



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0033FL-1 for Santa Rosa County School District

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>Applicant provides a compelling overview of the district, a mid-sized school district with 42 percent of student from low-income households and considerable diversity in its economy and geography from north to south, and how it is both a consistently high-scoring district with the State, despite being the low funded district in the State. Student demographics and achievement measures demonstrate that the district has need to improve district-wide achievement by creating an environment where all students can attain critical career skills and join the workforce (including post-college) prepared with critical skills such as persistence, determination, interpersonal skills, teamwork, presentation and critical thinking skills to be effective and productive in a business environment. This district was previously a recipient of Race to the Top—State (RTTS) funding through its State Education Agency (SEA), which allowed it to develop a framework to begin transforming teaching and learning and expanding Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) opportunities. The district began its transition to Common Core State Standards (CCSS) district-wide in 2011, and this grant will provide an interoperable Instructional Improvement System combined with an open-source learning platform that will allow the district to overcome the challenge of making data accessible and providing resources specific to each student’s needs. A detailed description is provided of the assessment measures the district uses and how they will be used to develop Personalized Learning Plans for each district student. The district will also use the grant to integrate its Student Management and Reporting Tool (SMART) with a robust on-line instructional improvement system that incorporates an intervention tool to empower educators to evaluate the needs of students and create the Personalized Learning Plans, including creating targeted response-to-intervention plans for individuals and groups. A single Instructional Improvement System (IIS) will be developed to facilitate seamless access and integration of all data through a single login portal in an open source data format available to students, teachers, parents, and administrators. The application proposes to develop a rubric for validating and calibrating the existing teacher and principal evaluation and link evaluations to student achievement via the IIS. The district will also implement a multi-tiered, intervention treatment for lowest-achieving schools in the district that will include new Career Academies, extended day activities, and parent engagement activities.</p> <p>These components convincingly build on the district’s work in the four core educational assurance areas, and articulate a very well developed approach for accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity. A succinct and powerful reform vision is provided, as is evidence of past success that bodes well for future replication of Career Academies (100% student graduation rates and 100% FCAT 2.0 passing rates for students taking courses at the Marine Science Station). As data-driven decision-making transforms the role of teachers, access to hand-held technology devices will allow access to resources specific to student needs, including their Personalized Learning Plan. The applicant provides a detailed description of how this use of technology will enhance the classroom experience, as well as how project-based learning and Career Academies will be advanced under the grant.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant persuasively explains why it has chosen to select every school in the district (entire district student population) to participate under the grant. However, the lowest-performing/highest-poverty schools in the district have been chosen for initial implementation including teacher training, student training, and parent outreach. Expansion will continue to middle schools first, then high schools. The applicants makes a strong case for why this approach is likely to support high-quality implementation of the program. The list of participating schools is complete, with all required information.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	9

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant clearly and systematically addresses the elements of a high-quality plan in this section. In the narrative, a broad overview is provided of the scaling of services under the grant to all students, with details provided in the four-year Work Plan in the Appendix. The overall application fills out how the reform proposal will translate into meaningful reform district-wide. The applicant's logic model or theory of change is integrated holistically into the text of the application at multiple points, but could more clearly demonstrate how all elements of the plan will lead to improvements in student learning outcomes for all students served. A score in the high range is awarded.

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

10

5

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provides comprehensive charts with the appropriate data for the five elements of this criterion. In general, the annual goals appear to be ambitious yet achievable (for raising student achievement, reducing achievement gaps, increasing graduation rates, and increasing college enrollment), although it is not clearly stated what the State's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) targets for the district are, and therefore it is not possible to ascertain that these targets are equal to or exceed those targets. Additionally, in many of the charts, the projected annual targets increase identically overall and in all subgroups (no explanation for why consistent annual increase were selected for all subgroups across multiple subjects every year of the grant), leading to no decrease in achievement gaps on the FCAT 2.0 (since all subgroups rise equally year by year in scores). The chart for (A)(4)(b), however, shows declines in achievement gaps for all subgroups against the highest-performing one (generally Asian), comparing each year or growth in the scores of subgroups against the static highest-performing subgroup's baseline, not it's comparable year-to-year targets. This provides a false sense of achievement gaps closing, when, in fact, they are not projected to, as all scores of all subgroups are being projected to increase equally from year to year. A score in the middle of the point range is awarded.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	8
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides evidence of students overall and in the bottom 25% making learning gains in reading and math from year to year, although the district acknowledges the gains are not high. Specific areas of success are highlighted (92 National Board Certified teachers, over 10,000 volunteers, strong business partners, active parent organizations). Limited information is provided about the district's record in the past four years in closing achievement gaps. Regarding high school graduation rates, some evidence is provided that they remained level for lowest-achieving schools and that they are on target for the State of Florida. College enrollment rates are not addressed. The lowest-performing schools have made modest gains but show a decline in math and reading scores in 2012 and 2013 due, in part, to the State adding additional measures to each school's final grade in those two academic years. The reforms implemented are not well defined in this section although described in general in various places elsewhere in the application. Limited data is provided (the charts with math and reading historical data are for one high school, without subgroups). The applicant describes its plans for making student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services, but does not describe its record of success in doing so over the past four years, as required by the criterion.</p> <p>The district's Instructional Improvement System gives parents, teachers, and students access anytime, anywhere to student data. The district plans to integrate such data with the teacher and principal professional growth system and with student personalized learning plans, using funding from this grant program. A score in the middle point range is awarded.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant makes available to the public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, student support, and school administration. Sub-elements (a) through (e) are thoroughly met through Attachment 8: Education Fund Accountability Report, which provide the minimally requested information under this criterion and which is posted online annually on the district's website. The narrative demonstrates that the district has a high level of transparency in its processes, practices, and investments. Full points are awarded.</p>		

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Florida statutes clearly provide each local education agency (LEA) the autonomy to implement the personalized learning environment, although the State still requires specific levels of seat time for “in-school” learning” (with an option for doing coursework online through the Florida Virtual School). The applicant has already begun implementing the local IIS using funds from the State’s RTTS grant and proposes now to complete the integration of resources through a technology platform, single login function, and access to the system for personalized learning. Full points are awarded.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	15
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant describes how students, families, teachers, and principals were surveyed on the priority goals of the grant proposal and asked for feedback specific to the proposal’s goals. The district held focus groups with external stakeholders to garner information, including the inclusion of programs specific to homeless and unaccompanied teens; Headstart; parent engagement; workforce, career and technical education; business; Chamber of Commerce; post-secondary education; and community groups. Overall, the applicant demonstrates both meaningful stakeholder engagement and widespread support of its application. In particular, an extensive appendix of diverse letters of support is provided, and 20 resource partners have committed to providing in-kind support totaling over \$5 million. The local collective bargaining representative supports the proposal. Full points are awarded.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	10
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant provides a detailed narrative for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment, but it does not address the elements of a high-quality plan, as defined in the notice. Students in traditional school environments will receive instruction in 21st Century personalized learning environments through Project Based Learning (with an emphasis on transfer of knowledge, collective grouping, and on-line/off-line rotation). A solid research base is presented, especially with regard to differentiated instruction. A Career Academy will be included in every middle and high school, under this proposal, aimed at deepening student interest in STEM. Teachers will be trained in project-based learning so that this learning approach is used systemically across all schools in the district. Career exploration will be age-appropriate and completed through interactive project learning taught by students in their career academies. The sub-elements of (C)(1) (a) and (b) are largely addressed throughout the application in narrative form, but, again, not with attention to the specific elements of a high-quality plan. Overall, this section of the applicant lacks the specificity and close attention to the detailed language of the criterion’s sub-elements that are necessary to score in the high range. Given the generalized discussion in the narrative concerning teaching and learning, and the lack of a high-quality planned as defined, this element is scored in the middle of the point range for this element.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	8
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant will implement a train-the-trainer program providing subject matter experts (SME) in each school. SME will conduct formal peer-training bi-monthly and informal peer support on an ongoing basis. Additional reinforcement will be provided to teachers through Professional Learning Communities and Lesson Study, and they will be trained on Project Based Learning Integration, with rotated observations at the Marine Science Station. Specialized training will be provided to Career Academy Instructors specific to their career interest area. Instant response units will allow teachers to quickly assess student knowledge of coursework and adjust grouping and peer learning based on response, in the classroom setting. The narrative, however detailed, does not address the elements of a high-quality plan, as defined in the notice. The sub-elements of (C)(2)(a) through (d) are largely addressed throughout the application in narrative form, but not with attention to the specific elements of a high-quality plan (concrete timelines for specific action steps, with clearly identified responsible parties, etc.). Some sub-element requirements, such as a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and non-effective teachers and principals, are not addressed at all. Given the generalized discussion, the lack of a high-quality planned as defined, and missing information, this element is scored in the middle of the point range for this element.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	8
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant does not address the elements of a high-quality plan but instead provides a general narrative description of each sub-element in (D)(1). The description of the LEA’s central office organization is basic; directors for each grade level, student services, federal programs, exceptional student education, and professional development work with school principals and staff directly as needs are identified. The schools use a Continuous Improvement Model to plan and implement programs to meet the specific needs of students and the community. State standards have not allowed competency-based learning to be fully integrated in the traditional public schools, although there is a Virtual School option, and the proposed program under the grant will allow blended learning in a traditional environment with virtual learning allowing achievement to be based on mastery of the course; this will allow students to supplement course work with classes that are of interest to the student or classes to remediate learning deficient based on a students’ personalized learning plan. Through the technology offered under this grant proposal, students will be able to rotate learning from on-line to off-line instruction, through video and distance learning, through project-based learning in Career Academies, and through peer-delivered video instruction. Thus, instruction will be delivered in multiple ways, in multiple venues, using a variety of techniques that can be implemented depending on a student’s personal learning preference. The district provides a support framework that guides the implementation of a technology plan to (1) empower learners, including those with special needs, (2) enhance learner outcomes, and (3) encourage independent and cooperative life-long learning. English language learners are not addressed with regard to the adaptability of and access to learning resources and instructional process. Given the generalized discussion and the lack of a high-quality plan as defined, this element is scored in the middle of the point range for this element.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	4
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant has a strong comprehensive technology plan and, as part of the grant, would provide training for all teachers and a framework for training students and parents on the proper use and adaptability of all handheld devices and interoperable software to ensure ease of use, access, safety, and application. A strength is that each district school's technology liaison will be clearly assigned responsibility for training coordination, internet safety protocol instruction, and digital training resources. Under the grant all district students would have individual hand-held devices and a technology platform to allow each student to learn in any environment regardless of income. Home Internet services will be offered through district partners at a nominal charge. This section is relatively vague in its description under each sub-element. As above, the applicant does not address the elements of a high-quality plan but instead provides a general narrative description of each sub-element in (D)(1). Some text appears to be missing under D)(2)(c) and (d); the narrative begins mid-sentence. Given the generalized discussion and the lack of a high-quality plan as defined, this element is scored in the middle of the point range for this element.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	7
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Under its previous RTTS sub-grant, the district developed a continuous improvement process. The missing pieces to be developed under this RTTD funding, if awarded, are calibration and validation of measures for teachers and administrator evaluations, an interoperable data system, and an external evaluation to contract and compare internal evaluation. This proposal would fund implementation of an interoperable IIS and single-log-in learning portal and would coordinate and validate internal and external review of the plan in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Education and a national evaluator. As above, the applicant does not address the elements of a high-quality plan but instead provides a short, general narrative description. A weakness is that the applicant does not explain with sufficient detail how the the existing continuous improvement process, when modified, will be used to monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the</p>		

quality of its RTTD investment, as requested by this criterion. Given the generalized discussion and the lack of some elements of a high-quality plan as defined (in (E)(2) a partial plan is provided that relates in part to (E)(1), but without timelines and clear rationales for activities), this element is scored in the middle of the point range for this element.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 Applicant's plan includes meetings with post-secondary education stakeholders and business stakeholders on a quarterly basis to review implementation, receive feedback, and adjust the plan accordingly. Stakeholders are on the evaluation team. The internal evaluation team, in concert with the external stakeholder, will develop a "report card" for all stakeholders and a bi-annual report on the state of the grant. Given the generalized discussion and the lack of a high-quality plan as defined, this element is scored in the middle of the point range for this element.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
---	----------	----------

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:
 Applicant provides charts with performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures. Applicant does not clearly provide the rationale for selecting each applicant-proposed measure or how it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress. Some of the performance measures are not clearly ambitious; for example over the course of the four-year grant, the percent of highly effective teachers will increase from 54.0 percent in 2011-12 to 55.5 percent at the end of 2016-17 school year (and from 59.0 percent in 2011-2012 to 62.0 percent for highly effective principals. Similarly the percent of students with an effective teacher will actually increase (not decrease, due to increases in number of highly qualified teachers) from 43.0 percent to 44.0 percent from 2011-12 to 2016-17. The charts for effective teachers and principals often show steep declines in most subgroups for principals over 2011-12 and 2016-17 but the overall principal group shows only minor declines from 40.5 percent to 38.0 percent, making it unclear if there are errors in the charts. One applicant-selected performance measure is the percent of students who are prepared to enter Kindergarten, but it is not clear why this measure was chosen when the grant funds are not being spent on increasing the preparedness of pre-school-aged kids. It is also not clear why, under many of the performance measures, including the applicant selected one for reading proficiency improvement, required immunizations, and improving parent engagement, the annual targets were chosen to move up lock-step by a specific percent every year, including for every subgroup. A score in the middle of the point range is awarded for this element.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 Although the applicant has detailed continuous improvement procedures, the applicant provides a very vague description of how that process will be applied to create a dynamic and ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness of the grant. Instead, the applicant appends a detailed overview of its existing continuous improvement procedures, but without making linkages to how they will be applied or adapted in service of evaluation efforts. Several evaluation questions are posed in the narrative, but they do not specifically touch on professional development and activities that employ technology. The elements of a "high quality" plan, as defined in the notice, are not fully included. A score in the middle of the point range is awarded.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:
 Applicant provides a well-developed, high-quality budget, including narrative and tables, that identifies funds supporting the project, and is reasonable and sufficient to support the proposal. Applicant could more clearly identify one-time investments versus ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grant period, although that is usually discernible by looking at the budget line in context of its purpose.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	3
---	-----------	----------

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a brief narrative about the sustainability of the project goal but does not provide a high-quality plan, as defined by the notice. As a result, the applicant's plan is not developed with enough specificity to determine whether the projects goals can be confidently sustained after the term of the grant.

Federal funds and state support are identified, and additional support comes from business, community, and postsecondary institutions. Applicant expects that, over the life of the RTTD grant, the district will build capacity within each school and some of the positions may be absorbed into other district positions, but a plan for building such capacity is not provided.

A score in the lower end of the middle point range is awarded.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provides a detailed description of a coherent and sustainable partnership that it has formed with public and private organizations in order to expand services to homeless students and unaccompanied teens through the expenses of the McKinney-Vinto health services for the homeless and through a unique Youth Count! Host Home program for unaccompanied teens. Population-level desired results are identified, and annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures are provided. The program is provides a much-needed set of services to a vulnerable student population group that is likely to achieve greater performance gains as a result of these services. Most of the sub-elements (3), (4), and (5) are not addressed in the general narrative or this priority. Due to this criterion's narrative being incomplete, a score in the middle of the point range is awarded for this element.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

This application coherently and comprehensively addresses how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to promote personalized learning environments. The proposal seeks to create an effective research-based personalized learning initiative that makes use of hand-held technology devices to enhance the classroom experience, as well as project-based learning. A single Instructional Improvement System (IIS) will be developed to facilitate seamless access and integration of all data through a single login portal in an open source data format available to students, teachers, parents, and administrators. The application proposes to develop a rubric for validating and calibrating the existing teacher and principal evaluation and link evaluations to student achievement via the IIS. The district will also implement a multi-tiered, intervention treatment for lowest-achieving schools in the district that will include new Career Academies, extended day activities, and parent engagement activities. In combination, these activities will help accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning, increase the effectiveness of teachers, and aid the district in narrowing achievement gaps between subgroups as well as increasing graduation rates.

Total	210	134
--------------	------------	------------

Race to the Top - District Technical Review Form



Application #0033FL-2 for Santa Rosa County School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA sets forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision, proposing to move the county "from good to great" (G2). They note challenges posed by geographical distance, socioeconomic gaps, and other aspects of diversity that frame their work to serve learners (e.g. schools serving populations of military families, agricultural communities, etc.).

- Regarding the core educational assurance areas,
 - because of the state funding in RTTT-S (2), the LEA has begun to implement standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy, around eight key areas. They have many structures in place for parent engagement, faculty development, and resources to support educators and families in understanding college and career ready standards, especially around math and science.
 - the proposal aims to build on these strengths to create an interoperable instructional improvement system to further support these efforts, thus enhancing data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction. They currently use Discovery Education Assessment (DEA) and plan its use three times per year to guide teachers on the success of educators' efforts to create personalized learning environments. They plan for alternative and supplemental assessments to use for groups needing intervention. Moreover, structures are already in place to allow all stakeholders access to Annual Measureable Objectives. Other measures designed to assess readiness across the PK-12 spectrum (PERT, FLKRS, ACUSCREEN) are described. These are currently integrated into SMART (Student Management and Reporting Tool), but the proposal is to integrate SMART with an intervention tool oriented around the creation of Personalized Learning Plans. Multiple and specific features of this alignment are provided.
 - To recruit, develop, reward, and retain effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most, the LEA recognizing existing strengths ("some of the best and bridgetest teachers and principals in the state") and plans for mentoring, specifically around facilitated Lesson Study and PLCs for new and struggling teachers. The LEA proposes continued work toward a performance pay system, with attention to validation and calibration of assessment accuracy. Educator evaluation processes will be aligned to the proposed IIS (Instructional Improvement System).
 - To turn around the LEA's lowest-achieving schools, the LEA describes that the highest-need schools are located near each other, and share common characteristics of demography and socioeconomic status. To transform this area, the LEA proposes development of several targeted initiatives, including G2 Career Academies, extended day with tutoring, and parent engagement. At the middle school level, highest-need settings will be served through G2 Academies of Engineering and Robotics, backwards-mapping from an existing high school with this focus. They propose an agri-technology academy to engage high school learners, based on a similar successful program elsewhere in the county with a marine science focus. Both academies will offer a project-based learning approach.
- Regarding their approach to accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning and increasing equity in learner-centered ways, the LEA proposes hand-held device access for each student in the county, accompanied by resources to help them access learning from home via portal. This is linked to a county "Parents Plugged In!" initiative to engage families. They concretely differentiate the various needs of schools across the county, noting that some sites need greater engagement, while others need enrichment for high performing students. Proposed efforts to transform teaching and learning focus on knowledge transfer among students as well as from teacher to students.
- Regarding the proposed classroom experience for students and teachers, the LEA sets forth a very clear and descriptive vision of how students might engage in studio work on project-based learning initiatives. For example, the qualitative descriptions of the engagement happening at the Navarre Beach Marine Science Station serves as

an effective prototype for the new academies envisioned in the proposal. The LEA provides other equally descriptive cases of what various level students might experience in the proposed G2 initiative.

The LEA has set forth a highly descriptive, detailed, and clear approach to building on existing strengths to address each of the areas listed in this criterion. As such, it merits a high score.

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

10

10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA has set forth a clear and reasoned approach to implementing reform, and concretely specify how the major foci of the grant unfold over time.

- They have described the process used to select schools to participate. They propose some grant goals that will reach all students in the LEA (personalized learning environments) with additional resources planned for the G2 academy schools (teacher training, student training, parent outreach, hand-held technology). The LEA as a whole and the selected high need schools meet the competition's eligibility requirements, with variable poverty levels across the county. Some schools have poverty rates as low as 10.14%, while others are at 100%.
- They have provided a list of all the schools that will participate in the grant activities.
- They have shared the total number of participating students, and noted which of those are identified as low-income and high need, as well as participating educators in each school.

The description and rationale are very well aligned with the proposed grant activities, and so this criterion merits a high score.

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

10

10

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Because of the LEA's participation in state-wide Race to the Top, they state that after initial resistance, the key stakeholders have embraced an orientation toward continuous improvement, reform and change.

- The logic model highlights foci on wellness and achievement;
- college and career readiness are addressed through project based learning academies;
- accountability and efficacy are emphasized;
- personalized learning for students, teachers and principals address skill and strategies for technology-supported learning.
- they evidence commitment to work at district-wide scale, having planned to involve all 26074 students in the district's 35 schools.

The high quality plan is described as an "Implementation Work Plan", and specifies timelines, parties responsible, and deliverables. It is framed around the goals listed above. All elements are appropriate to the proposed interventions, including their plan to ensure that practices are taken up by the district as a whole. As such, this merits a high score.

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

10

8

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Appropriate instruments and conditions are set forth to allow the LEA to assess whether or not its proposed activities result in improved learning, performance, and equity. They have set achievable goals to improve student learning and move all students toward proficiency, but the ambitiousness of those goals is questionable.

- Multiple measures of summative student performance will be gathered (FCAT, DEA, AMOs, as well as End-of-Course assessments.
- In table A4, all student groups are forecast for improvement of 2-3% per year, however this yields performance data that will reveal gaps between groups at the end of the grant. In table A4b, achievement gaps between the highest performing group (Asian students) and other groups are aimed to help all groups meet proficiency, so the data are presented as "on target" or a percentage below. Though they orient toward improvement for all, this does not sufficiently address the closing of achievement gaps, if the highest performing group maintains the same assessment gap from other groups.
- Regarding graduation rates, the LEA sets forth ambitious gains for all student populations, with 14% gains anticipated across all student groups and as measured by the SMART instrument.

- Regarding college enrollment, the LEA proposes gains of 2% per year, but does not explain the dip between their SY 11-12 data and SY 12-13 data as baselines.
- Regarding post-secondary degree attainment, the LEA proposes to build on the RTTT-S work to increase college completion from 25.6% to 37.6% over the grant period.

These goals as set forth seem warranted by the data and are accompanied by effective rationales. They are ambitious and achievable. Because the achievement gap data are not adequately addressed, this criterion merits a score on the low end of the high range.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	8
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Building off of a strong track record after Race to the Top-State funding, the LEA establishes a consistent track record of success, outpacing state averages in student performance scores. They have interrogated the data to identify points in need of greatest change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They have 92 National Board certified teachers, though they do not specify whether those teachers are serving in the highest-need school settings. • They do not provide prior years' data for graduation rates or college enrollment. • They provide limited data regarding district-wide gains or gains regarding subgroups. • Performance gains have been recorded over SY 2007-2011, with the majority of the lowest-performing students recording significant gains. • The LEA proposes sustaining heterogeneous cooperative grouping strategies, as supported by relevant research. • Lowest-achieving schools have dropped in SY 12-13 after additional evaluative criteria were added, but this does not significantly affect the overall picture of reform effectiveness. Math data vary more year-to-year than do the Reading data, which show slow but steady gains across all student groups, including the lowest quartile. • While the current data warehouse is available to teachers, parents and students, the proposed G2 grant will develop and provide a single-log-in portal to share multiple data sources with key constituencies. <p>The LEA has set forth some evidence of their record of success, they have omitted a few sources of relevant data over multiple prior years (high school graduation and college enrollment) or presented partial as opposed to district-wide views of gains. As a result, it merits a score in the low end of the middle range.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The LEA has made budgetary information accessible to the public since 1997. The school financial reports are publicized on the district's website, and compares school-level data to the district and the state.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel salaries, including broken out by instructional staff only, teachers only, and non personnel expenditures are identified. • A high degree of transparency is evident in these documents (including food service, plan maintenance, textbooks, computer costs, etc.). • the district makes its data available at the state level as well. <p>A high level of transparency is represented in the narrative and the artifacts, and so this criterion merits the highest score.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The LEA cites state policy, which provides for a high degree of autonomy and local control, "decentralizing authority."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each LEA has autonomy to implement personalized learning environments, while requiring seat time for "in school learning." 		

- The various elements of the State Race to the Top proposal have been translated to participating LEAs.
- The goal in this proposal around the development of an Instructional Improvement System is one supported by the state. There is 100% overlap between the goals and purposes of the state around systems for instructional improvement and the one proposed in this grant, which is a strength.

Because of the high degree of autonomy enacted in state educational policy, this applicant has demonstrated successful conditions for implementing the vision set forth in the proposal, and merits a high score.

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

15

15

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA included copious materials as evidence of how they engaged stakeholders in the development, revision, and refinement of the grant proposal. These included surveys of students, parents, teachers, administrators, focus groups with community agency stakeholders (such as programs for homeless teens, pre-K headstart, and business leaders). Many elements evident in the letters of support were reviewed and included as project areas in the proposal.

- Teachers' and administrators' feedback was gathered using survey and focus group procedures. The local collective bargaining representative has provided a letter of support for the proposal.
- Key stakeholders were contacted for letters of support and pledges of financial support. They received 185 letters of support bac, and gathered \$1.5 million in financial and in-kind support. Questions in surveys were well-crafted, and a diversity of responses have been integrated into the proposal (e.g. access to tablets, priority of hands-on activities). The responses were proportional to overall populations (teachers/ administrators) and equitable across schools.
- Consensus emerged around extended-day offerings, access to hand held devices, and innovative practices around robotics and engineering. These elements are incorporated into the proposal.
- The letters of support represent a diverse array of community stakeholders, from small non-profits to Head Start agencies, to financial agencies providing scholarship funds for students, paid internship opportunities, in-kind partnerships related to the agri-technology proposals (e.g. assistance in advising and instruction on topics related to the nursery industry), higher education partnerships, local health care agencies, behavioral support through sports opportunities and JROTC groups.
- Letters of support were also gathered from current and former school district students, which emphasize their interest in access to technology and the extent to which student councils and governance groups were engaged.

The LEA has provided copious evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement for each criterion listed, and disposition to continue engagement throughout the proposed project, and thus merits a high score.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA has set forth a strong 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. These offerings are provided in "traditional" school settings as well as via Virtual School, or a combination thereof.

Regarding their proposed approach to learning that engages and empowers all learners, in particular high-need students, to fully engage in learner-centered and goal-oriented experiences in schools:

- The emphasis on project-based learning and a "learn, do, teach" model has a track record of success in the district and is oriented around cultivation of student expertise; accompanying these efforts are development strategies to help teachers effect required differentiation.
- The grant engages students in math and reading individualized programs while charging the teacher with small-group instruction, consistent with RTI frameworks.
- Planned G2 Career Academies and related Project-based Learning implementation will engage learners in

classroom-based and field-based teaching and learning experiences, and are accompanied by professional development opportunities for educators to strengthen their ability to teach through PBL.

Regarding their proposed approach to granting access to learners:

- Individual work in reading and math via hand-held devices will be personalized to learners, though how interest-driven those offerings are is unspecified.
- 53 Career Academies will orient students to the world of college and professional work through hands-on learning and learn-do-teach modeling, as evidenced by the Navarre Beach model.
- The LEA has envisioned access "anytime, anywhere" to age-appropriate career exploration taught by peers. How the effectiveness of this teaching by students is to be measured is unspecified.
- Regular summative assessments (FCAT, DEA, EOC) will be provided as metrics of student progress.
- The faculty and leadership of the Career Academies represent a variety of disciplines and professional contexts.
- Alternate assessments are planned to capture and assess growth in students with diagnosed disabilities.
- Several considerations are integrated throughout to ensure all learners' engagement in high quality school experiences.

This section of the application does not mention mechanisms to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning.

While this is a generally strong component with a good level of detail and clarity in many components, the lack of addressing how students and families are to learn how to use these tools and resources to track and manage their learning is a weakness. As a result, this merits a score in the high end of the middle range.

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

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA has effectively addressed the required elements of a high-quality plan, under the acronym EQuIPS (Expectations, Quality, Integrity, Performance, Standards). To help educators improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements for all learners, particularly those with high needs, they propose to:

Support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments by:

- developing educators' understanding of effective project-based learning approaches, as well as training on software, hardware, and the use of the new IIS, and differentiated instruction, grouping, and integration of personalized learning plans.
- engaging educators through professional learning communities and lesson study approaches, with model lessons provided via video for math, science, and reading integration. Teachers will be engaged in developing their own model lessons; how the balance is to be struck between individual teacher autonomy and fidelity to pacing guides is unspecified.
- building support structures for middle and high school parents that will focus on "Bridges out of Poverty."
- visiting the Navarre Beach Marine Science Station to learn from effective practices at this promising site, and connect their observations to the new career academies in agri-technology and engineering/ robotics.
- engaging Engineering/ Robotics Career Academy practitioners in professional development through the National Robotics Engineering Center, and online coursework certified by Carnegie Mellon University.

- participating in the Certificate and Diploma levels of the AICE Cambridge International Certificate programs; it is not specified which teachers would be encouraged to participate in this program.

Adapt content and instruction, providing opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches by:

- supporting faculty in using the Instructional Improvement System and learning portal, so that teachers, students, and parents can match individual assessment outcomes with an individualized learning plan for each student.
- connecting this individualized view of student performance with resources for teachers' use in developing student's growth areas.

Measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards, or college- and career-ready graduation requirements, and use data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators by:

- Developing an IIS to gather data regarding content outcomes (e.g. DEA, FCAT) and career interests and college readiness, so that teachers can create Personalized Learning Plans.
- Formative assessment data can be added to the IIS via an Instant Response Unit (IRU), allowing teachers to gauge in-the-moment class understanding and regroup students as needed.
- Targeted inservice supports for developing teachers' use of the IRU are addressed.

Improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback provided by the LEA's teacher and principal evaluation systems, including frequent feedback on individual and collective effectiveness, as well as by providing recommendations, supports, and interventions as needed for improvement, by:

- a Performance Growth System (PGS), developed for Race to the Top- State.
- planned expansion of initial efforts toward performance appraisal incorporating student growth.
- acting on professional needs of practitioners through performance coaching.

The LEA plans to grant support key constituencies in learning how to use tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements, by:

- training all educators in each tool proposed (e.g. IIS, school-based studio practices).
- school based "Subject Matter Experts" will receive additional training, though it is unspecified how this would link to proposed grant activities.
- the proposal states that "teachers will hold each other accountable" toward these goals though means to do so are unstated.
- it is unclear how these processes will help educators identify optimal learning approaches, or act on feedback to improve their practices.
- the IIS portal will include access to learning objects and training resources for educators' use.

No response was provided for C(2)(c) or C(2)(d).

While the response for C(2)(a) was strong and clear, C(2)(b) only addressed key elements at the most general level, and the two other elements were unaddressed. As a result, this merits a score in the low end of the middle range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	12
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The LEA sets forth a high quality plan that supports project implementation through policies, infrastructure, and support and resources for educators and students. Many elements of this plan are strong,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Advisory Council structures include parents, teachers, principal, business, and community service representatives. This engagement was supported in the multiple letters of support received from these constituencies. • Instructional design directors support educators by grade level, student services, exceptional education, federal programs, and professional development. Reciprocal support structures are evident throughout the district and supported by the artifacts. • School leadership teams have had site-based autonomy for 30 years, though this balance has shifted somewhat in recent years, in part because of RTTT-S. Innovative programs are highlighted and replicated. A high degree of coherence is expected among schools, so it is difficult to determine how extensive the autonomy is over schedules, calendars, personnel/ staffing issues, roles/responsibilities. • Various models of student progress are provided though competency-based learning are currently at odds with State Standards and not allowed in traditional school settings, though they are permitted in Florida Virtual School models. • The G2 model proposes blended online/ face-to-face learning experiences across all grade levels. • Proposed IRUs will enable teachers to gain multiple opportunities to achieve content outcomes, should they not be successful in one way. This will be supported by video and distance learning modules, some created by other district students in the G2 academy studios. • The district has a framework to ensure access to learning for students with special needs and those who are learning English as an additional language. Planned technology supports aim to mitigate language and ability barriers. Specific ways in which these accommodations would be supported via technology devices is unspecified. <p>A few of these criteria are not elaborated as extensively as others, though in sum the plan to support implementation through infrastructure is strong. As such, it qualifies for a score at the low end of the high range.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	5
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The LEA has set forth a high quality plan to support personalized learning by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensuring that all school centers have access to the internet, with LANs to support classroom computers and labs. All but two schools currently have wireless internet connectivity; the proposal includes extending this access to the remaining two. • ensuring that the district Professional Development Center offers several means for accessing distance learning via instructional television, and also provides geographically dispersed (north/ south county) offerings for professional development. • proposing to utilize the PDC in teacher training, and student/ parents training on use of required tools and technologies. This training will be required as part of the check-out process for hand-held devices. • offering parent and student trainings through the school sites, as well as offering families the option of "BYODevice", though these participants will still receive trainings in order to access the single-login portal. • supporting these initiatives through the district technology plan. • extending internet access to families who may not have it through partnership with internet providers. • overall, their plan anticipates how to grant full and unfettered access to content, tools and other resources for all participants. <p>The LEA will provide technical support for planned initiatives via:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • trained subject matter experts receiving additional training. • parent and student training events held at school sites and bi-monthly via Parents Plugged In! • the IIS portal will also offer resources and supports. <p>For criteria (c) and (d), they provide a vision for all the features that might be included in the IIS, but do not give specifics about how these are to be created, interacted with by users, or exported for use in other systems. Nor do they make evident how the system would include human resources data.</p>		

Because the LEA responded effectively to two criteria but only partially and peripherally for two others, they score in the middle range.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA builds off of a position of strength from RTTT-S activities, and so is already practicing some of the key elements highlighted in this criterion.

- The existing evaluation system incorporates professional development, performance based evaluation for teachers and administrators, and digital access to student data.
- The G2 plan proposes to calibrate and validate of measures for teachers and administrator evaluations, an interoperable data system and an external evaluation to contrast and compare internal evaluation.
- The proposal incorporates coaching strategies to support principals in effectively and fairly assess a teacher's performance from a variety of input methods and to further assist with professional development plans to ensure each teacher and principal is highly effective.
- The LEA proposes to implement an interoperable Instructional Improvement System and single log-in learning portal to coordinate and validate internal and external review of the plan in cooperation with USDOE and a national evaluator.
- Although a graphic is provided showing the interplay of evaluation components (communicate outcomes, assess plan, define plan for internal and external stakeholders, implement plan, evaluate plan), the elements of a high-quality plan are largely not set forth.
- They did not describe how the various questions to monitor and measure the quality of their investments would result in specific changes to the grant activities, partly due to the wording of the questions. Most of them are phrased as "to what extent..." without a description of acceptable thresholds for progress or lack thereof. As such, it is difficult to know how this set of questions would fully enable stakeholders to know when they would need to take corrective action throughout the grant period.
- It was unclear how evaluation activities would provide rigorous, timely, and regular feedback on the proposed grant activities.
- Selected elements of the implementation plan address criterion E, but these do not sufficiently specify deliverables, parties responsible, goals, and timelines for the cycle mentioned above.

Although the context from RTTT-S is strong, the lack of specifics about the plan to evaluate and continuously improve the grant over its duration is a weakness. As a result, this criterion merits a score at the high end of the low range.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
---	----------	----------

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA plans to engage key internal and external stakeholders regularly over the course of the proposed grant.

- They plan to use an external evaluator in concert with internal evaluation team efforts to triangulate evaluation activities and inform continuous improvement; these evaluators will be charged with assessing implementation, impact; and efficacy of grant activities, and will communicate their findings to various internal and external stakeholder groups on a quarterly basis.
- Regarding engagement of internal stakeholders, deliverables, benchmarks, key activities, stated measures, and parties responsible are set forth in their plan, though these are not aligned concretely with a timeline.
- Regarding engagement of external stakeholders, the proposal includes quarterly meetings with post-secondary education stakeholders and business stakeholders on a quarterly basis to review implementation, receive feedback and adjust the plan.
- Together, these efforts will yield a "report card" for G₂ stakeholders and a "State of G₂" brief which will be published bi-annually. A model of the report card and brief were not provided, but overall the plan seems clear, appropriate, and well-articulated.

The LEA has effectively demonstrated readiness for most of these measures, though they omit a timeline. Therefore, they merit a high score.

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

5

5

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA has identified and articulated ambitious and achievable performance measures to evaluate grant effectiveness.

- Performance measures are consistent with those proposed elsewhere in the application, incorporating the FCAT, PERT, and the VPK, as well as records of absenteeism.
- The proposed IIS will make these data available for educator, student, and parent use.
- The increases in access to highly effective teachers/ principals LEA-wide are less ambitious, anticipating only 2-4% increases over the grant period. In the focus schools, however, these increases are more aggressive, with 20% gains anticipated.
- Performance measure improvements as listed (e.g. FCAT, PERT, VPK) cover academic as well as readiness assessment, and are ambitious and achievable, ranging from 2%-14% gains over the grant period. These are appropriately aligned with foci on serving students in the highest-need schools.
- Social emotional learning gains are ambitious and achievable, focusing on reductions in office referrals and absenteeism, as well as increased measures in the PERT.
- The evaluation and review measures listed in E1 will assess and pivot as necessary regarding data generated by these measures over time, and they have provided sample questions to guide this review.

In sum, the gains set forth are consistent, significant, and aligned with the proposal as a whole, meriting a high score.

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

5

2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA has set forth some questions to evaluate effectiveness of proposed initiatives, and described a cyclical approach to learn from the questions.

- The cycle of evaluation incorporates the following elements: Assess-Define-Implement-Evaluate-Communicate-Reassess.
- Evaluation questions focused on project based learning are complex and will generate substantive data.
- The identified questions do not address larger initiatives of the grant, such as the effectiveness of professional development, training of students/parents/teachers to use appropriate tools to personalize learning, or the success of the proposed Career Academies.

The response to this element is only partial, and so it merits a low score.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA has set forth a budget for the proposal that identifies all funds to support the project, including in-kind donations. These are supported by the letters from community.

- The budget as identified is reasonable and sufficient to support proposed activities.
- It is themed around the first key activities of the grant.
- They address other sources of funding, such as the State Workforce Investment Act funds.
- One time costs (such as equipment) are differentiated from training and salary costs.
- They have identified \$1.16M of in-kind donations of time and resources through volunteering; a volunteer coordinator position is planned to manage these donations of time and talent.
- Appropriate rationales are given for various components of the budget, and the components sufficiently align with costs of personnel, assessment activities, and startup costs for new initiatives/ programs.

The budget effectively addresses required elements in this criterion, and thus merits a high score.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	4
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The LEA has identified grant initiatives that will require support after the period of the grant ends, and plan for district supports to sustain efforts begun during the grant. These plans include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Federal funds (Title 1, Title 2, Title X and McKinney Vento) • State funds (Workforce Investment Act) • Business and community support (support services, volunteer programs, donations of resources and teacher rewards) • Postsecondary support (alignment with training opportunities for educators, mentoring, expertise, and land for field research). • Increased school capacity over the period of the grant may also lead to efficiencies and eventual reductions in positions after the grant period. <p>While the proposal mentions the above initiatives, it does not set forth a high quality plan for the three years following the proposed grant period. Nor does it describe how evaluation of investment effectiveness will inform post-grant decision-making. As such, it merits a score in the high end of the low range.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	10
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The LEA proposes several initiatives to integrate public and private resources in a partnership 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. Most of these partnerships directly target students in need of the greatest supports.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several strong partnerships already exist (Mentor Santa Rosa, Military Education Liaison, Backpacks 4 Teens). • The grant proposes to expand McKinney-Vento health services for homeless • Youth Count! Host Home and Backpacks 4 Teens provide housing support and nutrition for housing-unstable or homeless teen students, to support them in having the same opportunities to become college- and career-ready as their peers. • Aligned with these efforts, a recent implementation of a College Day program enables homeless youth to anticipate and plan for college and its related transitions. The grant proposes to extend this program and add wrap-around medical services. • These efforts will be aligned with guidance counselors, interventionists and school nurses to identify and refer students for supports. • Specific performance outcomes and behavioral outcomes are aligned with these proposals and targeted at the highest-need students. <p>The LEA has effectively proposed a focused set of initiatives to meet a specific and high-need student subgroups. Their proposed efforts are supported by the letters from community partners. As such, they merit a high score.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The LEA has set forth a focused, comprehensive, ambitious, and achievable plan to improve learning district-wide as well as targeted more significant improvements for the highest-need schools. They propose innovations that are situated in the professional and entrepreneurial contexts of the region (e.g. Marine Science, Agri-Tech) and have a high degree of coherence between educator development, student learning outcomes, and parent and student engagement. These proposals are uniformly oriented toward college- and career- readiness for district learners, and build off of existing</p>		

strengths stemming from RTTT-S. They have met absolute priority 1 for this grant proposal.

Total	210	156
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0033FL-3 for Santa Rosa County School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant offers strong evidence of a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that (a) Builds on its work in four core educational assurance areas; (b) articulates a clear and credible approach to accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support; and (c) describes what the personalized learning environment classroom experience will be like for students and teachers.

It's clear that the applicant has embraced a rigorous set of curriculum standards and assessment tools. The applicant district began implementing Common Core Standards in 2011, and teachers are supported in their efforts by professional development training, reading specialists, and other resources. Additionally, the applicant utilizes a wide range of student assessment tools, including specialized assessment tools for Pre-K and post-secondary students, as well as children with disabilities and those not meeting proficiency levels.

The applicant has a strong foundation on which to build its proposed programs; the applicant has built a SMART database that incorporates a plethora of student data to provide a holistic view of student achievement; the applicant plans to build on this database and has developed a strategy to attract and retain effective teachers through an expansion of the existing mentor program and will add mentor facilitated Lesson Study and new Professional Learning Communities for new and struggling teachers.

The applicant's proposed vision for turning around lowest-achieving schools shows a recognition of the importance of personalized, relevant, interactive learning opportunities through offerings such as hand-held devices to utilize personalized learning programs, intensive parent engagement programs, and special academies. Student and teacher life within the academies appears to offer many keys to successful college-and career-ready preparation.

The variety of learning approaches offered by the applicant can be tailored to individual needs. The applicant provides a good sense of the rich offerings and emphasis on academics and 21st century collaborative skills to be offered within the proposed special academies, including the interactive coursework within the G2 Agri-Technology Academy and the project-based learning models of the Navarre Beach Marine Science Station.

The applicant's vision of developing personalized learning environments in which students share knowledge among their peers offers an excellent approach to reinforcing student learning and knowledge. The applicant envisions 53 career academies, each with a focus on student teaching and outreach, field trips, and other transfers of knowledge.

The proposed classroom experience, beginning from Early Start/Pre-K, is a rich, comprehensive approach that immerses students in age-appropriate problem-solving and personalized learning experiences tailored to their interests and needs. Utilization of hand-held devices to access personalized learning promotes equity among all students regardless of their access to technology at home; in fact, the district will subsidize the cost of internet services for low income families.

Therefore, the applicant scored in the high range.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant offers strong evidence of an implementation approach incorporating schools, grade bands, or subject areas that will support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation. While services will be available to all district students, the initial implementation will focus on the 17 lowest-performing/highest poverty schools, as shown in part in the Chart on page 22.</p> <p>Additionally, emphasis will be placed on the 53 Career Academies and the proposed Agri-Technology Academy and the Academy of Engineering and Robotics, which will build on existing, successful concepts to meet the needs of a wide variety of students. Such a strategy also builds on students' expressed interest in interactive, "themed" schools, ensuring more student buy-in and engaging students in college- and career-ready instruction that is relevant and interesting to them. Existing programs will be enhanced for students with disabilities and English Language Learners.</p> <p>Nearly 42% of 26,074 students are low-income students and 14,620 are high-needs students. The rates of low-income families at the target schools ranges from 17.85% to 99.48%.</p> <p>Therefore, the applicant scored in the high range.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides strong evidence of a high-quality plan describing how the reform proposal will: (a) be scaled up to support district-wide change; (b) will help the applicant reach its outcome goals; and (c) will improve student learning outcomes for all students served.</p> <p>The high-quality plan outlined in the response to (A)(2)(a) offers evidence that the project will be scaled-up to support students in all of the district's schools, through annual rollouts that increase the number of schools served. The scale-up will build on what works: as the project is progressively rolled-out, each year's evaluation data, learnings, and best practices will be reviewed and incorporated into the subsequent year's implementation plan, and all stakeholders will receive quarterly progress updates.</p> <p>Attachment 5 offers an impressively detailed summary of the activities tied to the individual goals of the plan, including timelines, deliverables, responsible parties, associated criterion, and the location of that activity within the overall narrative. Its inclusion helps underscore the depth of thought that has gone into this proposal. The ties to individual criteria and goals are meaningful and support the project's ability to scale-up throughout the district.</p> <p>The high-quality plan ensures equity of opportunity for all students, including those with disabilities, English Language Learners, medical needs, and unaccompanied youth, including the development of college visits for unaccompanied youth and summer camps for homeless students.</p> <p>Therefore the applicant scored in the high range.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides strong evidence of the likelihood that the proposed project will 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 LEA in the areas of (a) Performance on summative assessments ; (b) Decreasing achievement gaps; (c) Graduation rates; and (d) College enrollment .</p> <p>Students in the applicant's district are generally well-performing, while there are areas of opportunity to increase reading and math performance among Asian, Black Non-Hispanic, English Language Learners, and Students with Disabilities in low-performing PreK-3 schools.</p> <p>In grades 04-08, Black Non-Hispanic, American Indian, English Language Learners, and Students with Disabilities in low-performing schools have significant gaps with other students in English and Math. In high school there are several subgroups with opportunities to increase scores within English and Math, including Black Non-Hispanic, American Indian, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities in low-performing schools.</p> <p>The proposed increases in overall scores by subgroup, at 10% per group over the five year period, are ambitious yet achievable for most groups, although more significant gains for English Language Learners PK03 reading (20%) and math</p>		

(40%), as well as English Language Learners 04-08 in reading (36%) or for Students with Disabilities in math (31%) do not seem ambitious enough.

The goal of decreasing gaps within subgroups shows emphasis on Black Non-Hispanic, English Language Learners, and Students with Disabilities; as stated previously, the proposed gains for some subgroups, e.g., English Language Learners PD-03 in Reading, still leave significant gaps. Graduation rate goals seem ambitious yet achievable, as are college enrollment rates and the (optional) proposal regarding postsecondary degree attainment.

Similarly, the 2% projected annual increase in high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates seems ambitious yet achievable. College enrollment rates for American Indian or Alaskan Native students, at 50% in the post grant year, seem somewhat low, but are reasonable given the 40% baseline rate.

The applicant envisions achieving these goals through its Cooperative Learning and Project-Based Learning models, and the organization of students into groups of heterogeneous abilities, a research-based approach.

Therefore the applicant scored in the high range.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	8

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides moderate evidence of a clear record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity. The applicant provides several highlights of success at various schools throughout the district, but information on the district's performance overall is less clear.

As an example of the district's successes, since implementing a Multi-Tiered System of Supports within the District to help students needing extra support, the applicant has seen a 47% drop in special education referrals, and an increase in reading and math scores.

In 2012, changes to assessment tests resulted in significant performance declines for the lowest-performing schools' students. In the previous four years, however, reading and math gains on state assessment tests among the 25% of lowest-performing students (from 55%-64% in reading and 64%-68% in math) show significant progress made by the district. It's unclear, however, how well these gains were tied to significant and ambitious reforms within the district's lowest-achieving schools.

Further, students who have enrolled in the model Navarre Beach marine Science Station, the program on which much of the new initiative will be based, have a 100% passing rate on assessment tests and a 100% graduation rate; 90% receive college scholarships. Equally encouraging, the first cohort of students are still enrolled in or have graduated college, and 70% have elected STEM majors .

Among its achievements, the applicant notes the strong community involvement, through dedicated, recognized teachers and administrators; volunteers; and parent and business partners, which underscores the strength and likelihood of success of a proposal with wide community support.

The applicant will build on its existing data warehouse to provide an integrated, interoperable system of student data available to teachers, students, and parents. However, it is not clear how successful the district has been thus far in providing data to students, parents, and teachers.

The applicant notes some highlights of achievement throughout its system, but the application lacks significant detail to give a clear sense of the achievements of the district. For example, the applicant cites the number of board-certified teachers, but does not indicate whether they are in high-needs schools. Further, previous data regarding previous years' graduation and high-school enrollment rates would benefit the application, in terms of showing what gains have been made by the district.

Therefore the applicant scored in the middle range.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides strong evidence of the 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. The applicant provides all of the data that this requirements seeks.

The Florida Department of Education requires and makes available to the public a school financial report that includes (a) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional staff, (b) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only; (c) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only; and (d) Actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level . The report also includes parent evaluation surveys and school performance data.

Therefore the applicant scored in the high range.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides moderate 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.

The state of Florida authorizes LEAs with the autonomy to implement personalized learning environments and offers flexibility regarding seat time through the Florida Virtual School . The state also has goals regarding developing and implementing a local Instructional Improvement System that bases continuous academic improvement on providing parents, teachers, and students with electronic and digital tools to monitor performance.

Because the proposed project entails non-traditional methods of measuring student mastery of subjects, more information regarding the state's flexibility regarding measuring student mastery would benefit the application.

Therefore the applicant scored in the high range.

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

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides strong evidence of meaningful stakeholder engagement throughout the development of the proposal and meaningful stakeholder support for the proposal. The high number of students and school personnel engaged, the multiple ways in which stakeholder support was engaged, and the numerous, thoughtful letters of support in the appendix show that the community has deeply considered the approach to this initiative. Especially enjoyable are the letters from students, who thoughtfully provide support for the new paradigm of learning as a way to challenge themselves to be their best.

The applicant evaluated surveys of 2,527 students and 706 school personnel and conducted focus groups of external stakeholders, as well as teachers and principals from low-performing schools, to develop and refine the proposal. The proposal was endorsed by the local teachers union, and the initiative has the support of 160 elected officials, parents, students and community members. Further 20 resource partners will offer in-kind support of over \$5 million, and 185 partners have offered letters of support. This is truly a community proposal.

Therefore the applicant scored in the high range.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides moderate evidence of a high-quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready, including an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students aligned to college- and career-ready standards and graduation requirements. The district has a strong plan to equip all students with the tools and training to succeed, but more detail regarding how its offerings reinforce college- and career-ready goals, and how a diversity of cultures and learning styles are reinforced for students, would be helpful.

The district has developed strategies for all students to have access to technology and to personalized learning, no matter what their socioeconomic or familial status. Grouping of students of different abilities, a mixture of classroom and online

instruction, project-based learning, and students teaching students offer a variety of approaches to gain, retain, and share knowledge.

The applicant provides moderate evidence of an approach that engages and empowers all learners to understand that what they are learning is key to their success. Students will participate in Career Academies at each middle school; it appears that the emphasis of these academies will be on developing interest in science, math, and technology, but it's unclear how students interested in the liberal arts will be engaged or how students will learn to formally tie their studies to their college and career goals. The application would benefit from more detail regarding how all students will engage in age-appropriate Career Exploration through interactive project learning and mentor relationships.

There's some evidence that students will learn more about diverse cultures and ways of thinking; for example, grouping students of differing abilities will provide students with wider perspectives on learning styles and ways to consider problem-solving. Additional detail, however, regarding how students will be exposed to diverse cultures would strengthen the application.

The applicant provides moderate evidence of student access to personalized instructional content that is college- or career-ready; a variety of instructional approaches; high quality content, including digital content; and ongoing and regular feedback; and accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-needs students. The applicant will supplement newly-purchased standards-based math and reading textbooks with technology content that offers differentiated learning opportunities, including utilizing studio space to record or watch videos and Skyping. The application would benefit from more detail regarding the potential sources of digital and other content.

The applicant provides strong evidence of mechanisms to provide training and support to students in utilizing tools and resources to track and manage their learning. It's particular strength is the variety of methods available and the option to learn in tandem with their parents. Students will have opportunities to take on-line, in-person, or parent and student training on utilizing handheld devices and the student portal. Further, ongoing support will be available for continued mastery of the various digital tools: Subject Matter Experts will be available at each school to help students and staff to utilize various technology platforms and other elements of the project.

Therefore, the applicant scored in the medium range.

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

20

8

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a moderate evidence of a high-quality plan to equip teachers with the knowledge and skills necessary to offer personalized learning plans to every student.

Teachers will clearly have a variety of professional development sources at their disposal. Teachers will have access to informal peer support and formal bi-monthly peer training from Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) in Technology, Project-Based Learning, Collective Grouping, Differentiated Instruction, and Integration of Personalized Learning Plans. Additionally, teachers will have access to Professional Learning Communities and Lesson Study, and principals and lead teachers will take Train the Trainer workshops to support mentors, students, and parents at their schools. Training in a special academy's area of focus will also be offered to teachers, including intensive workshops for Agri-Technology and Engineering and Robotics instructors .

However, it's not clear how the content of the professional development will support overall goals. The applicant provides moderate evidence that all participating school leaders and school leadership teams have training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure effective personalized learning environments, including Information, from such sources as the district's teacher evaluation system. The applicant discusses many elements of the teacher training and professional development plan, but does not include specific goals, milestones and timetables, and responsible parties to show the overarching goals, interdependencies of tasks, and principles guiding the plan.

While it's clear that teachers will have access to student performance data tied to that individual teacher, it's unclear how the teachers will utilize that data to adjust learning plans. Instant Response Units will assess student knowledge on various topics and allow teachers to adjust groupings and peer learning based on the student's proficiency, although it's unclear how this process will work.

The applicant offers a good plan for expanding the teacher's Performance Growth System to integrate student achievement scores, align teacher and principal evaluations to RtT requirements. Assessments will be calibrated and validated to ensure objectivity in assessments.

The applicant provides moderate evidence of a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals. For example, while the team will rely on teacher evaluation data, the application would benefit from more detail of the formal system by which evaluation results would be

utilized to create highly effective and effective teachers, such as through additional mentoring or coaching or training.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	10
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant shows moderate evidence of a high-quality plan that demonstrates that the applicant has practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning by flexibility and support from the LEA. Therefore, the applicant scored in the medium range.</p> <p>In the 1980s, the state of Florida mandated school-based decisionmaking, which is supported by the district, which is responsible for oversight and assistance. School Advisory Groups, consisting of parents, teachers, principals, and business and community partners, make decisions about all aspects of their schools. However, it is unclear whether the state has authorized the LEA and schools to implement key elements of this plan.</p> <p>Competency-based learning has not been completely integrated into the state's traditional schools; students are allowed to take virtual classes in lieu of traditional classes but it is unclear if the personalized learning environments will be as flexible as needed to effectuate change.</p> <p>Instruction will be provided through on-line and off-line classes, video and distance learning, and project-based learning so that students may receive instruction on a particular topic in the manner that best suits him or her. It's unclear if students can receive credit for demonstrating mastery through all of those different means.</p> <p>Technology will be adapted to support all learners, in keeping with the district's motto of "Equity in all we do" and project enhancements for students with significant socio-economic or health challenges .</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	10
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant shows strong evidence of a high-quality plan in which the LEA and school infrastructure supports personalized learning by ensuring that all participating students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources and technical support both in and out of school to support the implementation of the applicant's proposal.</p> <p>The plan's emphasis on equitable distribution of digital resources through a variety of channels to all students, regardless of income, suggests a good probability of success; meeting the equipment needs of all students necessitates considering those students' individual learning strategies. All schools are well-equipped to offer computer and internet access. Schools will offer Subject Matter Experts to help students, teachers, and families navigate various technology platforms. All students will have individual handheld devices, and the applicant offers flexibility to students, teachers, and families in accessing the student information portal.</p> <p>All families will be required to receive instruction in accessing the portal through in-person Parent-Student training events or digital training, and families without devices may check them out for use. The option for parents and students to learn together also reinforces buy-in and commitment to the process on the part of parents. Further, parent usage of student information portals helps to hold students accountable more frequently than parents reviewing end of term grades.</p> <p>Parents will have access to detailed student grade data. The district plans to build on its existing student data warehouse to develop interoperable data systems to allow data to be exported.</p> <p>Therefore, the applicant scored in the high range.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	7
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The applicant shows moderate evidence of a high-quality plan for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant.

The applicant's charts and narrative provides some information regarding the continuous improvement process -- oversight responsibility, other responsible parties, frequency of formative data review, authority for making changes based on formative data. It's especially welcome to see that so many stakeholders from the community will also engage in the evaluation process. However, it's unclear how they fit together in an overarching process of continuous improvement.

Based on the state's initial Race to the Top grant, the district has put together an evaluation plan utilizing formative and summative metrics for professional development, teacher and administrator performance, and student achievement; further, this data is housed in one system. The application would benefit from more detail regarding the various types of metrics to be assessed for educators -- for example, what will be measured, how will it be measured, to whom will it be reported. The applicant acknowledges that continued work is needed, in terms of validation, developing the interoperable data system, and utilizing external evaluators to assess the established evaluation protocols.

Further, it is unclear how the applicant will monitor, measure and publicly share information regarding the quality of its investments in order to ensure accountability and oversight. The applicant proposes some interesting questions for the effectiveness of the Project Based Learning, for example, but it is unclear what metrics would be used to measure the results of those questions.

Therefore, the applicant scored in the medium range.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
---	----------	----------

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides strong evidence of a high-quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. The extent of the communication plan ensures that accountability with a variety of stakeholders. In particular, actively seeking stakeholder feedback via various surveys and roundtables, while tracking student achievement measures against benchmarks, suggests that many sources of data will give the applicant team a fuller picture of the success of its initiative.

The applicant has planned quarterly meetings with post-secondary education stakeholders and business stakeholders to review implementation results and feedback and make necessary adjustments to the program. The evaluation team will also create a "Report Card" and "State of G2" brief to provide stakeholders with information on the project's successes and challenges.

While it's clear many stakeholders will receive information regarding the program's success, it's less clear how that communication will lead to adjustments or improvements throughout implementation.

Therefore, the applicant scored in the high range.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides strong evidence of ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures.

The applicant will use various state assessment tools, along with the Discovery Educational Assessment for measuring the effectiveness of Personalized Learning Environments. Additionally, high school seniors will be assessed for college- and career-readiness, and PreK children will be assessed as well.

The post-grant goals are ambitious yet achievable; while the proposed 46-48% of black participating high school students having highly effective principals or teachers seems low, it appears reasonable given the lower baselines for these schools. The higher percentages of effective teachers seems reasonable as well.

The additional measures around PreK-3, while not having baseline measures for some, appear to aim for reasonable goals, at baseline + 10% by the post-grant year. They also offer early indicators of how useful Personalized Learning Plans will be for the student's needs.

The 04-08 projections for the post-grant year, while quite small for black, economically-disadvantaged, English Language Learners, and SWD groups, seem reasonable given the low baselines. While the 09-12 performance measures do not

include baseline data, the proposed rate of percentage changes are appropriately conservative and yet ambitious and achievable. Of interest is the industry certifications metric -- a good indicator of student engagement and achievement in their field of interest. The largest proposed gains over the project period are related to college- and career-readiness, which is encouraging and appropriate.

The rationales for selecting the various measures -- mainly one of relying on proven statewide tools tied to particular grade levels, as well as the Discovery Education Assessment for personalized learning environments -- appears sound and provides a basis for comparison to other Florida students. Many of the most robust assessments will be annual assessments, which could be supplemented by more "interim" reporting in order to better gauge student progress. The applicant does not address how the measures might be revised if they prove less useful in determining implementation success.

Therefore, the applicant has scored in the high range.

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides strong evidence of a high-quality plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities, such as professional development and activities that employ technology.

As previously stated, the district has developed a high-quality plan to utilize formative and summative metrics for professional development, teacher and administrator performance, and student achievement, with the recognition that an outside evaluator needs to be engaged, and that an interoperable data system is key to the evaluation's success.

The applicant's chart and narrative give a sense of the various responsible parties and the interdependencies of the evaluation process. Accountability will be achieved through regular meetings with internal and external stakeholders and reports communicating results. Therefore, it is clear that the applicant has the various elements in place in order to revise the various activities of its project as needed.

Therefore, the applicant scored in the high range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides strong evidence of the applicant's budget, including the budget narrative and Tables, that (a) Identifies all funds that will support the project; (b) Is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal. More information regarding the applicant's rationale for investments and priorities would be helpful.

The applicant's budget proposes \$26.85 million over four years, or a per student cost of \$257.47 annually. Impressively, the applicant also expects \$5.4 million in in-kind support, another indicator of the strong community support for this initiative.

The five project level budgets are well-delineated and show how the various elements of the initiative will work together to provide a holistic set of services for students and families; more narrative regarding this approach would be helpful to the application. The emphasis on student health and wellness is a sound basis for helping students and families achieve, and, at the generally-accepted level of slightly less than 10% of the overall budget, the \$2.5 million budget for accountability and efficacy is appropriately sized.

The applicant meets (c)(i) and (c)(ii). Overall and project-level budgets show the \$5.4 million in other funding that will be used to support the project, which the narrative suggests will come from a variety of federal funds. Nearly half of the funds will support equipment purchases, with another third for contractual services, and about 75% will be utilized to develop Personalized Learning for students, with one-time expense totals of nearly \$9 million. These plans are in keeping with equipping students to succeed through a variety of wraparound supports and services.

Therefore, the applicant scored in the high range.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	4
---	-----------	----------

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides moderate evidence of a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. The applicant expects funding from Federal, district, Postsecondary, Business, and Community in-kind and cash investments, including state Workforce Investment funding and business and community mentoring and weekend nutrition programs, and college support with technical training and professional development for teachers. The applicant will build on its evaluation data to fine-tune and sustain the program in subsequent years, although more detail on the formal processes utilizing the evaluation data in the post-grant years would benefit the application and underscore the sustainability of this approach.

The applicant would also benefit from the inclusion of a high-quality plan, with specific deliverables and associated activities, timelines, and responsible parties, to provide a sense of how the applicant will seek sustainable funding and/or increase efficiencies to reduce the need for ongoing funding. Given the large-scale change the district seeks, a detailed plan is essential to the sustainability of this initiative over time.

Therefore, the applicant has scored in the medium range.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant shows moderate evidence of the integration of public and private resources to augment schools' resources. With an emphasis on total child wellness, the applicant will work with at least 10 community partner agencies to provide wraparound services to address the medical, mental health, and socio-economic challenges of students. The services focus on specialized needs and as such offer substantial benefit to migrant worker families, military families, and homeless and unaccompanied students; for example, the applicant has plans to address the needs of 1,650 who are eligible for more focused health care support and 140 students who are unaccompanied. The degree of detail regarding services for homeless youth is very impressive.

Nonetheless, the application would benefit from a stronger description of how the various services would work together to support students, including how services would be targeted, integrated, and coordinated for children and families. School guidance counselors, intervention specialists, and resource liaison/nurses will identify the needs of homeless students, such as dental, nutrition, mentoring, or transportation, and work with the student and their host family to provide wraparound services. More information about a similar decisionmaking infrastructure to identify the needs of all students, and provide appropriate referrals to wraparound services, would be helpful to the proposal.

The applicant's proposed measures to evaluate the program, focused on fostering achievement through a reduction in absences and discipline referrals, and an increase in the number of students receiving services, appear ambitious yet achievable; the proposed 5% annual reductions in absences and discipline referrals seem especially effective.

As part of their academy instruction, students will have the opportunity to work with community organizations working to help families with significant socio-economic challenges, an approach that will help sustain student commitment to their tasks as they see the meaningful results of their work.

The applicant does not address how teachers and school staffs would be trained to assess the needs and assets of students in order to identify needed community supports and engaging families and students in decisionmaking about solutions to perceived family needs.

Therefore, the applicant scored in the medium range.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has shown evidence of meeting the absolute priority of a coherent and comprehensive vision of 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 graduation requirements.

The applicant offers a firm commitment to getting digital tools and the training to utilize them to parents and students through a variety of means, including student-parent training classes. Teachers will have numerous opportunities for professional development, training, and support in developing personalized learning environments. Various digital resources will complement interactive, hands-on instruction successfully pioneered within the district's Marine Science Station program, whose early results suggest high graduation and college enrollment rates.

Most impressive is the significant community backing and support of this proposal; the proposal process included numerous opportunities for stakeholders to provide their insights and preferences, and the communication loop to be established during the evaluation process will include reporting back to these various constituencies, including business and higher education partners.

The applicant's comprehensive program is built on the solid foundation of initiatives begun under the state's Race to the Top program (e.g., data warehouse) and under the advice, encouragement, and interest of students, families, and the community (e.g., the Marine Science Station.) As evidenced by the numerous letters of support, a wide range of stakeholders is committed to this project, and the continual evaluation and communication of results promises accountability and success.

Total	210	159
--------------	------------	------------