



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0168FL-1 for Bay District Schools

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The District very succinctly outlined it's work on the four core educational assurance areas. They have a past history of targeting a low performing school and increasing student academic success; they have processes in place to retain effective teachers known as "irreplaceables;" the District was focused on integrating rigorous standards into the K - 12 curriculum, and they have utilized the AIMS site and it's companion LIIS systems to build data systems to measure student growth.</p> <p>Six key projects were presented in a well developed chart to target specific goals. Equity through the 1:1 digital device plan, digital personalized learning plans, strengthening the teacher and principal evaluation system, utilizing community resources to support the community, transitioning to the common core, and developing assessments to use data to drive instruction are described.</p> <p>The District provides a very detailed description about the teacher and student experience within the proposed personalized learning environment they have termed GO PLACES.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The District has opted to select all schools for participation. They also have a past history of including all schools when implementing large scale reform. It's a District philosophy. A chart provided a list of schools who will be included in the initiative as well as the total number of participating students, students of high need, and students from low-income families. The response is complete.</p>		
<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>This response does not include the elements of a high quality plan. There is no discussion regarding personalized learning, college and career readiness or increased graduation rates. The District provided minimal information as to how it would be scaled up to surrounding districts. This response is incomplete.</p>		
<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
<p><b>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>A rationale as to the methodology and rationale for sub group target goals was provided. 4% annual target growth per sub group was identified in years 2014 - 2017. This reflects an ambitious but achievable target. The graduation rate increase target goals were much more narrow. 1% - 2% growth through 2017. Although it is achievable, it does not reflect an ambitious goal. The same is reflected in the established college enrollment goal. A chart for decreasing the achievement gap was presented. The target was to decrease the levels 1 - 2 in reading by 30%. That definitely reflects an ambitious yet achievable goal.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>
<p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The Bay District demonstrates a strong track record of advancing student learning over the past 4 years. Since 2007, the District graduation rate has increased by 10%. A new CTE certification program began in 2009 and since then 366 certifications have been issued. In addition, the CTE academy enrollment has increased from 2271 to 4951. Finally, students enrolling in Alg. I in grades 7 and 8 have increased as have the number of students earning passing scores. The District also has a demonstrated record of success with improving low performing schools. Springfield was the District's first identified low achieving school and in two years time their state school grade improved from D to a C and their value added model increased from effective to highly effective. The District used this school as a model to identify what worked and what didn't work. These lessons are being applied to other schools. The District also has 85% of parents registered for the Focus platform to share student grades, attendance, and other academic data. Parents may contact a teacher for remediation advice and retesting opportunities. Email is also available. No discussion was provided as to how to make student data accessible to the other 15% of the parent population who are not registered.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The District posts the Master Contract for instructional salaries. In addition the Superintendent's Annual Financial Report is available on the District's website. This response is limited due to the fact that it does not include the salaried information in the grant narrative or appendix. The District did identify that the Master Contract is in effect from 2011 - 2014. An Annual Financial Report is completed each year and the Fiscal End 2012 is available on the web-site.</p>		
<b>(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The District identified several legislative supports necessary to implement their proposal. The common core state standards, multiple diploma track options, professional development guidelines, teacher evaluation systems, and acceleration of credits through mastery versus time. In addition, the town voted for a half cent sales tax to provide the school district with the necessary renovations (equipment and infra structural) to the schools. No discussion was provided related to the ability for the school to implement personalized learning with autonomy separate from the legislative mandates.</p>		
<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Parents were surveyed, a PLC consortium was formed, and teachers attended a CCSS seminar where they expressed a need for appropriate technology and training. The Bay County community has offered their support because they view this initiative as a means to expand the workforce within the community, and the town has voted to support the technological needs of the district through a half cent sales tax. Letters from Mayors, students, teachers, business stakeholders, government representatives are included in the appendix. Most of the letters do not reflect an intimate knowledge of the grant proposal. Although several important initiatives were presented, the District did not discuss how stakeholders were specifically involved with the details of the grant proposal itself. The District did not provide specific information as to how the collected surveyed information was utilized for the purposes of informing the grant.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Some evidence was provided to support each element of a high quality plan; however, the presented information was not elaborated upon. The applicant continued to repeat the same information for each component of the learning plan without</p>		

directly tying in how the District's initiatives impacted each of the learning's approaches. This resulted in a brief overview instead of an in-depth discussion.

The District did not that it is implementing the common core state standards. In addition, the reform initiative is accessible and available for all students while focusing on college and career readiness skill within a personalized learning environment.

The District continued to relate personalized learning opportunities - 1:1 Digital Devices, Common and Summative Assessments, Personalized Digital Platform and Community and Family Outreach. However, the lack of details significantly limited the response.

The District noted that teacher evaluation practices will help to establish a common language and using the Danielson framework will help teachers and students understanding what they are learning is the root of their success. To embrace diversity Bay District offers free tuition to teachers who would like to work toward their ELL endorsement. In addition, the District noted that the technological initiative will break down the cultural and geographical barriers that exist. A very limited description as to how that would be accomplished hindered this response.

Personalized instructional content will be developed through pacing guides, focus calendars, virtual courses and credit recovery programs. High need students will be monitored through the Multi tiered System of Supports for accommodations and strategies. Mechanisms for student support and training were briefly outlined.

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

**20**

**10**

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

Elements of a high quality plan were provided via a brief overview. The District noted personalized learning and data collection via more frequent assessments, integration of common core standards, access for all students, and the focus on college and career readiness; however, no description was provided as to how specifically this would be accomplished.

Again, the response continued to repeat the personalized learning components of their plan without elaboration. The District described how it will adapt instruction through additional support staff (TOSA) - 15 member training cadre; however, it never expanded on the process and expected result. They identified how frequent measures of student progress will take place through more frequent assessments and the use of the digital test platform; however, the description did not enhance the vision. Improving teacher effectiveness will take place through the feedback received on observations and data collected through walk throughs. However, the feedback process was excluded.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The District noted confidence in their Central Office staff and provided an organization chart for the Teaching and Learning Division. They noted previous experience with successful district roll out; however, specific policies for support were not identified. Each school within the District operate on a school site leadership structure. Significant autonomy exists; however, no specific discussion regarding school leadership teams was presented. The District presented multiple alternatives for demonstrating mastery for course completion vs. seat time: Credit Acceleration Program, virtual courses, ACCELL (Academically Challenging Curriculum to Enhance Learning, etc...). Students are afforded multiples ways to demonstrate mastery. The District has a CAG (Classroom Assessment Guidance) document that outlines multiples ways to demonstrate mastery of learning. Personalized reassessment, re-administration of testing, and online curriculum through Edgenuity are available. Teachers are required to earn continuing credits in ELL and ESE. Technology/software programs are utilized for ELL students throughout the day. Several resources were identified for ELL students; however, specific information related to students with disabilities was lacking.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		

Elements of a high quality plan are met through rigorous standards, access for all , data for graduation requirements, and personalized learning. All participating students regardless of income will benefit within this proposal. Every teacher and student will be provided with a digital device. All stakeholders will have access to the Personalized Digital Platform. Technical support will be fostered through online videos, FAQs, a help desk. student support model on campus which will be made up of student troubleshooters. The District platform will allow parents and students to export the data directly into an excel format. The inter operable system meets the RTTT specifications of the state of Florida. Even though the response addressed elements of the high quality plan, the description was brief and the lack of details limited the response.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>
<p><b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The response was very limited in its description and elements of a high quality plan were not presented. Personalized learning and the ongoing monitoring process of the personalized learning initiative were brief and not thoroughly presented. Details as to the process were not present. The District did provide revision milestones: 12/13 - 6/14 will be the purchase and hire time period. During 7/14 - 12/17 - quarterly reports regarding achievement, attendance and discipline will be examined. Digital impact surveys will be provided quarterly and each year climate surveys will be conducted. Teacher evaluation data and student growth data will be shared as well. Elements of a high quality plan were not presented in this response. However, the response was limited without a discussion of how, when and in what capacity these milestones would be met. In addition, the response did not discuss college and career readiness or increased graduation rates.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Elements of a high quality plan are lacking. No discussion of personalize learning, college and career readiness, or increased graduation rates was presented. One strength of the response was the fact that the District will be hosting public service announcements, updates for the personalized digital platform, school info app, and quarterly community forums; however, no discussion was presented as to how the District would go above and beyond to communicate with stakeholders.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Each level includes academic and one grade level appropriate health / social emotional leading indicator. Out of school suspension coupled with attendance and student achievement data were factored into the overall performance measure. The District supplied a rationale for each measure and outlined a rigorous, timely , and achievable measure over time. At the high school level, the Algebra 1 End of Course exam as well as graduation rates were factored in. All of the data was also broken down into sub-group: all students, African America, Asian, Hispanic, Multi, White, and students with disabilities. Not all of the targets were ambitious. For example baseline data for the number of students taught by an effective teacher was 79.4% and the goal for 2017 was 79.5% A second example include the number of students who complete the FAFSA baseline data was 48.5%; however, the goal for 2017-2018 was 49.1%. These goals are 2 examples of non-ambitious performance measures. Also the lack of narrative made it difficult to understand the impact of of the performance measures on academic achievement.</p>		
<b>(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The response embeds elements of a high quality plan: rigorous standards, personalized learning; however, access for all students and college and career readiness are not addressed. A plan is identified using four focus strategies in an action research model; however, it is a general overview. Specific details regarding the plan are lacking. District funded activities are not addressed.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The District identified all funds and provided a rationale for the investments. The District noted that following the conclusion of the grant, District funding or Title II will be utilized to continue to support the initiatives. The proposed budget is reasonable and sufficient.</p> <p>However, the District did not provide a specific amount for each District or Title funding. In addition, the District noted seeking new grant funding opportunities but no specific plans were provided. Sustainability of the LIIS will be maintained through the 1/2 cent sale tax. One time investments were also noted. A final concern is that consultants will only exist until the completion of the grant. No discussion was provided as to how the plan would continue without consultants and how new staff would be trained.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
<p><b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>No specific link to all of the elements of a high quality plan were identified. Personalized learning was inferred; however, college and career readiness, access for all, and increased graduation rates were not addressed in the sustainability plan.</p> <p>However, the District did identify state and local support through Senate and House Bills and RTTT. The District also outlined their Financial Supports, ways in which to evaluate effectiveness, an estimated budget for 3 years after the grant, and potential sources for funding. The potential sources for funding were addressed in very general terms even though no specific plans for how the district will absorb some of the costs are noted.</p>		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
<p><b>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The District presented an effective competitive preference priority plan. They focused on streamlining services to benefit students social, emotional, behavioral, and physical needs to keep students in schools. 5 different population measures were identified.</p> <p>The District adequately addressed how data would come from the current 8th grade population as the District monitors them over the next 4 years. Data will be mined at an individual level. This is an effective strategy.</p> <p>Bay District would continue their partnerships with other businesses, social service organizations and local colleges. Community partnerships would be vital as well as guidance counselors, teachers, parent liaisons, School Health Advisory County, and a Community Liaison would coordinate and monitor support efforts. This is an ambitious plan for stakeholder involvement.</p> <p>A significant limitation of the response was due to the lack of details regarding the plan. Much of this proposal is presented in very general terms. A specific outline of infrastructure and decision making are also lacking.</p>		

## Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>
<p><b>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>The District clearly outlined a personalized learning environment through the 1:1 laptop initiative and the personalized learning platform. The four core educational assurances were presented and discussed. An effective and achievable plan</p>		

was described to ensure the adoption of the Common Core State Standards which will ensure the adoption of rigorous standards. A data system and data mining was also effectively addressed. The District has a track record of turning around the lowest performing schools. This District outlined plans to retain and recruit highly effective teachers and principals.

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>134</b>
--------------	------------	------------



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

#### Application #0168FL-2 for Bay District Schools

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

	Available	Score
<b>(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>

#### (A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Bay district schools has set an ambitious vision aimed at allowing the district to provide students with a quality education through the GO PLACES approach (Goal oriented, personalized learning, accelerating educational success). The applicant indicated that it has been participating in the Florida RTT funded activities (Florida won a RTT state competition grant in 2010). This vision of the applicant is to build on current efforts funded in part by RTT while using RTTD funds to achieve even success in the four core educational assurance areas. The district indicated that it has adopted Common core standards, it indicated that the entire state of Florida is in the process of adopting CCS.

BDS has set forth an ambitious vision built around four core educational areas:

- Assurance 1: Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy.
  - o BDS indicated that it recently implemented Common core standards in K-2 and has trained instructional and administrative staff to attend a 2-day common core institute.
  - o BDS indicate that it has contracted with McREL to provide additional training to the Common Core Training Team on goals and scale and has equipped Common Core classrooms with SMART technologies and digital learning tools and job embedded technology professional development.
  - o Based on the evidence presented the district has partially met the first assurance area. The district has adopted the Common Core standards, however the Common Core has only been adopted at the K-2 level, the applicant explains that it has added job embedded technology professional development but does not provide additional information about the trainings. BDS did not address specifically how the standards will be implemented at the middle and high school level and prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy.

- Assurance 2: Building data systems that measure student growth and success and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction.

BDS indicates that teachers and administrators will be using a data system LIIS (Local Instructional Improvement System comprised of the AIMS (Appraisal Information Management System) and the AIMS companion site). The BDS indicated that the implementation of the use of the AIMS system by district personnel has been a difficult process but that the district has achieved greater success than the year before. The district indicated that it would keep working on professional development to the needs of teachers to impact student success. The district provided a lot of information about the capabilities of the data systems but is not very specific in its narrative about how the systems provide data that can improve instruction. However, the district indicated that student registration was completed on the FOCUS online portal and hopes to use this portal to communicate with families and improve student achievement. Based on the narrative provided the BDS only partially met assurance area 2.

- Assurance 3: Recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most.

BDS indicates that it is currently working with local colleges and universities to revamp the placement of intern teachers with effective and highly effective teachers while also growing its own alternative certification program. BDS uses targeted professional development to develop and retain administrators and teachers. It appears that the district has adopted an approach aimed at retaining highly effective teachers "irreplaceable". The district also indicated that the retention of teachers is based solely on performance not seniority. BDS is also working with the local teacher's union to implement a new performance pay system.

Based on the evidence it provided in this section, it appears that BDS has a plan in place to recruit and reward effective teachers and administrators. However, the district does not indicate how it would support teachers who may need additional support in serving the needs of students. While the BDS is to be commended in its efforts to reward the most effective teachers it does not provide evidence that the most effective teachers will be assigned/reassigned where they are needed most. Based on the narrative provided BDS only partially met assurance area 3.

#### Assurance 4: Turning around lowest-achieving schools.

BDS indicated that because of the recent adoption of the Common Core standards by the state of Florida numerous schools are now identified as low achieving. BDS indicates that it has taken specific steps to turning around low achieving schools such as adding one hour of instructional time per day, a change in instructional material, and change in school leadership. The applicant also mentions an instructional redesign but does not provide additional information about the scope or specific nature of this change. According to the evidence provided BDS has been able to turn around one elementary school and hope to replicate this success at other schools with the implementation of GO PLACES with RTTD funding BDS has met assurance area 4.

BDS explained that BDS seeks to implement GO PLACES with all stakeholders with complete equity and access. The applicant designed 6 projects centered on specific areas:

- Project 1 focuses on Personalized Professional development and personal community learning for teachers and administrators (including coaching and professional development for common Core implementation).
- Project 2 focuses on Summative and Common assessments to train teachers to write valid assessment aligned to Common Core/Next Gen standards.
- Project 3 focuses on Teacher and Administrators evaluation (Charlotte Danielson Framework).
- Project 4 Personalized digital platform creating data system for evaluation of teachers, administrators and for students to monitor own progress. Creating a community communication platform.
- Project 5 Digital Devices, Purchasing 1:1 device for teachers and students, developing and maintaining a network and supporting/training teachers, students and parents to use new technology tools.
- Project 6 Community/family outreach Advertising free public WIFI within the community, informing community members on how to use and maintain 1:1 device.

BDS presents an ambitious plan but does not provide a narrative articulating a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized

student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests. Consequently, the applicant's description of the teacher and student experience is not credible based on the information provided in the narrative. Overall, based on the evidence provided BDS presented an incomplete reform vision.

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

**10**

**10**

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

BDS indicates that it will take a system wide approach for GO PLACES. All forty-four schools that comprise BDS were selected to participate in grant activities. BDS has demonstrated effectively why it selected all schools in the district that are to participate in RTT-D funded activities (full scale implementation secures the same opportunities for all). The district has listed the schools that would be participating as well as the number of students being served, as well as information about all sub-groups that would be served if RTT-D funding were received. BDS has presented a well-documented plan for its approach for implementation.

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

**10**

**3**

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

BDS provides information about the ways in which it intends to share their successes through Consortium for School Networking (CoSN) and the Florida Educational Technology Conference. However, the applicant does not provide a high quality plan describing how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform but simply indicates that it has a proven track record in the success of full-scale implementation models such as with Teacher and Administrators Evaluations, Common Core and the technology upgrades in core classrooms without providing evidence to support this claim.

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

**10**

**6**

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

The district appears to have set ambitious, yet achievable academic growth on summative assessments (Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT) 2.0 Reading grades 3-10, Math FCAT 2.0 grades 3-8, Algebra End of Course Exam (EOC). The district projects a steady growth for all subgroups White, Black/African American, Hispanic, Asian, and multi racial students, students in Special Education, students with Limited English proficiency (LEP) and economically disadvantaged students. The district also included data for a category labeled "other" but did not provide more information about this group. The applicant does not provide a narrative detailing specific goals by subgroups. The district has set ambitious yet achievable goals in its attempt to close the achievement gap, increase high school graduation rate and college enrollment rate. Overall, the district has set mostly achievable LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes; a narrative detailing goals for specific subgroups would have strengthened this section.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>

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

The district presented some evidence of reform in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement. The district reports improvement in graduation rates over the past four years (63.2 % to 73%). The district also indicated strong growth in its Career and Technical education program and in the number of students receiving CTE industry certification, as well an increase in the number of students passing Algebra I in middle school. The applicant speculates that passing Algebra I in middle school would allow students to personalize learning throughout their High school career but did not provide additional evidence to support its claim. The applicant did not provide evidence about how it increased equity and college enrollment rate in the past four years. However, BDS has shown a clear record of success at one elementary school labeled "low achieving", the district hopes to replicate this success at other schools. BDS has demonstrated that it

will make student performance data available to all stakeholders through the FOCUS platform. Overall, BDS has presented a partial record of success over the past 4 years.

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

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

BDS indicated that the district makes its finalized available to the public via the district website. The applicant also indicate that the master contract between the Bay District School Board and the Association of Bay County Educators is also available on the website. The district also indicated that it submits the Superintendent’s Annual Financial Report (ESE 145) to the Florida Department of Education. However, the district does not provide evidence that it practices ongoing trasparency, or how it will continue to make adjustments to positively impact student achievement.

Overall, BDS has demonstrated some evidence 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.

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

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

BDS indicate that the state of Florida legislature has passed a variety of legal statutory and regulatory requirements that will enable the district to implement personalized learning environments. Upon receiving Race to the Top funding in 2010 Bay district has complied with state requirements single-sign on procedures, CTE-advanced program professional development, Local information Instructional Systems (data systems) and professional development redesign. The district also lists 5 Senate Bills (736, 1012.98, 524, 1076, 1006.40) and house bill 7091, providing evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant’s proposal.

<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

The applicant has demonstrated limited stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal. BDS indicates that it regards the clear voter mandate received in 2010 with the half-cent sales tax increase as an endorsement of the application. The applicant indicates that Bring Your Own Device (BYOD) policies have received strong support from parents. However the applicant does not discuss the involvement of all stakeholders in the development of the proposal. It appears that stakeholders overwhelmingly support the 1:1 device initiative but the applicant’s application is not limited to the 1:1 device initiative. The Association of Bay County Educators (ABCE) has written and signed a letter of support for the GO PLACES initiative, several other entities and local government officials have provided letters of support for GO PLACES, however most of the letters are form letters. Overall, the applicant has demonstrated limited stakeholder engagement and support for the project.

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>(C)(1) Learning (20 points)</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>9</b>

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

BDS has an ambitious plan to prepare students for College and career. The district indicated that it adopted the Charlotte Danielson framework rubric for teacher evaluation hoping to train teachers to turn their classroom into a student-driven environment. Based on the evidence provided it is unclear if this initiative will help all students understand that learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals. The applicant also explained that it would identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to career and college readiness through the use of personalized digital platform, this plan is very ambitious but BDS does not provide specific information about how it would train students on using 1:1 digital devices, helping them get acquainted with the numerous online tools at their disposal, helping them with setting realistic goals when working online. BDS is to be commended for guaranteeing student access to technology but supporting them is essential,

the narrative provided is vague and does not specifically address this critical issue. It appears that students will be able to be involved in learning experiences in areas of academic interests thanks to access to 1:1 digital devices, however the narrative provided does inform on the level of depth of the learning experiences. It appears that BDS does not have a clear plan to allow students to have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts and perspectives that deepen student learning. The applicant explained that such opportunities would come naturally once students have anytime access to the World Wide Web. It appears that students in BDS have access to a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable the student to achieve his or her learning goals through curriculum aligned to common core, Next generation standards, Career Technical Academies, International Baccalaureate, Advanced Placement, and Advanced International Certificate of Education however BDS assumes that students will be able to navigate with ease in cyberspace. The applicant does not indicate clearly how this plan will be implemented. Overall, the applicant relies overly on the possibilities provide by “anytime” access to 1:1 digital devices without providing much background information on how the plan will be implemented, how students (especially those who need most help) will be supported. The training that would be provided to students is inadequate to support this ambitious project.

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

**20**

**10**

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

BDS presented a plan for preparing students for college and careers through teaching and leading. The district indicated that all instructional staff and administrators attended a Common Core summer institute focusing on technology integration, instructional shifts and differentiated strategies. Bay district schools explain that this training supports the effective implementation of personalized learning environments to meet students’ needs. However, the applicant recognizes that this training is the first step in supporting all teacher’s effective implementation of personalized learning environment. The district also explained that many teachers are still very apprehensive about using technology, the ration of 4 TOSAs for 1500 teachers is low, the number of 15 TOSAs for 1500 teachers still appears to be inadequate to meet the needs of teachers in adapting content and instruction to meet the academic needs of students. It appears that BDS is expecting a lot from teachers during and after the school day is over. Providing Wifi access in several public places throughout the community is a laudable goal but does not help with the training and support of teachers for them to be able to use technology tools. The use of technology should enable teachers to assess students more frequently and therefore accelerate learning, this assertion is not backed up by evidence.

BDS reported that it is using multiple resources for instruction (SM6(Pearson), Classworks, Discovery Education Streaming, Discovery Education Assessment, Read 180, AgileMinds, Edgenuity, ThinkCentral (Pearson Digital Textbook Supplement), Compass Learning, Khan Academy and Other resources include district-wide usage of 6 Trait Writing, Kagan (student engagement strategies), Project CRISS (CreatingIndependence through Student Owned Strategies), Ruby Payne, Fred Jones and Harry Wong (Classroom Management).

BDS’s teacher appraisal system has recently been modified (following the adoption of the Charlotte Danielson framework), job descriptions have been modified. It appears that teachers and school leaders have a system in place to assess and improve individual and collective educator effectiveness. The district indicated that it will rely on the Danielson model to conduct teacher evaluation and determine if a teacher is effective, highly effective.

Based on the evidence provided in this section BDS has provided an incomplete plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. The applicant relies extensively on new technology tools without providing the training and support for teachers to be successful in the classroom. The plan appears unrealistic.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>11</b>

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

The district provided ample evidence that the school district’s leadership team is organized to provide support and services to all schools participating schools in the project. The applicant explained that school leaders autonomy and operational flexibility to meet the needs of all students on their respective campuses.

The applicant indicated that it will give students ample opportunities to earn credit based on demonstrated mastery through CAP (Credit acceleration program) or virtual courses. The district indicated that it follows the state of Florida mandate providing students an academically challenging curriculum or accelerated instruction. A long list of programs and options

offered to students is provided as well as the procedure to determine student eligibility for these programs. The district also indicated that students have the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards in a variety of ways through the use by CAG (classroom Assessment guidelines), the teacher serving as the ultimate decision maker for curriculum, assessment or remediation. The applicant indicated that it will purchase a platform to gather all high quality assessment designed by teachers will allow for standards to be measured multiple times and in multiple ways. Based on the evidence provided the district provides resources and instructional practices adaptable to the students that need it most. However, the fact English Language Learner's needs are served by teachers who are not fully credentialed is troubling as well as the claim by the district that new technology will allow students to have access to translator tools to assist them is also worrisome. Overall BDS provided sufficient evidence that an acceptable plan is in place to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator (as defined in this notice), and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.

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

**10**

**7**

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

The applicant provided some evidence that through its school infrastructures it supports personalized learning. The district indicated that students, parents, educators and other stakeholders have access to technology thanks to the half-cent sales tax by the citizens of Bay county. BDS also indicated that it will be working with internet providers to make available discounted web access to economically disadvantaged families, however a specific plan of action is not provided. It also appears that the applicant does not have an adequate plan to support technical support, the district plans to rely on a multi layered system starting with students, this plan is not appropriate to support the number of new technology devices and tools to be used for GO PLACES. The district has provided sufficient evidence to support that parents and students will have access to students data through the FOCUS system. The applicant has also provided evidence that it uses interoperable data systems (in large part thanks to the Florida winning an RTT grant in 2010). Overall, the district does not have an adequate plan in place to support personalized learning with school infrastructures.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>BDS has not provided a strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. The district indicates that it will put in place a GO PLACES Implementation Committee will be convened consisting of GO PLACES project leaders and other district office staff such as the supervisor of instructional technology and media services, the director of K-12 teaching and learning, director of ESE and Director of student service. However the district does have a specific plan in place indicating what will take place in the first 6 months after funds are received. The plan for years 2014-2017 should be more detailed. Overall the applicant has not presented an appropriate for continuous improvement process.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The BDS presented a limited plan for ongoing communication and engagement, the district provided limited rationale for the activities it will conduct, there is not a clear timeline for ongoing communication. The applicant only names one entity charged with ongoing communication and engagement (Go PLACES implementation committee). Overall the plan for ongoing communication is very limited.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>BDS has selected ambitious yet achievable performance measures (testing, out of school suspension, attendance, Algebra I course completion, graduation rates). The target for graduation rates post grant are not very ambitious. The rationale provided for selecting each measure makes sense, the district selected measures starting in the early grades to high school. The applicant also indicated precisely how these measures provide rigorous, timely, and formative information</p>		

tailored to the overall *GO PLACES* proposal. However the applicant did not indicate how it will review and improve the measure over time if insufficient to gauge implementation progress. Overall, the applicant presented an acceptable plan.

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

**5**

**3**

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

E4: The district indicates that it is currently participating in the Race to the TOP initiative PD redesign (action research). The district appears to have a good plan in place to evaluate the effectiveness of RTTD funded activities when it comes to professional development. However the applicant does not appear to have a clear plan to evaluate activities that employ technology other than hiring consultants. Overall, the applicant does not have a high quality plan because it does not provide a detailed timeline, deliverables and the parties responsible for carrying out the plan.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>

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

The applicant's budget clearly identifies all all funds that will support the project. The applicant indicates all funds that will support GO PLACES. Based on the evidence provided it appears that the budget is sufficient to support and implement the applicants' proposal. The equipment budget line appears disproportionately high compared to other categories such as the amount of funds spent on personnel charged with technical support. The budget is broken down into categories (personnel, fringe benefits, travel, equipment, supplies, contractual). The applicants have provided sufficient information to earn an acceptable rating for their budget plan.

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

**10**

**5**

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

BDS provided a very limited plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. The district did not indicate if it has been seeking partnerships to sustain project goals beyond the term of the grant. It appears that the applicant is mainly relying on potential federal funding, the half-cent sales tax, and the district general budget. The district also hopes to secure a partnership with Internet providers to continue sponsorship of community Wi-Fi hotspots. Overall, the applicant has not provided a high quality plan for sustainability.

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

BDS provided an ambitious plan to grow the local workforce through school to work components. The applicant provided a list of local partners and indicated that the personalized digital platform and community connection platforms will allow community members to access these resources accessible. The applicant does not describe coherent and sustainable partnerships but identified six desired results for students in the LEA. BDS indicated that it intends to continue working with Bay EDA, local colleges, community agencies and other businesses to provide opportunities for students to pursue individual interests but do not provide specific examples other than a partnership with community agencies to provide English Language classes at the library. The district indicated that families of participating students will be involved in GO PLACES. Overall, BDS's plan is ambitious but lacks clarity and fails to identify key partners

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

	Available	Score

<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>
<p><b>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</b></p> <p>Bay district schools has set an ambitious vision aimed at allowing the district to provide students with a quality education through the GO PLACES approach (Goal oriented, personalized learning, accelerating educational success). The applicant indicated that it has been participating in the Florida RTT funded activities (Florida won a RTT state competition grant in 2010). This vision of the applicant is to build on current efforts funded in part by RTT while using RTTD funds to achieve even success in the four core educational assurance areas. The district indicated that it has adopted Common core standards, it indicated that the entire state of Florida is in the process of adopting CCS. Overall, the district's plan offers students enrolled in BDS and opportunity to learn using personalized strategies aligned with CCSS standards and tied to College and career readiness; while also providing these same students with effective teachers who will be able to meet their needs. Based on the information provided in this application BDS has met absolute priority 1.</p>		

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>128</b>
--------------	------------	------------



## Race to the Top - District

### Technical Review Form

Application #0168FL-3 for Bay District Schools

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

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

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

The Bay District presents a well-conceived, substantial, comprehensive and coherent reform vision in its application. Everything proposed is well-contextualized with the practical circumstances of the community, as thoroughly described in the initial sections of the application related to diminished tourism, a reduced tax base, and very specific evidence of the lack of workforce preparation necessary to develop and retain jobs in the area, and well articulated with regard to each requirement of the criterion.

(a) Bay District benefits from its early and thorough embracing of the State's successful Race to the Top application. The four core educational assurance areas are fully addressed in the narrative including a rich array of detailed elements providing evidence of the district's commitment to Common Core and its successful implementation over the previous three years. The plan also presents a solid description of a well-executed framework of integrated data systems including evaluations for teachers and administrators, student information, parent portals and evidence of full-scale implementation.

Teacher effectiveness is described as an ongoing priority with mentoring opportunities to expand the number of available effective and highly effective teachers, shifting teacher retention to performance based rewards rather than seniority, and performance pay. Finally, the district acknowledges a system to identify lowest achieving schools with a clear emphasis on strategies to improve their performance through District Assistance Teams, already evidencing success. The application fully complies with the criterion.

(b) The reform proposal is quite thorough in its presentation of six detailed projects, designed to augment the district's existing Race to the Top efforts, and that demonstrate a consistent, strong band of training across each to increase the chances of success. This is a particularly strong element in the proposal. The narrative articulates a clear, credible approach, through the six projects, that will accelerate student achievement through personalized learning supported by leveraged technology, strong educator development and support and active, integrated involvement from parents and the community. There is evidence that the approach is grounded in common and individual tasks through the personalized digital platform and flipped classrooms that engage common student activities. Emphasized throughout the application is the objective of improved content, aligned with the Common Core, as the foundational element to deepen student learning.

(c) A particularly compelling strength of the application is in this nuanced section reflecting careful, step-by-step thought that illuminates exactly what the teacher and student will experience through the envisioned personalized learning environments, in full compliance with the criterion. The narrative provides evidence of how both the teacher and student will be informed about the opportunities within the personalized learning architecture and how strong support will be provided consistently to greatly increase the chances of success.

<b>(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:**  
 The narrative indicates a commitment to include all schools within the district in the reform proposal and offers a strong, thoughtful rationale for ensuring equity for all participating students at the start of the implementation and throughout the grant period. The plan demonstrates evidence that the proposal will be implemented across all grades, in all schools including district charters, and in all subject areas. However, subject areas are not defined within the district charter schools in the narrative nor does the chart indicate what subjects are or are not included for the charter schools. While this represents a relatively small overall student population, the narrative does not address the issue resulting in a reduction in points. Included in the plan is a complete list of participating schools along with the data required, by category, in full compliance with the criterion.

<b>(A)(3) LEA-wide reform &amp; change (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**  
 The application provides a high-quality, well thought-through plan for including every student, school and charter school within the district therefore beginning at full scale upon implementation. However, the plan includes several statements indicating a commitment to offer consulting and modeling for area districts as a mechanism to assist them with achieving full Race to the Top State implementation based on what Bay District learns from its GO PLACES reform strategy. Bay identifies two partners, the Consortium for School Networking and Florida Educational Technology Conference, intended to assist with this area scaling and an intention to create a professional development comprehensive program to better enable other districts to benefit from Bay District's work. The plan is brief, does not reach the level of high-quality, and fails to present sufficient detail to support how the district's outcome goals will be reached through this scaling initiative.

<b>(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
--	-----------	----------

**(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**  
 The application, in the aggregate of all performance goals presented, fails to attain ambitious yet achievable goals for all student subgroups with regard to summative assessments and decreasing achievement gaps. The goal to have all subgroups show growth and achieve 50% proficiency by the end of the grant still leaves an unacceptably low performance picture for Black students. Though growth is steady and achievable, it is not ambitious. Bay District seeks to achieve a 30% reduction in the achievement gap which is ambitious yet achievable. The application fails to provide information that compares the district's goals with the State ESEA targets as required by the criterion, therefore an evaluation against that metric is not possible. Goals for graduation rates is particularly weak, reflecting only a 2.5% increase overall post-grant period. And the goal for college enrollment is equally weak reflecting an increase of only 1.25% over the grant-period. Gains of this sort might be appropriate if the baseline is closer to 85% or 90% but not when the baseline is 72.5% for graduation rate and 56.25% for college enrollment. The plan does not address the optional performance goal.

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12</b>

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:**  
 In the aggregate, based on the evidence provided in support of this criterion, Bay District has demonstrated an ability to achieve student learning success in a variety of meaningful ways, as indicated below. Though the plan does not address each element required by the criterion, the overall evaluation of what is presented suggests evidence of ability to succeed.

(a) The application provides evidence of steady success over the past four years with regard to graduation rates, improving over 10% in a five year period, and presents impressive growth data for students attaining industry certifications through the Career and Technical Education Program over a four year period, complying with the criterion for college

enrollment growth. Data are also included that demonstrate a clear record of success in the number of students tested for Algebra I in grades 7 and 8 but only over a two year period in which data are available and only offering a narrow window into improved student achievement. Data are not presented to address success with regard to student learning outcomes or closing the achievement gaps.

(b) The application previously noted that Bay District has only recently identified any of its schools as lowest achieving and provides evidence of success in improving a low achieving elementary school from a D to a C on the State grading system over a two year period. Sufficient evidence to demonstrate significant reforms or ambitious results in lowest achieving schools, as required by the criterion, is not included.

(c) Bay District utilizes the Focus platform for its student information system and boasts of an 85% enrollment rate for all families in the district. The narrative briefly describes how student performance data, particularly around grades, is available to students, educators and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services through immediate, consistent communication.

<b>(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
---	----------	----------

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

The narrative briefly describes the mechanisms that are in place to assure transparency including access to the budget via the website, through the Master Contract between the district and teachers organization, and an Annual Financial Report. But the plan fails to demonstrate a high level of transparency nor does it provide any evidence at all with regard to the four categories required by this criterion. The fact that sentences are offered implying compliance does not rise to the level of producing evidence as required.

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

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

The application provides a comprehensive description of five State laws which collectively provide very successful conditions and sufficient autonomy to implement the personalized learning environments described in the reform proposal. These include rigorous teacher and administrator evaluation systems, mechanisms to evaluate impact of professional development on student achievement, a commitment to implement Common Core State Standards, a commitment to spend at least 50% of the district's budget for material allocation on digital and electronic materials, and multiple diploma tracks. This is further augmented by the State's Race to the Top implementation and the Bay County half cent tax that has allowed for substantial infrastructure improvements in the schools.

<b>(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>
--	-----------	----------

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

Letters of support are one element required by this criterion. Also necessary is demonstrated evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement throughout the development of the reform proposal. This is completely absent in the narrative. Further, surveys of students and parents are referenced yet the data evidencing the results is not included nor any description of the proportional representation of the populations who participated. The application is also totally silent with regard to how input from stakeholders was captured and utilized to inform, modify or improve the proposal as required by the criterion. While a letter of support from the collective bargaining organization is included, there is not evidence of direct engagement or support from the organization in developing the proposal. The letters from four mayors, the Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners, the Bay County Chamber of Commerce and the Panama City Chamber of Commerce are all identical form letters and do not reflect individual knowledge of the proposal and diminish the quality of the application. Quality letters of support are included from state elected officials, foundations, the Navy, universities, economic development organizations, and marvelously vivid letters from principals and students reflecting authentic knowledge and support of the district's vision. Again, several letters are included from local businesses that are the same form letters as evidenced above with the mayors, diminishing their value.

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Score</b>
--	------------------	--------------

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

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

The application offers a reasonable plan but falls short of meeting the requirements to be deemed high quality. Much of the plan re-states the same elements previously covered, with relatively minor modifications by section, namely an over-reliance on involvement with the Common Core State Standards as evidence of non-related items in the criterion, for instance suggesting the adoption of the standards is proof of involving students in deep learning experiences without any detail to explain why this is the case. Three projects are briefly described, then re-stated several times ostensibly as a running thread, involving assessments, personalized digital platforms, and community/family outreach but the narrative lacks any integration, definition of responsible parties, timeframes for completion or sufficient detail to explain how each will be implemented across all participating schools. The plan lacks any definition for instructional strategies that enable students to participate in rigorous courses of study aligned with college and career ready standards, are able to link what they are learning with their individual goals, or any description of how students are assisted in identifying and pursuing learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards. A reference is made to providing students with opportunities for enrolling in courses and earning college credit in an un-named local state college without describing how this will be scaled or integrated into the larger reform initiative. There is no correlation provided as to why Bring Your Own Device is presented as evidence for exposure to diverse cultures, contexts and perspectives and does not meet the criterion. Once more, the re-statement of 1:1 digital devices, community/family outreach, the Danielson framework, Common Core, summative and common assessments and personalized digital platforms throughout this section does not equate to evidence required by this criterion. A list of a few current district content programs is provided as evidence of digital learning content but no details, context or explanatory narrative for why these programs were selected or how they integrate with the reform proposal is included. The narrative does provide reasonable evidence of programmatic content in support of high-needs students and the benefit of expanding student and parent access to these programs through digital mechanisms beyond regular school hours. The presence of 1:1 digital devices is offered as evidence that frequently updated individual student data will be provided in regular, ongoing feedback without ever defining frequency, how students will be trained to access the data and interpret it to determine progress toward mastery. It seems as if the devices are viewed as the solution without developing sufficient depth with regard to effective implementation suggesting a high probability of success. The narrative describes a set of mechanisms as being available to provide training and support to students for the use of the new tools but simply fails to weave any coherence as to how these will be implemented across all schools, grades and participating students.

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

**20**

**8**

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

Overall, the narrative reflects the applicants understanding of the importance and necessity of a wide array of teacher training tools and paints with broad strokes regarding the approach offered in the reform proposal. Statements are made that essentially re-state the requirements of the criterion but the plan fails to describe how the district intends to implement an execution plan or whom will be held responsible for undertaking the work. For example, the narrative describes creating "partnerships with community leaders to provide relevant and personalized communication regarding skills a college or career ready graduate should possess" then offers no detail with regard to who the identified partners might be, evidence that they have agreed to participate, and if this will be made available to all participating teachers. Another example is in the broad statements about Bay District participating in a professional development redesign. This could be a valid and meaningful element of evidence for a high quality plan if supporting details were included. Again, the plan briefly references "partner with EDA to promote 21st century workplace skills" without then enunciating what this partnership entails, how or when it would be implemented or how many teachers would be able to participate. It is not sufficient to assert intent without offering reasonable detail to meet the threshold of what is required for high quality.

(a) The narrative fails to provide evidence of how all participating teachers in all participating schools will have access to training specifically designed for the effective implementation of personalized learning environments as required by the criterion. The criterion require evidence that teachers are trained to adapt content to the personalized needs of students aligned with the vision of the reform proposal yet the plan lacks any details in this regard beyond pointing out the low training staff to teacher ratio, 7:1500, and asserting that GO PLACES will provide "unlimited opportunities" and will "clearly support" the development of teachers without ever describing a high quality plan for how the district intends to accomplish this. The plan discusses the district's intent to have more frequent, less formalized assessments at the classroom level, supported by the opportunities new devices will afford teachers to assign computer-based interim and summative assessments, but fails to present a coherent understanding of how these assessments will be organized over the school year, nor does the narrative define the district's expectation or definition of frequency or how this data will be used to inform the acceleration of student progress. The plan does adequately address the use of evaluative data derived from teacher and principal practice through recently implemented evaluation systems. The narrative refers to "FSLA" with regard to being a mechanism for principals to receive feedback but does not identify what is mean by "FSLA" nor the frequency or detail of what is included in the feedback.

(b) The narrative offers an insufficient explanation of how educator accessibility to tools through the digital devices will yield actionable items, as required by the criterion, nor fully explains how the transition from plans to reduce reliance on

purchased assessments to teachers writing their own standards-based questions will result in optimal learning approaches. While the plan provides a long list of available learning resources, it does not describe them, nor define how they are coherently aligned to college and career ready student development. The plan lacks specificity in describing specific resources that are or intend to be aligned to provide continuous feedback.

(c) The narrative rambles across a wide array of training opportunities for school leaders and school leadership teams, data interpretation, and general statements that lack any coherence in providing high quality evidence for how any of this will meet individual student academic needs, accelerate student progress or enable the structuring of effective learning environments as required by the criterion. Nor is evidence provided that details how information will be specifically obtained from the teacher evaluation system or other sources in order to assess and move forward in the result of continues school improvement. The narrative does provide reasonable evidence of existing and planned training systems and practices toward increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps.

(d) State law requires the presence of a highly effective teacher for students who are retained in the third grade, indicating a strong intervention at a crucial development point for students. The plan points repeatedly to the Danielson Framework as evidence of high quality elements but this over reliance fails to offer detailed coherence for exactly how the district intends to ensure that it will increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals. The plan speaks in generalities with regard to how teachers can self-select professional development options to improve their effectiveness which does not meet the requirement for high quality nor does the plan extend any discussion with regard to how the effectiveness of principals will be improved.

The application includes a very lengthy chart describing a list of action items, deliverables, responsible parties and timeframes across six projects. Unfortunately, the plan does not introduce this section, offer any coherence as to its purpose relative to the information previously presented nor does it draw together the many items into any cogent alignment with the requirements of this criterion.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9</b>

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

The application falls short of a high quality plan in that it lacks coherence and sufficient detail to evidence a thoughtful strategy to support overall project implementation. While a number of necessary policies are in force, a comprehensive view is not provided in the plan.

(a) The reform proposal suggest a dramatic approach to change by deploying substantial amounts of technology, generating tremendous amounts of new data through augmented summative assessments, flipping the classroom, focusing on student-led vs. teacher-led classroom instruction, and a host of laudable reforms yet the organization of the LEA central office is presented in the application as is without any description of how the structure will be modified to accommodate and support these meaningful changes. It is not clear that the LEA organization is being improved to better align with what is being proposed resulting in a reduction in points.

(b) The plan fails to meet the requirements of the criterion by indicating that such factors as setting the school schedules, assessment schedules, and school personnel decisions are made at the central office consistent with the teachers' organization contract and schools are not given sufficient flexibility and autonomy in these areas. The narrative asserts that school based decisions are allowed to make hiring decisions, create and implement school improvement plans, assign responsibilities to staff, and control budget decisions. It is not clear where this authority is derived, if by State law, or school board policy, nor is sufficient detail provided to delineate how these policies are effectively operating.

(c) The district utilizes Credit Acceleration Program courses as one mechanism to enable students to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery rather than seat time. In addition, provisions in State law, Academically Challenging Curriculum to Enhance Learning (ACCEL), fully support student progress through acceleration and mastery which is implemented in Bay District.

(d) Bay District does show evidence of rules and practices that support the opportunity for students to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways, as required by the criterion, though some limitations exist with regard to personalized assessment resulting from the lack of an existing assessment platform. The creation of this platform is envisioned as part of the reform proposal.

(e) The district relies on various software programs, the Newcomer Program and Inclusion/Mainstream instruction for students with disabilities and English learners. But the narrative fails to paint a coherent picture of how these various tools might be integrated and aligned with the goals of the reform proposal.

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

**10**

**6**

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

(a) The application does present a high-quality plan for building upon the recently constructed technology infrastructure, made possible by the half cent sales tax in 2010, by extending access to parents and students through personal laptops and tablets, and to the community through free designated WiFi areas and partnerships with businesses to address access for families with high economic need. This reflects a well thought-out and detailed plan. However, the plan also indicates that 1400 core curriculum classrooms have benefited from this infusion of technology dollars but does not state whether this represents all participating classrooms or what proportion of all classrooms this suggests. This makes it difficult to evaluate the required assurance that all participating students and educators have access to necessary content, tools and other learning resources.

(b) The plan calls for peer training of technical support, augmented by the district's existing Management Information System help desk, to back up students and educators. Web-based solutions will also be provided. The narrative fails to reach the level of a high-quality plan in that technical support for parents and other stakeholders is not addressed and the three avenues of support described remains a narrow range of strategies.

(c) The plan only touches on how information technology systems are currently limited with regard to how parents and students can export information but asserts that the GO PLACES strategy will address the issues without offering sufficient detail describing how other electronic learning systems' data will be utilized.

(d) The interoperability of the data systems has been established through the State's Race to the Top grant.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The plan fails completely in presenting any rigorous or high quality plan for implementing a continuous improvement process. Beyond stating that a series of meetings will take place to discuss various aspects of the progress of the plan, no detail is provided to substantiate how any of it will result in regular feedback on specific progress toward project goals, necessary to evidence rigor, nor is there any discussion with regard to how the district might intend to monitor, measure and publicly share information on the quality of its Race to the Top - District funded investments.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The plan fails in meeting the requirements of high-quality in that it lacks any detailed evidence for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. The narrative indicates the use of a School Info app without ever describing the app, what it includes, how stakeholders might access it or know about it, or how it would be widely implemented. Also, the plan offers a few sentences indicating that quarterly Community Forums will be held but does not describe what an agenda might look like, who is responsible for organizing, how these are publicized or who is invited to attend. Overall, the plan lacks substance.</p>		
<b>(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</b>		
<p>The application includes 15 performance measures, complying with each of the categories required by this criterion, and offers a thorough rationale for why each was selected. The narrative accompanying each performance measure, identified by subgroup as required, adds some coherence to the objectives of the reform proposal but does not adequately address how the measures will be presented in a timely manner resulting in formative leading information aligned with evaluation the progress of the elements contained in the reform proposal. Overall, the performance measures reflect generally ambitious goals though the post-grant target for 8th grade Math FCAT scores is not aggressive nor is the post-grant target</p>		

of 31% for 3rd grade Hispanic students in reading a goal consistent with a high quality plan. The plan is silent with regard to how the district intends to review and improve the measure over time if it is viewed as insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

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

**5**

**3**

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

The application fails to provide a high-quality plan as required by the criterion in that the narrative briefly offers an existing Race to the Top State initiative, PD Redesign, as evidence of rigorous evaluation of professional development activities. This suggests a reliance on activities not directly linked with the GO PLACES reform proposal, lacks detail in describing how this initiative has been integrated into the proposal to ensure meaningful evaluation of the effectiveness of Race to the Top - District funded activities. The ideas presented lack coherence and substance to meet the threshold of high-quality.

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

	Available	Score
<b>(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>

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

The budget presented is framed across seven projects. Six are stakeholder-level activities and one is devoted to project management. The budget clearly and comprehensively identifies all funds that will support the GO PLACES reform proposal including a substantial amount of funds contributed from other sources including district funds, sales tax revenue, and federal e-rate funds.

The budget is thoughtfully outlined and reflects adequate resources to fund the development and implementation of the district's proposal. The emphasis is appropriately placed in funding additional personnel at greater levels in the early grant years and reducing in out-years in support of the Personalized PD and PLC Training project. The budget narrative throughout is well-written and offers a coherent rationale for budgeted priorities and expenditures. Also, the narrative identifies those items purchased from other sources that are for the support of this reform proposal, for instance, the acquisition of the item bank platform for the Summative and Common Assessments project. Other one-time purchased items are reflected in the training required in the Teacher and Administrator Evaluation project in which the narrative clarifies this expenditure as important to initially deepen student learning but to transition on-line resources to sustain the activities post-grant.

The largest expenditure by far is the \$20,000,000, one-time expense, out of a \$30,000,000 grant request, allocated to the purchase of equipment in the 1:1 Digital Devices project. The narrative is insufficient in this important area in that it lacks any detail with regard to what specifically this large sum will purchase nor is their evidence of the degree of advance research necessary to make smart purchasing decisions at this substantial spending level. This greatly diminishes the overall quality of the budget section.

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

**10**

**6**

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

The application includes a high quality plan for sustaining the project's goals beyond the grant period. The plan is specific in identifying the elements intended for sustainability accompanied by a rationale for this selection. The application includes a chart explaining how funding for ongoing activities is embedded on the district's operating budget along with existing or proposed funding sources and legislative requirements aligned with these items. What is not adequately addressed at all in the narrative is a plan to evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes to inform a post-grant budget nor is a three-year post-grant budget, including assumptions, provided. The chart provided does address potential sources and uses of funds, however.

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

	Available	Score
<b>Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4</b>

**Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:**

(1) The narrative presented in support of the application's Competitive Preference Priority describes 17 existing partnerships as continuing relationships with the district along with a very brief description of the services provided by each. The narrative does not describe how many students in the district are currently benefiting from these partnerships nor does it offer any sense of how this will be enhanced as a result of the reform proposal. The lack of explanation about the length of time each partnership has been in place suggests that all 17 commenced at the same time and are essentially equal in terms of impact. More detail is required to provide coherence to this large number of partnerships. The notion of consolidating the resources into a more accessible location, the digital device, and implying greater awareness of these tools for students and families is a good one but the necessary level of detail that would evidence careful thought as to implementation is absent.

(2) The application identifies six population-level desired results, all focused on an 8th grade cohort, including four education outcomes and two family/community supports. The rationale for each is clearly articulated and the desired results are aligned with the expectations described in the reform proposal. The chart outlining these elements strengthens the overall quality of the application and reflect reasonable, though not particularly ambitious, results.

(3) The system for tracking results is already in place and available with plans to aggregate, as stated in the narrative, and identifies four tools that will provide data and feedback. The plan does not offer sufficient detail, however, in describing how or when this feedback will be made available nor to whom. The application is silent with regard to how the data will be used to improve results for participating students and does not address scaling the model or improving results over time.

(4) The application does not adequately address the integration of education and other services as required by the criterion.

(5) The narrative describes a CHOICES inventory as the tool that will assess the needs of participating students resulting in a personalized learning map. It is not clear how this map aligns with the personalized learning plans envisioned in the reform proposal. The district intends to rely on a single individual, the Community Liaison to coordinate and monitor support efforts on the part of several district partners but the narrative does not offer any detail of where this person fits in the organization, to whom they are responsible -- the district or the partners -- or exactly how the coordination will take place. The criterion asks for evidence of an inventory of the needs and assets of the school and community and their alignment with those goals for improving education but the application is silent in addressing this point. Nor does the application offer sufficient detail in support of creating a decision-making process to select, implement and evaluate supports, describe specifically how parents will be engaged, nor how the district intends to routinely assess its progress, as required by the criterion.

(6) The performance measures reflect an intention for steady growth, are achievable but not particularly ambitious, for instance, with a goal of 2% annual growth in the number of 8th grade students taking the ACT, SAT and PERT or an increase of 2% over four years of those graduates eligible for the Florida Gold Seal Vocational Designation.

**Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments**

	Available	Score
<b>Absolute Priority 1</b>		<b>Met</b>

**Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:**

The overall application does meet the absolute priority in that the narrative repeatedly aligns with the core educational assurance areas and targets the reform proposal on creating meaningful personalized learning environments. The plan describes a strategy for significantly improving learning and teaching including a broad set of tools and supports aligned with college- and career-ready standards already in place through State law and the ongoing implementation of the State's Race to the Top initiative. The plan addresses the district's ideas for accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning and methods for increasing the effectiveness of educators. Limited discussion is offered relative to decreasing the achievement gaps. A reasonably strong focus is apparent in the plan for how to increase graduation and college enrollment rates. What keeps this plan from achieving the definition of high-quality is through its lack in offering distinct dimensions that would reflect comprehensive, coherent thought in each of the areas required by this competition. Too often, the narrative from section to section is a re-statement of the previously articulated elements contained in the six project areas. These are impressive the first time but grow stale when the criterion requires detail that substantiates how the plan will accomplish its objectives.

---

<b>Total</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>119</b>
--------------	------------	------------