessible to all students was made throughout the narrative of this proposal. The E3 RTTT-D reform initiative has its ultimate goal of enabling all students, regardless of disability, ethnicity or economic status, to graduate from high school college and career ready.</p> <p>In sum, having provided full evidences and supporting documentation to demonstrate how to accomplish this criterion, full points were earned in the high-range category.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>It is to a large extent that the applicant has addressed each aspect of this narrative accurately. As specified in the proposal, the school infrastructure supports personalized learning in some ways and not in other ways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some evidence was provided ensuring that participating students parents, educators and other stakeholders regardless of income, have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources. Evidence was provided for in school and out of school access. For example, Florida has virtual high school that are accessible to all students Evidence also was provided that parents, educators, and other stakeholders have access to appropriate levels of support extended through a range of strategies. For example, many teachers have a website that allows students to ask questions. Learning communities and blogs also offer ongoing support for teachers to learn how to implement new strategies using technology 		

- Justification was made of how information technology systems will be used that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format for this data to be used across platforms with ease and efficiency. Using of the data in other electronic learning systems was not addressed.
- With the infrastructure already in place, to a large extent, there is strong evidence of the LEA and schools having the ability to use interoperable data systems inclusive of human resources, student information data, and instructional improvement system data. Through collaborative efforts, with interoperable systems, the Member Districts have similar goals of advancing high-quality classroom instruction for improving student learning outcomes.

In sum, the strong narrative advanced in this section spoke eloquently to the fact that the school's infrastructure has the capacity to support the E3 RTTD reform initiative. As a result, this narrative scored in the high range.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The clear and high-quality approach to continuously improvement in the E3 RTTT-D plan determined the great extent to which the proposal had clearly outlined the strategies for continuous improvement and success.</p> <p>First, the strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback will be: utilizing formative and summative evaluations. That is, both process and impact measures will be focused on. Evidence showed a commitment to timely data collection and reporting; close monitoring of the project activities; monthly operations reports of activities inclusive of (numbers served, challenges and recommendations). These evidences will be prepared and reviewed. This check and balance will serve to ensure progress toward project goal achievement as well as opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the grant initiative.</p> <p>Second, an external evaluator will collect and analyze the data quarterly and report findings. This will allow stakeholders to have 4 opportunities to assess results and recommend modifications where deemed necessary.</p> <p>Finally, cumulative reports of the formative and summative evaluations will be shared annually with project's stakeholders and the Federal programs office.</p> <p>In sum, the proof advanced in this narrative is supported by strong evidence that the applicant can implement a rigorous continuous improvement process. The strategy purported clearly addressed how the LEA will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its program. With this high-quality implementation plan, full points were earned in the high-range</p>		

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

<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>It is to a large extent that the Florida LEA in this reform initiative has provided substantiated evidences of workable strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. These strategies include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Communication will be tailored according to the interests of the diverse stakeholders 2. Project results will be aggregated for quarterly and annual reports 3. Outcomes will be disseminated using formal reports, team meetings, professional development training, student/parent orientations meetings, city council meetings, and digital newsletter etc. 4. Continuous engagements also will be evident through community-based meetings and school meetings 		
---	--	--

The LEA has demonstrated effective and workable methods of implementing and sustaining open communication with all stake holders. Multiple formats have been advanced inclusive of face-to-face meeting, digital media and reports sent to various stakeholder. Because of the high-quality strategies advanced, full points were earned for this criterion in the high-range.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4
---	----------	----------

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

It is to **some extent** that the narrative for the performance measures satisfied this criterion. 11 performance measures were advanced in this narrative. The recommendation was for 12-14 performance hence full points were not earned for this criterion.

The E3 RTTT-D reform initiative advanced ambitious yet achievable performance measures for implementation success. Overall and broken down by subgroups with clear annual targets strong evidences were provided

- (a) Clearly a rationale for selecting each performance measure was provided;
- (b) Focused evidences addressing how each measure will provide rigorous, timely, appropriate and formative information also was provided
- (c) How each measure will be reviewed and improved as the needs arise was presented with sufficient explanations to gauge implementation progress.

In addition to satisfying the criterion, the application went above and beyond the requirement to include relevance to proposed plan/theory of change. The exhaustive descriptions provided to justify (E) (3) qualified this criterion to score in the high range.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

It is to a **medium extent** that the applicant has provided a clear rationale for evaluating the effectiveness of the E3 RTTT-D activities

Some evidence has been provided addressing process and impact evaluation. The strength of this narrative was that six valid evaluative questions were advanced. Weaknesses of this narrative include having just a generalized statement assessing the evaluation capacity. In addition, a cursor mention of "our evaluation design" without clearly identifying the specific design was not sufficient. was indicated

Plans to successfully evaluate the effectiveness of activities, such as professional development, technology usage, productive use of all resources to improve results were addressed in other areas of the narrative such as context for implementation. However, some evidence was missing from this section. In addition, no mention was made of strategies to improve use of technology, working with community partners, compensation reform, and modification of school schedules and structures (e.g., service delivery, school leadership teams and decision-making structures, in this section.

In sum, with several missing data points, this narrative has earned mid-range score.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

It is to a pleasingly **great extent** that the applicant provided a reasonable and workable budget based on the needs for the E3 RTTT-D reform initiative.

The following budget (inclusive of the budget narrative and tables) provides clear, balanced, justifiable information that—

(a) Identified all funds that will be needed to fully support the project. Both external and internal funds were accounted for

(b) Demonstrated that the \$30,809.355.00 being asked for reasonable (based on projections) and sufficient to support the development implementation and sustainability of the E3 RTTT-D proposal

(c) A careful and thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities also were provided that was in keeping with the vision, mission and goals of the E3 RTTTD initiative

In sum, a high-ranging score was earned for this budget because it was complete and reasonable based on the proposed needs.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

It id to the **fullest extent** that the sustainability of project goals were clearly outlined in this narrative

Sustainability of project goals have been assured based on the project’s goals during and after the term of the grant, in multiple ways. Due to previous successes and sustainability of former initiatives, the evidences advanced in this narrative clearly indicate sustainability success for the E3 RTTT-D. Sustainability strategies include:

1. The plan includes support and oversight from the PAED Board of Directors, which are district superintendents
2. Budget for the three years after the term of the grant that includes budget assumptions, potential sources, and uses of funds
3. Protocols for training and professional development are in place
4. The use of a variety of digital learning approaches are in place
5. The curriculum for college and career camps will be the responsibility of university partners
6. a catalog of videos featuring effective teaching during the grant period will be in place
7. The integrated student navigation system in place will last beyond the grant
8. Direct planning and coordination with the state Department ensures succession
9. Regular presentations and dissemination of reports to internal and external stakeholders
10. Collaboration with Florida STEM related career centers and other partners at the state level.

In sum, together, these alliances and strategies for sustainability clearly positions the E3 RTTT-D reform initiative to live beyond the life of the grant. With this strong sustainability vision outlined, full points were earned in the high-range category.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

It is to a **great extent** that the narrative has for the E3 RTTT-D meet the criterion for a high quality competitive preferences. Specifically, this has been achieved the following evidences.

(1) A full and coherent description of sustainable partnerships between public and private organizations, businesses, philanthropies, civic groups, and other community-based organizations including higher education partners demonstrated their support for this E3 RTT-D plan of action in this school district.

(2) The population-level desired results for students demonstrated alignment and support for positive student learning outcomes. Educational results presented included all students in the school district increasing their learning outcome, graduating from high school college/career ready and enrolling in higher education

(3) A full description of how the partnership demonstrated

- (a) Tracked selected indicators that measured each result at the aggregate level for all children within the school district;
- (b) Used the data to target its resources in order to improve results for participating students with special emphasis on students facing significant challenges, such as English learners, and students affected by poverty was clear;
- (c) Developed a clear strategy to scale-up the model beyond the participating students to at least other high-need students and communities in the LEA or consortium over time; and
- (d) Improving student learning outcome results over time;

(4) Unfortunately, description of how the partnership would integrate education and other services (e.g..., services that address social-emotional, and behavioral needs) in and outside of the school was missing for the narrative.

(5) An extensive description of how the partnership and LEA or consortium would build the capacity of staff in participating schools by providing them with tools and support for

- (a) Training protocols
- (b) Professional development activities
- (c) Creating a decision-making flow of the processes
- (d) Engaging parents and families
- (e) Constantly assessing, monitoring and revisiting project goals and
- (f) disseminating of information to stake holders as needed

(6) Finally, there was some degree, though inadequate, of identify the annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed marginal population described in the narrative supporting the E3 RTT-D initiative.

Overall, the evidence provided in this narrative demonstrated the great extent to which this high-quality plan meets the competitive priority criterion. With a few missing pieces of evidence, this narrative still earned a score in the high-range because it satisfied most of the criterion measures.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

What does it takes to satisfy meeting the absolute priority 1 for the RTTT grant applicants? It requires a strong narrative that provides concrete evidences supporting multiple performance measures as outlined in the application. Furthermore, it requires a full, complete, ambitious yet achievable project plan that can be scaled-up and sustained after the life of the grant. Having evaluated the E3 RTTT-D proposal, it was found that this absolute priority 1 criterion was fully met in the following ways:

The applicant coherently and comprehensively addressed how core educational assurances would be built through strong partnerships with public and private entities; evidence also showed how the learning environment would be designed to significantly improve student learning outcomes and teaching using personalized strategies and tools that support a sustainable education and are directly aligned with college and career readiness.

In addition this narrative met the absolute priority criterion as evidenced in how the applicants will strategically accelerate student achievement incrementally, overtime, and simultaneously deepen student learning. This deepening of student learning will lead to results of decreasing gaps across student groups and increasing rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college.

Finally, the absolute priority 1 has been fully met by the E3 RTTT-D reform initiative with strategies in place that will impact and expand student access to educational opportunities, tools and resources inclusive of increased effectiveness of educators that will come about by the training proposed for these educators.

Total	210	192
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0234FL-2 for Washington County School District/PAEC

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: PAEC offers a clear coherent vision concerning personalized student support and postsecondary preparation, but it is unclear how they plan to address academic achievement in English language arts or mathematics. They provide details on how students will gain personalized access to planning resources and how they will be mentored in determining a college and/or career pathway, which are appropriate given the 6-12 grade span. But there is no specific information in the vision about turning around low-achieving schools beyond monitoring and professional development. The proposed enhancements to Florida requirements for this aspect are the same as those for college and career planning.		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant's approach to implementing a personalized college and career planning and monitoring process could support a high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation. The decision to focus these efforts on grades 6-12 is sound. The list of schools provided and the numbers and groups of students to be served meet the requirements of the competition. The degree to which implementation will be high-quality is unclear. There is insufficient information to determine quality.		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	5
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: PAEC's plan to help students develop individualized college and career plans is likely to be scalable and translated into meaningful district-wide change specific to postsecondary planning. The systems they intend to develop respond to the problem as they have defined it.		

It remains unclear what steps will be taken beyond planning and monitoring to improve student achievement on the FCAT and end-of-course exams. The logic model appears to put forth the assumption that focusing on postsecondary goals will suffice for improving achievement. Activities associated with the plan include professional development and training on course delivery, but there is insufficient information to determine if these activities have demonstrated any success in improving achievement.

The implementation plan relies on infrastructure that may not exist given the introductory text. Specifically, the plan relies on technology (e.g., tablets) that require wireless networks.

If the infrastructure and technology are not essential to the postsecondary planning and monitoring, the goals associated with college and career planning should be attainable. It is unclear if the goals associated with learning outcomes beyond postsecondary aspiration and planning are attainable given the lack of information on what the applicant plans to do.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	3
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided specific goals for student performance on summative assessments. They have presented goals for closing the achievement gap, increasing graduation rates, and improving college enrollments. Although they have presented targets for the required elements, there is little information about how they intend to reach those targets. It is therefore impossible to determine how likely the vision is to help them reach those goals. They appear to be relying on the college and career planning and monitoring process to spur student achievement, but this is not explicitly stated.

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:

Although districts identified as low-performing and labeled D or F by the FLDOE improved to grades of C or higher over a three year period, there is no evidence of improvement in reading or mathematics for Black or economically disadvantaged students or students with disabilities. There is no evidence that achievement gaps have narrowed.

The applicant reports that only one secondary school in the consortium is labeled persistently low-performing. In Madison County where that school is located specific individual supports for low achieving students (e.g., mentoring, teachers meeting to plan, individualized attention) are being credited with improved performance.

Graduation rates are high or improving in general; and dual enrollment options are available to students through the local community college.

Performance data are available electronically, but there is no indication of how these data are made available to parents who may not have internet access.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4
---	----------	----------

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

PAEC reports that all of the required data are publicly available, but does not provide documentation to support that report.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

PAEC has the authority to provide services, make instructional delivery changes, and secure resources as required by this section. According to the applicant all of the authority needed to implement their plan exists either at the level of the consortium, the county, or the schools. And the state has recommended the types of personalized learning environment

and devices being proposed. Aside from the tenuous nature of the infrastructure funding, there are no clear obstacles or challenging conditions to reform.

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

10

5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant reports that a survey was distributed to students, teachers, parents, principals, and school board members. The applicant describes specific input from principals, student councils, and school improvement councils. The applicant describes what areas that input addressed. The applicant reports that input was thoroughly analyzed and considered. It is unclear how that input contributed to the development and/or revision of the application. There is also no supporting evidence is provided concerning input from teachers, parents, parent organizations, student organizations, tribes, the business community, civil rights organizations, advocacy groups, or local civic and community-based organizations. Letters from institutions of higher education are provided.

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

5

2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

PAEC does not provide a high-quality plan for an analysis of their current status in implementing personalized learning environments. They do list needs and planned responses to those needs. There is a lack of support for the existence of some needs. For instance, PAEC asserts an "obvious need for increased student access to digital learning devices." The needs is not obvious. PAEC does not make a clear connection between the devices and an improvement in student learning outcomes on state assessments beyond the FLDOE recommendations. The pattern persists for the other needs identified in this section.

The reponse for this section lacks a clear set of goals, objectives, tasks/activities, timeline, responsible parties, and assigned resources.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant has many elements of a high-quality plan for personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready, but the plan lacks clarity about the specifics of improving learning and teaching.</p> <p>The adoption of personalized college and career plans and the integration of those plans into electronic monitoring systems should help students develop most of the understanding and make most of the connections required in this competition. It is unclear how those planning and monitoring systems will allow students to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest. PAEC does not provide sufficient information about how a supplemental curriculum will allow students to master critical academic content although there is sufficient information to see how such a curriculum could help students with goal-setting. It is unclear whether the technologies to be adopted would lead to the development of teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, or problem-solving.</p> <p>It is unclear how the video-linked global classrooms will sufficiently expose students to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning. These classrooms appear to be the applicant's only approach to addressing this criterion and little evidence is provided that this approach will produce the necessary outcomes.</p> <p>The plan to adopt an adaptive personalized digital learning approach where students will be required to master skills and perhaps content before moving ahead should allow students to achieve individual goals. There is insufficient information to judge whether the instruction to accompany the digital learning approach will be of high quality.</p>		

The digital learning approach to be adopted will provide individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards and college- and career-ready graduation requirements. They will also provide personalized learning recommendations based on the student's current knowledge and skills.

The degree to which any of the proposed activities will address the needs of high-need students beyond personalization is unclear.

The mechanisms to facilitate training and support for students do not yet appear to be in place, but the applicant does specify the activities to be undertaken.

PAEC reiterates in this section the challenges created by poor infrastructure. Although they describe how they will adapt if state-level requests for infrastructure improvements are not funded, it is unclear if the existing infrastructure can support PAEC's plans to increase bandwidth among member districts and install wireless networks.

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

20

14

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a series of training opportunities for teachers and leaders that are directly tied to the requirements of this competition. Trainings will be available over each of four summers during the grant period as well as through specialists hired to work closely with teacher and leaders. The applicant has aligned trainings with the integration of technology, which is the focus of the application.

Although the applicant is attentive to every sub-criterion for this section, there is a lack of information about how the applicant will assure and account for the quality of the training and its results. For instance, the applicant asserts that differentiated instruction has been practiced in the consortium for seven years. Differentiated instruction is also among the new training to be offered given a renewed focus on personalized learning environments. The applicant offers no specific information on the degree to which differentiated instruction has been evaluated in the district, how the new training will be responsive to practice deficits, or how the effects of the new training will be measured.

The applicant does not have a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals. Little evidence is provided to demonstrate how the applicant will determine whether teachers and leaders have the knowledge and skills necessary to fulfill the elements of the application or how skill development activities will be measured.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	14

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has policies and structures in place to support districts and schools through the consortium. The purpose of the consortium is to create opportunities for low-capacity districts to benefit from sharing knowledge, skills, and resources. Member districts work together to solve problems which might overwhelm a single district.

School leadership teams have sufficient flexibility and autonomy. They control their personnel decisions, schedules, and budgets.

Students already have and will continue to have the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery; students also have the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times. In digital learning environments, students must demonstrate mastery before moving to new content. And students have three opportunities per year to demonstrate mastery in English and mathematics in addition to course-based assessments.

It is unclear to what degree the applicant is or is preparing to provide learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to English learners; the applicant has an IHE partnership to be responsive to the needs of

students with disabilities. The applicant asserts an interest and capacity to serve high-need students, but there are few details about capacity.

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

10

8

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Provided they have access to the internet, all stakeholders 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. Technical support is also to be made available; the applicant will offer courses to the public. It is unclear whether current technology systems allow users to export information in an open data format, but it appears that the new systems to be adopted meet the requirements of this competition. The core of the application is focused on creating interoperable data systems. The software systems to be adopted will integrate with the current system.

The applicant does not address how parents without access to the internet will gain access to the information to be provided via various webpages.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	10

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a thorough and detailed plan for monitoring and evaluating implementation. Figure E1 contains the required elements of a high-quality plan; and the plan promises quarterly reports along with formative and summative feedback. It is unclear however whether the evaluation plan will result in information that will lead to the kinds of feedback the applicant desires. For instance, it remains unclear what activities the applicant will take to achieve their goals of improving student achievement and reducing achievement gaps. Yet, the applicant intends to monitor achievement-related data elements and compare outcomes over time. Additionally, there is an assumption throughout the application and in the evaluation plan that the chosen professional development activities are likely to lead to improved student outcomes. This assumption is made evident by a lack of attention to evaluating the professional development activities themselves beyond whether teachers have additional knowledge as opposed to whether they have learned to put that knowledge into practice. The applicant presents a strategy for implementing a continuous improvement process, but there is insufficient evidence to suggest that the process will be rigorous considering the lack of specificity on what activities will be undertaken to improve student learning and the reliance on professional development that will not be evaluated.

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

5

5

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant will tailor communication strategies for specific audiences which suggests they have not yet settled on a set of strategies. But the evaluation process requires that the evaluator gather feedback from a wide-range of stakeholders including parents and provide them with regular one-page progress reports called comparative impact summaries. Including parents in the ongoing evaluation will provide the applicant with information about the student experience that might otherwise be missed by school-based personnel. The applicant intends to use the student information systems to communicate outcomes, which would integrate this new information with existing and familiar methods. Considering the many new aspects to be added, maintaining something familiar may facilitate communication.

The applicant also intends to focus on internal communication to make sure that projects are running smoothly. Considering the size of the consortium, this particular strategy will be essential to making adjustments in implementation.

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

5

3

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has selected appropriate measures, provided research-based rationales for many of them, and explained how they are relevant to the theory of change. The applicant has also explained how measures will be reviewed.

The weakness in this section is due to a lack of specificity about expected incremental improvements and/or the ultimate goal for a given measure. For instance, for the 9-12 population, the applicant intends to increase standard diploma achievement to 85%. It is unclear whether this is the overall goal or the goal for the first year. If it is the overall goal, it is unclear how the applicant will judge annual performance. If it is the first year goal, it is unclear what the applicant plans to accomplish in subsequent years. This lack of specificity is pervasive in this section.

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

5

3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant proposes a sophisticated modeling approach to measure the effectiveness of investments through evaluation, but this approach is not consistent with the evaluation plan described and illustrated in Figure E1. The plan illustrated in E1 is not likely to contribute to the type of specified model indicated in this section.

The plan illustrated in E1 does not include the kinds of variables necessary to specify a sophisticated model. It is unclear what additional data will be used. The plan will include educator knowledge of individualized instruction, value added factor computed in part from student achievement, and student assignment to teacher of record. These data do not address teacher content knowledge or other instruction-related variables. Beyond teacher variables, the other measures to be taken are mostly output measures, which means questions about causation (which are tenuous already), are not likely to be answered. It appears that participation in a given project in the proposal will be a sufficient indicator to measure the impact of that project, but again there is a lack of specificity about whether additional variables will be used.

Given there is no requirement for such a sophisticated modeling approach, and the lack of information about what additional data will be used, it is difficult to determine whether the applicant's plans are likely to be successful.

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 has identified all funds that will support the project but does not specify the origins of those funds. The budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the proposal. The applicant's description of the all the funds to be used is not sufficiently specified, but the use of funds is clearly delineated among one-time investments versus ongoing costs.

There is insufficient focus on strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of personalized learning environments. The applicant proposes to purchase several thousand tablet computers but does not appear to have a plan for maintaining or upgrading those devices as the technology changes or becomes obsolete. These tablets are central to the proposal, so their ongoing functioning is directly tied to the applicant's capacity to sustain any interventions.

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

10

3

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not have a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. The elements of a high-quality plan are a set of goals, objectives, activities, responsible parties, and resources. These are generally absent. The applicant does, however, provide information on how it intends to address some aspects of sustainability through the dissemination of lessons learned and good practice produced by the grant.

Given the applicant's reliance on a large number of tablet notebooks and a number of software packages that will require considerable work to integrate into existing packages, the lack of attention to how new hardware and software will be maintained and upgraded over time is troubling. If these devices and programs are central to the implementation of the

proposed projects, the inclusion of 2 items concerning this issue among the 22 sustainability efforts listed suggests a lack of planning. The applicant reports a track-record of success in securing funding to support its endeavors and is confident that it can sustain what it undertakes, but they do not provide sufficient information to explain the origins of that confidence.

Without careful attention to the long-term hardware and software needs, it is unlikely that efforts can be sustained.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

It appears the applicant has elected not to address the competitive preference priority. There is no explicit reference to the priority in the application. There is also no attention to how the applicant would seek to address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of high needs students through any type of partnership public or public-private.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has proposed to focus on the college and career-ready standards component of the absolute priority while providing insufficient information on how student achievement will be improved or how achievement gaps will be closed. The applicant's approach to providing individualized plans to students in grades 6-12 is strong and should help students to develop a better understanding of the connections among their course work, their interests, and their postsecondary options. The use of assigned mentors should provide a level of support and accountability to help keep students on track.

What is missing from this application are any details on what steps teachers and leaders will take to address the persistently very low achievement of Black and economically disadvantaged students in the consortium. There are no specific academic interventions addressed in the application. Although there are plans to rely on technology to motivate students, which suggests that motivation is the root cause of the low achievement, the applicant provides no evidence that motivation is the root cause, therefore the use of technology as a solution is not directly tied to an identified problem.

The applicant proposes to use personalization strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards. Their plan to assess student interest and create personalized plans which will be monitored by mentors should assist student in developing a greater understanding of postsecondary options.

The applicant aspires to accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning through personalization, but they provide insufficient detail on how they will do so. They offer no specifics on the types of interventions teachers will use to meet student needs. There is almost no attention to the very low achievement of Black students. Although the applicant mentions the needs of English learners once, there is insufficient information provided to suggest the applicant has properly identified ELs or assessed their needs. There is no EL subgroup listed in the test scored provided. Aside from the partnership with IHEs to address the needs of students with disabilities, the applicant gave little attention to the specifics of student achievement and narrowing the achievement gap in this application. Student achievement and the narrowing of the achievement gap are fundamental to students being able to take advantage of the college- and career-planning aspects of the application.

The applicant plans to increase the effectiveness of educators through professional development but do not provide sufficient detail on how they will determine the effectiveness of that professional development and its impact on teacher practice and student learning. The plan to make sure more students are given access to teachers who have completed

professional development in personalized instruction is laudable, but it is insufficient to ensure that the most needy students have access to effective teachers.

The applicant has not met the absolute priority because the lack of attention to student achievement and the narrowing of achievement gaps leaves a substantial hole in the foundation of the proposal and leaves criteria of this competition unaddressed.

Total	210	129
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0234FL-3 for Washington County School District/PAEC

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the high range. The Panhandle Area Educational Consortium's (PAEC) application presents a clear comprehensive and coherent reform vision that builds on and leverages the work set forth by the state of Florida and RTT funded projects.</p> <p>The plan identifies six ambitious but doable goals to utilize personalized learning environments. Examples of evidence provided includes: reduce by at least 30% the number of Black/African American students who score below Level 3 on state level measures of academic proficiency in ELA, Algebra I, and Biology I to close the achievement gap; increase participation by 80% in advanced placement and students who take the AP exams; increase by 15% the number of students who are taught by effective or highly effective teachers; and increase college enrollment to 10% over baseline measures, .</p> <p>By leveraging the strong collaboration among education, community, government, and business stakeholders, four interconnected objectives have been developed and have the potential to achieve this vision for every student and teacher, and to transform teaching and learning in each of the eight participating school districts.</p> <p>The PAEC offers a clear and ambitious plan that is developed through four core educational assurance areas to strengthen and build on the work the consortium has already started as well as supporting state initiatives. The PAEC details proposed enhancements to current activities taking place.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the high range. The proposal demonstrates that the applicant's approach to implementing its reform proposal will include activities developed from assessment data in reading, math, and science and will serve students in grades 8 - 10 in year 1 and grades 6, 7, 11, and 12 in year 2 to support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation of their proposal.</p>		

(a) The PAEC's application details a clear process to select schools to participate and used the following criteria:

- Continuous engagement in activities that support the four core educational assurance areas;
- School district participation related state and regional initiatives which include minority subgroups; and
- Participating districts meet the competition's eligibility requirements.

The PAEC's application provides a concise and convincing table (Table (A) (2)) with accompanying text as evidence that the participating schools collectively meet the competition's eligibility requirements.

(b) The applicant provides a list of 38 schools that will participate in grant activities Table (A) (2).

(c) The applicant has identified that there is a total of 13,628 participating students of which 7,695 are from low-income families and 5,853 are high-need students in this. The project will serve 609 participating educators.

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

10

8

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the high range. The PAEC application demonstrates appropriate leadership is in place to scale up, to create meaningful reform, and to sustain project beyond the grant. It also describes consortium level reform will occur along the school and community tracks, and will be scaled up through archived events and grant developed products. However, it is unclear how this project will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools.

The applicant indicates it has a long history of working collaboratively with community that includes business and higher education partnerships to support educational initiatives. However, the application lacks clarity on how the consortium will build capacity to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools.

The applicant's logic model or theory of change demonstrates through its outputs how it will improve student outcomes for all students who will be served by the applicant. The logic model does not provide the number of staff that will be needed. However, the applicant provides further clarification on staffing in the narrative in the Criterion C. With appropriate staff in place, the project can be translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools is detailed in Criterion C.

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

10

10

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the high range. The applicant's vision is strong and is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals that are equal to or exceed State ESEA targets for the LEA(s), overall and by student subgroup for each participating member district in the consortium.

(a) The applicant's project will measure student learning and performance using multiple summative assessments, which will in turn offer formative feedback for the project to modify subsequent implementation of reform activities. Summative measures and baseline data are detailed in Tables (A)(4)(a) through (A)(4)(d). The applicant specifies that as the state moves toward full implementation of common core standards, end-of-course (EOC) assessments and FCAT 2.0 will measure student achievement of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards in each of the core subject areas of ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies. EOC tests in Algebra I, Biology I, and Geometry are already in use.

(b) The applicant has established ambitious yet achievable annual goals to reduce the achievement gaps between the lowest and highest performing subgroups such as reducing the achievement gap by at least 30% the number of Black/African American students who score below Level 3 on state level measures of academic proficiency in ELA, Algebra I, and Biology I.

(c) The applicant has established ambitious yet achievable annual goals to increase consortium graduation rates by increasing to at least 85% of students who graduate on time with a Standard high school diploma; and decreasing by at least 15% the number of high school students who are at risk for high school dropout due to a cumulative grade point average less than 2.0.

(d) The applicant has established ambitious yet achievable annual goals to improve college enrollment rates by increasing by at least 10% over baseline measures of the number of graduating seniors each year who complete the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA), as measured by district-level student information system. The project's Parent Outreach component will demonstrate that 95% of parents served by the project will demonstrate increased knowledge and understanding of students' graduation requirements, course selection, and post-secondary educational and career opportunities.

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	13

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the high range.

(a) Schools within the PAEC school districts have experienced improvements in student achievement and have the foundation to see further gains as evidenced by the Florida Department of Education and FCAT 2.0, state assessments.

- 81% of the schools received a rating of A or B between 2008 - 2011 while 6% received D or F in 2011.
- Improved proficiency in reading, science, math is evident.
- Graduation rates have increased in 6 of 8 PAEC districts; one district has highest in the state.
- College enrollment rates have increased in 4 of the member districts.
- A variety of PAEC, county, and individual district and school successes to support student progress.

(b) The PAEC application documents that member school districts with the support of the Florida Department of Education (FLDOE) have a record of intervening with its persistently lowest-achieving schools or in its low-performing schools.

- All but 1 of 35 low performing schools in member districts improved school grades from a D or F rating to a C rating or higher. A and B ratings.
- Data shows district efforts in member districts to close achievement gaps by making gains in reading and math among low performing students.
- Districts targeted for school improvement demonstrated improvement in students most at risk of failure.
- Six of seven schools are no longer identified as a persistently lowest-achieving school. However, the one school still identified as a persistently lowest-achieving school has made increases in reading proficiency and gains in math.
- Partnerships with PAEC are in place to build capacity to "turn around the lowest performing schools.

(c) PAEC school districts have data access and management systems in place to facilitate availability of student performance data available to students, educators (as defined in this notice), and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services.

- Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network is used to facilitate instruction in reading.
- A Local Instructional Improvement System (LIIS) is being developed and will use two software products that will facilitate access to and provide data to inform students, parents, and educators in real time to inform classroom instruction, grades, discipline, attendance, etc.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the middle range. The applicant indicates high level of transparency available through the Florida Department of Education website. Evidence was not provided to determine high level of transparency.

As per the applicant, there is a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments, including by making public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration. Each of the member districts already make available school-level expenditures from State and local funds. All school data is available on the Florida Department of Education Transparency website at <http://public2.fldoe.org/TransparencyReports/ReportView.aspx?ReportID=6> under the

“Program Costs per Unweighted FTE.

(a) – (d) The applicant describes how this is accessible through the website simply by selecting “District” and “School” to obtain the actual salaries of instructional staff (teachers and instructional aides), support staff (staff who provide support services to students and/or to instructional staff).

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

10

7

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the middle range. Although the applicant asserts that it meets this criterion, the applicant provides no evidence.

The Panhandle Area Educational Consortium (PAEC) is submitting an application as consortium. The PAEC describes that there are successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant’s proposal as a consortium, and at the district and campus levels.

The PAEC demonstrates that it:

- operates under the guidance of school superintendents who serve collectively as the board of directors.
- has a formalized governance structure and strategic planning process in place.
- operates in compliance with all Florida Statutes and State Board of Education Administrative Rules.

The Washington County School Board is the applicant and the designated fiscal agent that will provide the fiscal support for the grant activities.

School Districts participating in this grant have an elected school superintendent and elected school board members to guide and oversee District and school control and supervision over this Project.

Each school principal has authority over school district personnel at their school site and serves as the instructional leader and has the leadership and vision to implement the strategies, structures, and supports needed to implement personalized, student focused approaches to learning and teaching that will produce excellence and ensure equity for all students.

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

10

5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the middle range. Although evidence is lacking, the applicant describes that there was stakeholder engagement and support for the proposed project through:

- Surveys done with students, teachers, parents, principals, and school board members to develop this plan.
- Conference calls, superintendents’ and principals’ input were instrumental in determining the logistics of the E3 RTTT-D Project.
- Surveys from Student Council members detailed suggestions.
- School Improvement Council surveys yielded insight into successes, gaps, and needs of the Member Districts.

No evidence was provided to indicate direct engagement and support for the proposals from teachers in participating schools.

Letters of support found in Appendix 6 include local civic and institutions of higher education.

There was no evidence of letters of support from such key stakeholders as parents and parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, tribes, the business community, civil rights organizations, advocacy groups, local civic and community-based organizations and institutions of higher education.

City and state officials were provided with opportunity to comment on the RTT-D application. The SEA provided feedback.

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

5

5

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the high range. The applicant demonstrates a high quality plan which has identified a need of change in the community in order to close the achievement gap among the subgroups. The applicant proposes the implementation of personalized learning environments to reduce the academic gaps and needs by:

- Increasing student access to digital learning devices that can be met through the proposed initiative by purchasing devices for students' use;
- Providing additional training and support for teachers to utilize the devices for the greatest support for student learning;
- Increasing contact between high needs students and individual adults in the school setting in a mentoring or support process;
- Increasing academic rigor to improve college and career preparation;
- Assessing interests and aptitude of students starting as early as the 8th grade in order to begin awareness of college and career goals;
- Providing a better selection of courses to students in small schools;
- Increasing teacher proficiency in differentiation of instruction and assessment;
- Increasing access to tools such as CPALMS (an FLDOE online site that offers self-paced professional development, course descriptions, standards, and access to resources);
- Increasing professional learning/training for teachers to enhance their knowledge and skill to implement the State Standards, and to prepare students for success on the appropriate State assessments and the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test; and
- Changing instructional practices to transform instruction.

The PAEC application notes the following needs and gaps that will be

- In member districts, 20% of adults have college degrees
- 9 - 10 graders scored below 50% in reading and Algebra EOCs
- When compared to White students, academic gaps and needs are identified for African-American and economically disadvantaged students whose scores and graduation rates are lower.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the high range. The applicant presents a strong high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. This plan includes proposes initiatives to support an approach to learning that engages and empowers all learners, in particular high-need students.

(a) With the support of parents and educators, all students will have access to personlized learning environments to graduate college and career ready.

- (i) The applicant has evidence of secured commitments from local colleges and universities to provide students with college and career camps to have concrete experiences in areas of personal interest to help them better understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals. (See Appendix 6)
- (ii) The applicant presents a comprehensive plan to implement a Student Navigation System (SNS) to build a college- and career-ready graduation pathway for students, and to link all student data that is available in each of the member districts. It includes a Student Data Dashboard and Local Instructional Improvement System (LIIS) that is currently in the development phase and funded by Florida’s RTT funding. The applicant will implement a Personalized Learning Support System for targeted high school students to learn how to use and navigate the SNS.
- (iii) The PAEC will hire Parent Outreach Coordinators to work and train parents as a method to increase student participation in rigorous academic and career preparation options in order to deepen learning experiences in areas of academic interest.
- (iv) The PAEC will establish video-linked global classrooms throughout the consortium to connect students to others outside their communities.
- (v) To ensure academic rigor, the applicant has chosen to implement a College and Career Preparatory Curriculum that is aligned to the Common Core State Standards.

(i) – (iii) The PAEC will be expanding the digital learning options for participating students that are aligned with aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements by providing:

- A personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development that will be adapted to the students’ current level of performance;
- Access to variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments;
- A personal Internet access device;
- Access to high quality virtual courses;
- Interactive and adaptive digital content; and
- Other opportunities to develop skills to function in a digitally rich environment.

(iv) – (v) The applicant proposes to use digital learning to provide ongoing and regular feedback, including frequently updated individual student data with embedded assessments and analytics which can also provide:

- Immediate accommodations and high-quality strategies for all students, including high-need students [(b)(v)] through a plethora of strategies such as the use of point and click dictionaries and language translation tools,
- Personalized learning recommendations based on the student’s current knowledge and skills [(b)(iv)(B)] that pinpoint each student’s weaknesses and allow teachers to provide additional instruction, interventions, and accommodations through face-to-face instruction in the classroom.

In order to address the digital learning gaps, the applicant proposes to: upgrade technology infrastructure by increasing bandwidth; upgrade hardware by purchasing tablets for students and interactive technologies in classrooms; and enhance instruction by expanding digital learning options and providing blended learning options.

(c) The applicant has developed a comprehensive implementation plan that includes 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.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the high range. The applicant demonstrates a comprehensive and 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.

(a) The applicant's approach is to implement a series of Summer Institutes for educator and principal training that include the following strands:

- (i) Personalized Learning Environments - Effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student’s academic needs and help ensure all students can graduate on time, college- and career-ready.
- (ii) Differentiating Instruction - Adapting content and instruction, providing opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches (e.g., discussion and collaborative work, project-based learning, videos, audio, manipulatives);
- (iii) Measuring Student Progress - Measuring student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards, or college- and career-ready graduation requirements; Data Informed Instruction - Using data to inform the acceleration of student progress; and Data Informed Practice - Using data to inform the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators; and
- (iv) Using feedback provided by the LEA’s teacher and principal evaluation systems to improve individual and collective practice.

(b) The applicant will hire Teacher Learning Specialists (TLS) to ensure all participating educators have access and support on learning how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements. The TLS will support teachers in the:

- (i) Identification of optimal learning approaches that respond to student academic needs and interests;
- (ii) Using high-quality learning resources, including digital resources, and tools to create and share resources; and
- (iii) Use of processes and tools to match student needs with specific resources and approaches to provide continuously improving feedback about the effectiveness of the resources.

(c) The PAEC has a strong plan to ensure that all participating school leaders and school leadership teams have training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and accelerates student progress through common and individual tasks toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements.

The Summer Institute Strands specifically targeted to principals and focused on effective leadership will include:

- (i) 1) Educator effectiveness - Evaluating individual and collective educator effectiveness; 2) School Culture and Climate - Assessing and improving school culture and climate.
- (ii) 3) Continuous Improvement - Increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps; 4) Motivating teachers to make systemic change; 5) Planning for the most effective use of technology support in your school; and 6) Celebrating successes of teachers who are demonstrated leaders in implementing grant initiatives.
- (i) (ii) The PAEC will also hire Principal Learning Specialists (PLS) to support principals in the 1) use of information from sources such as the teacher evaluation system to assess and take steps to improve individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate; and 2) use of training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps.

The PAEC has designated appropriate staff to carry out successful implementation of grant activities. In addition to the TLS and PLS positions, the applicant will also hire Content Area Specialists (CLS) for Reading and Math train teachers in the implementation of Summer Institute Strands. Learning Specialists will also support implementation of the Professional Learning Communities and digital training for education channel.

(d) The applicant describes its high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals that includes recruitment efforts from each of the districts and evaluation system to ensure students are sitting in classrooms of effective and highly effective teachers. The PAEC is well positioned to assist the member districts in supporting school leaders and teachers.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score

(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	13
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the high range. The applicant seems to be in a position to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.</p> <p>The applicant has practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning as follows:</p> <p>(a) The PAEC has a governance structure to fully provide support and services to all participating member school districts and as evidenced in the Memorandums of Understanding.</p> <p>(b) Statutes in the state of Florida provide school leadership teams in participating schools with sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school-level budgets.</p> <p>(c) The applicant indicates that policies are in place to give students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery. Some examples provided are End of Course (EOC) exams, digital on-line courses, industry certification courses, and other measures of mastery.</p> <p>(d) The applicant indicates that policies are in place PAEC districts to give students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways throughout the school year. Some examples cited indicate that students have multiple options for completing and assessing coursework, EOC exams are provided at a minimum 3 times per year, and district assessments at a minimum 3 times per year; and</p> <p>(e) The member districts provide learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners through various programs such as Migrant Education, USDOE training programs. The applicant will use grant funding for digital learning and assessments that provide for accommodations and high quality strategies.</p> <p>The applicant does not provide evidence to support its assertions. Therefore, full points were not awarded.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the high range. The applicant describes adequate infrastructure that is currently in place to support project implementation to support personalized learning.</p> <p>(a) The PAEC and member districts ensure that all participating students have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources through the classroom and the schools media centers. Students have access to virtual and distance learning. Teachers have access to professional learning resources for teachers are provided in multiple formats, and parents have access to information and resources through a “parent portal” on their webpage. Parents can access their student’s information at their discretion. RTTT-D Project funding will ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All targeted students would have access to digital tablets to be used both in and out of school, and adequate data telecommunications and Internet access to participate; • School/District bandwidth will be upgraded to an adequate level; • Increased technology will result in alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment so that instruction and assessment are transparent and content is accessible, engaging, and rigorous; and • To assign a staff advisor/mentor who will ensure that the student has access to all the resources that will lead to college- or career-ready graduation. <p>b) Teachers have a webpage that provides a forum for technical support questions. RTTT-D Project funding will ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-going support will be provided through a webpage with a tutorial and tech support; • Support and maintenance is also available from District/School Technical Coordinators and Coaches; • Training is provided at all levels for member districts. 		

(c) The applicant describes in great detail that Member Districts currently use Focus School Software as the Student Information system Using that allow parents and students to access their student information. Through the E3 RTTT-D Project in the upcoming year, the applicant proposes to provide a password protected open format for the Student Navigation System (SNS) and the Student Dashboard, as well as the tutorial, and it will be linked to Focus School Software.

(d) All student data reported to the FLDOE flows through the Focus School Software student system ensuring the use of interoperable data systems. The SNS and the Dashboard, both in the E3 RTTT-D Project, will interface with Focus as well as other software described in the plan.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the high range. The applicant has a thorough strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. It clearly delineates the roles and responsibilities of the project director and the external evaluator who will be responsible for conducting the project evaluation.</p> <p>The Evaluation Design is strong and focused. It includes a strategy on how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of the project. It is a continuous evaluation model to facilitate regular project review and needed adjustments.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the middle range. The applicant describes sound strategies that seem to provide for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. They include strategies to be used will be tailored according to the interests of diverse audiences such as current and prospective students, parents, educators, community partners, elected officials, state legislators, and the media.</p> <p>The plan is unclear as to how the communication will be carried out, at what level (i.e., consortium, district, campus), and who will be responsible.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has developed ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures. The applicant provides a comprehensive chart as evidence that identifies performance measures for each of their project objectives as seen in Figure E-2.</p> <p>(a) – (c) The applicant provides a thorough explanation of: its rationale for selecting that measure; 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 how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.</p> <p>The applicant explains that the participating districts have adopted the State of Florida’s value added protocol for educator evaluations. Therefore, baseline data are pending for measures regarding teacher and principal effectiveness until the Florida Department of Education makes the value added determinations available to the school districts.</p>		

Similarly, subgroup performance data is not yet available for the Biology I end of course exam that was implemented in 2011-12 under the state's Next Generation Sunshine State Standards.

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

5

3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the middle range. The applicant presents a vague approach to continuously improve its plan. Although the applicant follows the Evaluation Design, the applicant does not show a clear plan or process for evaluating the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities, such as professional development and activities that employ technology, and to more productively use time, staff, money, or other resources in order to improve results, through such strategies as improved use of technology, working with community partners, compensation reform, and modification of school schedules and structures (e.g., service delivery, school leadership teams (as defined in this notice), and decision-making structures).

Through the evaluation, the applicant will assess the relative efficiency and effectiveness of each initiative for impacting student performance and to determine who will benefit more. The applicant provides guiding questions that include:

- Are the impacts of RTTT-D on student performance larger in some schools/districts than others (e.g., high poverty or low-performing schools)?
- Are some RTTT- D initiatives more effective in increasing student performance than others?
- Are some RTTT-D initiatives more effective for some students than others (e.g., high need, economically disadvantaged, older, or younger)?
- Are some RTTT-D initiatives more effective for some educators than others (e.g., effective or highly effective teachers and educational leaders, veteran versus novice educators)?
- How cost effective and sustainable are the project's initiatives?

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the high range. The applicant's budget includes appropriate budget narrative and tables describing various sources.

(a) Clearly identifies all funds that will support the project. Throughout the narrative, the applicant provides examples of how local district funds, Title I, and Title VI funding will support some of the positions already in place needed to carry out the grant activities (e.g., technology coordinators, instructional coaches, travel);

(b) The budget presented by the applicant is sound and reasonable. The applicant demonstrates how it will leverage with current infrastructures at member districts and other funds to support the project which is sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal; and

(c) The applicant clearly provides a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities throughout the narrative in Section C.

(i) The applicant provides a description of all funds that include district local, federal and state, and grant funds that the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal, including total revenue from these sources; and

(ii) Throughout the budget and budget narrative, the applicants identifies numerous examples of the funds that will be used for one-time investments (e.g., purchase of computers and tablets, wireless service, startup supplies, etc.) 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.

The applicant did not provide a clear plan as to how the funding would be allocated throughout the consortium school districts participating in the proposed project. Therefore, full points were not awarded.

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

10

9

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The overall quality of this response to this criterion is rated in the high range. The applicant presents a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. The applicant presents a plan that includes a sustainability strategy to ensure that the project activities funded by RTT-D grant continue beyond the life of the grant, such as:

- The PAEC plans to provide intensive training to teachers, staff, and coaches to build capacity in knowledge and skill to provide training to others.
- Curriculum and videos developed during the grant period will be archived and used when the grant period is over.
- Video linked global archived and readily available to districts for future use.
- The Student Navigation System will be available beyond the life of the grant.
- The PAEC and member districts will continue coordination and planning with the Florida Department of Education.
- Marketing efforts through presentations and reports will be implemented to seek support from State and local government leaders and financial support.

Although the applicant provides a strong sustainability plan, the plan does not include a monitoring strategy to ensure that the project activities funded by RTT-D grant continue beyond the life of the grant within the participating school districts.

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 adequately address the Competitive Preference Priority: Results, Resource Alignment, and Integrated Services. The applicant did not propose to integrate public or private resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students (as defined in this notice), giving highest priority to students in participating schools with high-need students (as defined in this notice).

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has addressed Absolute Priority 1 through its thorough responses to the selection criteria.

The applicant has provided a coherent and comprehensive plan to address how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements; accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student; increase the effectiveness of educators; expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

Total	210	176
--------------	------------	------------