



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0098FL-1 for School Board of Duval County, FL

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths

- Identifies a vision of "Excellence, Integrity, Innovation, Equity, and Collaboration" by combining "online and traditional instruction and to expand the integration of student-centered digital curriculum blended teaching, and personalized learning options allowing for authentic differentiation and successful movement of every student to a higher standard of academic achievement, beginning with middle school students".
- Vision infers core educational assurances

Weaknesses

- The chart delineating the school district goals, supporting strategies, and 1:1 learning connection presents district goals that do not include measurable targets. Additionally, the 1:1 learning connections identified, do not align with the goal they are tagged to. For example, goal 1 of Developing Great Educators and Leaders identifies principals and district educators, presumably teachers, having "immediate access to the performance data of students, differentiated in a multiple ways." A specific link as to how this is going to happen is not provided leaving the reader to have to create the alignment between access to student performance data being a connection to being a great educator or leader. Goal 2, Engage[ing] Parents, Caregivers, and Community has similar misalignment challenges by identifying the 1:1 learning connection as "Parents will have increased availability to student performance data, therefore increasing their ability to support and inspire their children's success". Additionally, inclusion of how parents without internet access or computer skills will accomplish this goal is not provided.
- A clear and credible approach for accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity based upon student individual interests is inferred but not clearly articulated. For example, of the four district goals presented of "Developing Great Educators and Leaders, Engage Parents, Caregivers, and Community, Ensure Effective Equitable, and Efficient Use of Resources, and Develop the Whole Child, none specifically states deepening student learning or accelerating student achievement as part or all of the goal.
- Description of the classroom experience through the lens of the students and teachers is not provided.
- Clear, detailed narrative description of how the four core educational assurances are to be met is lacking. How the applicant will "unite with what the Superintendent declared as the theme for the 2013-14 school year, 'One District/One Voice/One Vision'" to "support the goal of student achievement" is not articulated. Additionally, while the application is focused on the implementation of digital devices, narrative of how this is building data systems that measure student growth and success and inform teachers and principals with data to improve instruction is not specifically addressed. Furthermore, narrative description of how the recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retention of effective teachers and principals is not addressed.

Lastly, specifically how the implementation of these devices will turnaround these low performing schools is not provided.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	4
--	-----------	----------

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths

- Organization of the section includes specific mention of rationale for school selection and content areas attempting to include research to support the decisions.
- A list of participating schools, students from low-income and high-needs families, and educators is provided.

Weaknesses

- The extent to which the applicant's approach to implementing its reform proposal will support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation is concerning. While a list of schools, participating students, and numbers and percentages of low-income, high-need students is provided, the rationale and quality of the reform proposal has the following flaws:
 - Research lacks citations for credibility and author recognition purposes. For example, in the section labeled "Why focus on middle school?", the applicant states, "National research indicates that academic achievement attained by eight grade has a significant impact on college and career readiness by the time of graduation." yet provides no citation for this national research. This is followed by the following two sentences, "DCPS' current graduation rate is 67.7%. The critical middle school stage is enhanced by solid preparation and supportive partnerships that wrap-around students. When combined with the preceding statement about national research about academic achievement by eight grade, the reader is left to attempt to draw their own conclusions regarding what these three sentences mean as they appear to be contradictory. The low graduation rate of 67.7% combined with "solid preparation and supportive partnerships that wrap-around students" are in direct opposition to each other. This is just one example where the narrative does not make sense in this section.
 - Claims advanced lack strong evidence and support to make them plausible. For example, the applicant states, "One-to-one devices will assist students obtain, organize, manipulate, and display various sources of information in useful ways. Technology serves as a way to develop and encourage meaningful activities closely related to activities undertaken in the world beyond the classroom." without providing evidence, data, or research to support their claims.
 - Descriptions and definitions are absent to provide clarity as to what the applicant is addressing. For example, the applicant writes, "Historically, data pulled from probeware was noted in lab books or journals. This process often wastes class time and negatively affects the pacing and transitioning of science class activities." By not providing a definition of probeware or a description of how it is used in labs and journals that wastes time, the reader is unable to clearly identify the problem.
 - Names and titles of members of the design committee are provided without a description of why these are the best individuals to lead this effort. The organizational chart provided in the appendix indicates individuals at the director level specifically in charge of math (3 positions) and science (2 positions) yet they are not included on the design team nor is their absence explained. Additionally, a noted lack of educators with direct classroom or content area experience such as department heads, classroom teachers, and principals is concerning.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
--	-----------	----------

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths

- The plan identifies goals, activities, deliverables, and persons responsible

Weaknesses

- The quality of the reform plan is subpar for the following reasons:
 1. The goals are vague and unmeasurable. For example, goal 1 states, "Students will be individually inspired and motivated to personalize the investment in their academic success when multiple opportunities for enrichment are made available to them by one-to-one learning choices." The applicant does not define "inspired" or "motivated to personalize the investment in their academic success" nor do they provide a tool to measure inspiration and motivation to personalize investments in academic success.
 2. The activities listed do not involve students. For example, all three of the activities listed for goal 1, presumably the 'student goal' involve computer hardware rather than how students will be engaged with the equipment to enhance their learning and boost student achievement, 'inspiration', and 'motivation to personalize the[ir] investment'.
 3. The timeline identified by the applicant identifies the year the activities are planned to be implemented only with 7 of the 9 activities listing only 'Y1-4'.
 4. Deliverables listed are procedural rather than student focused including, "Academic evaluation and requirements established for earning course credit", "Approved procedures and criteria for personalized learning training". The reader does not know what will be different district-wide other than a collection of policies and plans. Specific targets of increased student achievement in math or science, reduction of the existing achievement gap between white and black 6th grade students in math from 27 points as indicated in table (A)(4)(a) to 13 points, or other student focused deliverables would enhance your plan.
 5. Persons responsible are collections of district personnel including teachers, instructional coaches, i3RLC project director, and principals with monitoring and fidelity checks by the superintendent and cabinet effectively including the entire instructional staff in the district. Responsibility is dispersed beyond accountability by not naming a specific director, chef, or building principals as the specific individual responsible for the implementation and success of the goal.

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

10

3

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths

- Goals and targets are achievable

Weaknesses

- Goals are not ambitious. Each subgroup, regardless of where their current achievement level is, will gain 3 points in year 1, 4 points in year 2, and 3 points in years 3-4. No rationale is provided regarding how or why these growth targets were determined and no closing of achievement gaps within the district are accomplished as acceleration of poorly performing subgroups is not planned through the target goals.
- Decreasing achievement gap chart does not align with targets chart

- Graduation rate targets perpetuate and maintain gaps between white student graduation levels and all other subgroups
- No college enrollment data is provided or planned

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	4
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reforms in five middle schools are mentioned. • Student performance data is available to educators • 2012-13 scores in algebra and reading in 3 grades are strong <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear record of success in the past four years is not provided by the applicant. The narrative describes initiatives put in place this year that have yet to be evaluated for effectiveness. • Achievement gap closure for the past four years are not included in the application. • Reform effectiveness for the five middle schools mentioned in the application is not possible because no student data is provided as evidence • All evidence provided by the applicant regarding availability of student performance data to parents and students describes an initiative implemented this school year thus not meeting the requirement of "a clear record of success in the past four years". • Evidence of how data was used to increase student achievement and inform and improve participation of instruction and services for the past four years is not provided. 		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	0
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <p>No strengths noted</p> <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the district states, "a number of new and expanded programs resulting from a shift in resources from administrative costs to classroom support" have been enacted, budgets, charts, or graphs from before this occurred are not provided to compare with the current expenditures. • Actually personnel salaries and budgets are not provided, at any level, for any of the required expenditures. 		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant provides definitive evidence in the appendix from the State of Florida of sufficient 		

autonomy to implement the proposal

No weaknesses noted

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

15

4

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths

- Two letters of support from potential vendors who might provide the 1-to-1 devices and a letter from the Mayor of Jacksonville are provided
- Awarded a Qualified Zone Academy Bond (QZAB)

Weaknesses

- Letters of support from "public and private donors, such as local universities, the Duval Teachers United, Jacksonville Public Education Fund, Pearson Solutions ... EMTEC" are not provided.
- Letters of support from students, administrators, community groups, parent groups, local businesses, etc are absent
- No documentation of communication with the teachers through collective bargaining are provided
- While the intent of the QZAB is laudable, the actual process used to create the application that resulted in the award as well as rationale and description for why the deliverables identified in the goals have not been achieved is absent. For example, the applicant states that the QZAB will "improve student ratio [of computers] to a minimum of 2:1" yet is requesting an additional \$15.9 million of RTT funds to achieve this. The contribution of the QZAB grant for equipment, according to budget table 3.1, is approximately \$7.5 million.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths

- The proposal intends to provide participating students deep learning experiences in areas of their academic interest through the use of digital science and math curriculum delivered on personal devices in conjunction with teacher guidance.
- A District Improvement and Assistance a Plan and Student Progression Plan is in effect in the district
- Schools are currently implementing "data chats" with students
- Currently have software and structure through 'data chats' to identify immediate needs and gaps in student learning

Weaknesses

- A high-quality plan specifically tailored to learning is not evident in the narrative or appendix.
- All information in the narrative addresses educators. Specific detail of how students understand what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals and how

to structure their learning to achieve their goals, as well as measure progress toward those goals is not provided.

- Explanation why only 14 coaches each for science and math are used for 28 schools and why 14 math coaches are needed if 16 are already being used is absent. Specific detail about coaches responsibilities, including job descriptions is not provided.
- The District Improvement and Assistance Plan and Student Progression Plan are not included in the appendix to determine the quality and appropriateness of the plan in reference to the proposal.
- While the applicant expresses a desire to 'build upon digital curriculum practices already in place within the adopted curriculum', examples of current digital curriculum is not provided in the appendix.
- The proposal does not address what student experiences look and feel like in the classroom. Detail regarding how the student creates or accesses lessons, courses, and assessments are needed to clearly demonstrate what the student experience entails. Additionally, description of the teacher of record involved would bring clarity to the proposal.
- description of how students will have access to diverse cultures and perspectives is not evident
- Specific detail of how the QZAB grant will be integrated into the RTT project is not provided. For example, the applicant notes the current computer to student ratio is 3:1 yet they also note the QZAB will improve this ratio to 2:1. Detail of the district's current progress including successes and limitations is not provided. Furthermore, a computer ratio of 3:1 far exceeds the ratios of many schools throughout the country.
- Specific detail of the quality, frequency, and evaluation of data chats is not provided
- Description of how classroom instruction has changed as a result of implementing the Inspire platform to highlight gaps in student understanding is not evident
- Detail of how high- needs students learning will be facilitated is not addressed

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

20

4

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Strengths

- The applicant provides professional development district-wide as well as at school sites.
- The use of coaches to support educator implementation enhances effectiveness of initiatives.
-

Weaknesses

- A high-quality plan specifically detailing how learning and teaching will be enhanced by personalizing the learning environment and specifically increasing in the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principal is not evident in the narrative or appendix.
- Copies of teacher/principal evaluations are not provided
- Detail of professional development for educators and leaders including the process used to determine what is provided district-wide and what is delivered at school sites, is absent.
- School leadership involvement in the implementation of the project at their site is not evident
- How educators have access to high-quality learning resources is not addressed.
- Detail and definition of the differences, roles, and responsibilities of academic coaches, instructional coaches, district specialists, and instructional specialists and how each position supports increased student achievement is absent.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	2
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant mentions they will structure governance practices to ensure their mission supports their practices. <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed is absent. The applicant does not mention or describe the district structure, policies or procedures that are already in place to support comprehensive plan implementation. It can be assumed that significant policy changes to insure the smooth implementation of a district-wide initiative of 1-to-1 devices at the middle school level either was or is needed, yet the applicant provides no mention of past or current practices that address this critical step. 		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	2
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant indicates that educators have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources for project implementation. A portal upgrade is planned to provide access for all stakeholder <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed is absent. It is unclear how parents, regardless of income, will have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation of the applicant's proposal. Details of how students, parents, educators have appropriate levels of technical support, which may be provided through a range of strategies is not provided. Narrative of how the infrastructure will allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format and to use the data in other electronic learning systems is not evident. The applicant does not detail how they will ensure that the district and schools use interoperable data systems. 		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District accreditation process provides structure, definitions, and accountability for ongoing, continuous, system improvement • Inclusion of the superintendent and cabinet monitoring the three program goals is mentioned • The continuous feedback loop provides support for classroom teachers in their practice. <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant fails to provide a continuous improvement plan that includes timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals, activities, rationale, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties, in addition to opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant in their application or appendix. The district's continuous improvement plan used for district accreditation would have been a significant enhancement to the application. • Mention, evidence, or awareness of how the district will measure and publicly share information on the quality of the investments is not evident. 		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multiple internal and external stakeholders mentioned. <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No communication plan that includes includes key goals, activities to be undertaken and the rationale for the activities, the timeline, the deliverables, and the parties responsible for implementing the activities is provided. 		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant provides 12 performance measures, that include subgroup targets, drawn from their four strategic plan goals. • The applicant attempts to demonstrate that the performance measure and rationale will inform future decisions. • Targets for performance measures are provided for qualified and highly qualified teachers/principals <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Theory of action not included so unable to evaluate how measures are aligned to it and inform it. • Formative timelines and data are not specified • "Review improvements" are not aligned to the specific measures. For example, it is unclear how 		

reviewing "Frequent surveys and focus group, particularly students, to foster understanding and articulation of individually inspired instruction for reflective learning choices" will have an impact on "The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who decrease suspension and expulsion".

- It is unclear how each measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information as no timelines, benchmark dates, specific and ongoing measurements are noted.
- While the applicant mentions "review improvement" the misalignment of this section of the table with the measure it is designated to inform creates confusion for the reader. Detailed narrative about how the measure will be specifically utilized, how often it will be reviewed, what committee or group will be tracking, and how changes will be enacted would provide clarity.
- An instrument or method to evaluate "demonstrate[d] improvement in engagement and efficacy" is absent as is baseline data for this measure
- Baseline data for suspensions and expulsions is not provided
- All targets represent the same target regardless of differences between subgroups indicating no closure of gaps or acceleration for subgroups.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1
--	----------	----------

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:		
Strengths		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarterly results briefings to the school board are mentioned. 		
Weaknesses		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A high-quality program assessment plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities is not provided. 		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	4

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
Strengths		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the plan. • Rationale for allocations is provided. • Equipment quotes are based upon existing contracts. 		
Weaknesses		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget tables 2.1 and 3.1 in the areas of program management and science and mathematics coaches does not align to the project-level itemized costs found in table 4.1. For example, in budget tables 2.1 and 3.1, the program manager salary and benefits are not identified as grant expenses yet in table 4.1, the salary and benefits are included in the grant requested funds. • Table 4.1 includes benefit expenses twice for all personnel lines. For example, the \$32,130 per year needed for fringe benefits is included in salary and again in the benefits line doubling the amount of benefit costs. This is replicated for all personnel allocations representing \$1,971,771 overage. • One time costs are identified as equipment. The other costs allocated are for personnel with no 		

indication if some or all of the positions will continue after the funding cycle ceases.

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

10

0

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

No strengths noted

The applicant does not address sustainability in their application.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	2

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Strengths

- Two program partnerships are highlighted that focus on providing services to students.
- Two educational and one family/community desired results with targets are identified.
- A listing of current partners for the two highlighted programs is provided.

Weaknesses

- No letters of support provided
- Description of how any of the services will be scaled up is absent.
- Baseline data for desired results targets are not provided making evaluation and tracking of the results problematic.
- Details of how results will be improved over time are absent.
- The applicant does not describe how partnerships would integrate education and other services for participating students.
- It is unclear specifically what community organizations the applicant is planning to scale up.
- Descriptive narrative of how staff capacity will be built is not evident.
- No performance measures are identified.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

There is no doubt that Duval County Public Schools senior management have a passion for providing 1-to-1 devices to their middle school students. The consistent messaging of providing a blended instructional approach to differentiate instruction and the commitment of the superintendent and cabinet level administrators are evidence of the passion that resonates throughout the application.

However, the application lacks attention to the specific requirements and prompts they are required to address. Every response, in every section, fails to provide specific detail as to how the proposal will be implemented. Of greatest concern is the impression given that stakeholders beyond the cabinet

level were not involved or even aware of the application's existence. Extremely limited letters of support that fail to include any teachers, administrators such as principals, students, parent groups, community or faith-based groups, or businesses, even those noted as partners, is concerning. Chances that any significant reform or improvement in student achievement will result from the proposed program is unlikely given the narrative, appendix, and previous results provided by the applicant.

Total	210	57
--------------	------------	-----------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0098FL-2 for School Board of Duval County, FL

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

DCPS has instituted and proposed interventions that are not in alignment with all of the four core educational assurances.

- 1) Students are instructed via curriculum that is aligned with Common Core State Standards;
- 2) The district uses a tiered system of assessments that include student-level data analysis that measure student growth;
- 3) It is unclear how the district rewards and retains effective and highly effective teachers and administrators, nor how their evaluation is tied to student growth.
- 4) DCPS has prepared a proposal which can impact the district's ability to turn around the lowest achieving schools.

The DCPS proposal includes core assurances 1, 2, and 4, but it is not clear how the proposal meets core assurance 3.

DCPS has not articulated a clear and credible approach to accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity. The DCPS approach includes specific interventions that combine online and traditional instruction to expand their curriculum, however it is not clear that the personalized support are grounded in common and individual tasks based on student interest. While at the student level the proposal states that individuals will work on digital devices to further personalize their learning, it is unclear how this instruction will change for teachers.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	5
--	-----------	----------

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The DCPS proposal includes all 24 middle schools in the district.

The demographics table includes 28 schools, which is inconsistent with the number stipulated in the prior narrative.

The School Demographics table includes the number of participating educators and number of participating students in each of the demographic categories. Not all schools meet the criteria, but the population as a whole meets the inclusion criteria.

The district appeared to have chosen middle schools based on research indicating the importance of 8th grade success in graduation, however the district maintains a 66% graduation rate. Additionally, the district proposal does not support high quality implementation or a focus on subgroups.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The DCPS plan includes 3 key goals related to Students, Educators, and Parents. These goals include appropriate activities, deliverables, and parties responsible. However, the plan is not considered high quality in that there is a lack of detail with regard to the timelines and specifics with regard to which specific party is responsible for each deliverable. In each case the goal/deliverable is monitored by the Superintendent's Cabinet, but it is unclear how this is done. An example of this lack of detail can be seen with the following:

Deliverable: Academic evaluation and requirements established for earning course credit

Parties Responsible: Teachers, Instructional Coaches, t3RLC Project Director, Principals

It is unclear who will lead this effort, how each of the responsible parties will be involved in the development and whether this is a school-based or district based decision. There is also no timeline for completion.

Due to a clear lack of detail and direction it is not likely that this proposal could be scaled to support district-wide change.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	6
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

DCPS identified the FCAT as its summative assessment instrument for both Math and Reading (6-8th grade). The district also included an appropriate methodology for assessing both proficiency and growth using the state-defined achievement levels and state formula for growth. It is unclear why the district chose not to include a measure of status and growth in science since the intervention will be rolled out in middle school science and math classrooms throughout the district.

DCPS has committed to decreasing achievement gaps, however the identified benchmark is the state average for the subgroup and not district or state highest achieving subgroup.

DCPS reports an overall graduation rate of 67.7% with slight variability in rates by subgroup with the exception of SWD (32 point gap). The district has proposed significant, ambitious and achievable targets.

DCPS did not report college enrollment rates or postsecondary degree attainment rates.

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	5

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

DCPS has documented their ability to make proficiency improvements exceeding the state average in reading and math specifically. There is little evidence however, of raising graduation rates or college enrollment.

The district identified Persistently Lowest Achieving Schools (PLAs). The proposal states that "over the years many of the districts [sic] PLA schools have had mixed results." The district has adopted state initiatives and re-designed school improvement initiatives, but there is little evidence that they have been able to achieve ambitious and significant reforms.

The district identified a system whereby educators capture and share data via PLCs. The district attempted to provide clarity and support through the use of Learning Guide Assessments, but the use was limited and voluntary. Currently the district utilizes Pearson Inform and Pearson Limelight to assist teachers in data utilization. The district proposes further development of a student and parent portal to provide access. Timelines are not specified for these two specific deliverables.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: The proposal indicates that budget details can be accessed online or in person. However, it is not clear that the required budget categories are included in their online system. The proposal does not indicate where online the budget is accessed and whether the data is available at the school level.		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	10
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: There is sufficient evidence that DCPS has both the conditions and sufficient autonomy under State, legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environment. This proposal is in line with the Florida State's Board of Education Statutory Goal of maximizing access by expanding digital education to improve college readiness and increasing high school graduation rates.		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	2
(B)(4) Reviewer Comments: In the development of the proposal it is not clear that DCPS engaged each of its principal stakeholders. There is no mention of students, parents or teachers (other than through the Duval Teachers United). DCPS has stated that they recognize their need to work with DTU, teachers, students, and local universities but there is no evidence that any of these groups informed the process. Letters of support were submitted by the Mayor's Office, Apple and Microsoft. There were no letters of support included from any of the key stakeholders.		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	7
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: The proposal identifies two key goals 1) personalized support for students with comprehensive college and career preparation and 2) individualized learning paths and self-guided exploration options. The activities to achieve these goals include the use of academic coaches and instructional specialists (who work with teachers), implementation of a student progression plan, blended learning, and digital tools. The timeline for each of these deliverables and specific responsible parties is unclear. The proposal is unclear in how the identified activities will help develop skills and traits such as teamwork, critical thinking, communication, or creativity. The proposal does meet the requirements of including a personalized sequence of content, a variety of quality instructional approaches, on-going and regular feedback that can be used to make personalized learning recommendations. The proposal does not indicate how accommodations and high-quality strategies for high need students will occur. The proposal does not include mechanisms to provide training and support to students to ensure they know how to use the tools and resources. Due to a lack of detail with regard to full implementation of the system, specifically the timeline and responsible parties, lack of discussion of accommodations for high-need students, and lack of mechanisms to provide training and support to students this would not be considered a high-quality plan.		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	6
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: DCPS utilizes PLCs to support personalized learning to meet each student's academic needs. These PLCs, with support from instructional specialists assist teachers in adapting content and instruction and measure student progress. The process is also supported by the Collaborative Assessment System for Teachers (CAST) in which teachers and administrators work together to talk about instructional observations, recommendations and improvements.		

The plan consists of a key goal of improvement in access to real-time data and the alignment of instructional supports to improve the quality of instructional delivery. While the activities are referenced above there continues to be a lack of timelines for implementation and responsible parties.

Aside from School Improvement Plans (SIP) that identify long-range goals and action steps, there is no evidence that a training system exists to assist school leaders and leadership teams. It is not clear that the information in these plans is actionable in that they inform practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps.

The applicant did not include a high quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals. The proposal does not include how they do (or will) staff hard-to-staff schools, subjects, and specialty areas.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	2
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The DCPS proposal does not include a discussion of the organization of the LEA central office and how it provides support and services to all participating schools.</p> <p>The proposal does not indicate that school leadership teams have sufficient flexibility or autonomy over factors including scheduling, personnel, and staffing.</p> <p>It is not clear how DCPS students are given the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on mastery nor if they can demonstrate mastery of standards in multiple ways or at multiple times.</p> <p>It is not clear that resources and instructional practices are adaptable and fully acceptable to all students including those with disabilities and English learners.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	2
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The proposal does not indicate how all stakeholders, regardless of income will have access to necessary content, tools and other learning resources. There is no evidence provided that there will be an appropriate level of support for all stakeholders nor that the information will be exportable in an open data format. The districts current tools and proposed upgrades are interoperable data systems. This would not be considered a high quality plan because it lacks all required components. Key goals are not identified, there is a lack of activities and rationale, the only specific deliverable is the upgrade of the data system, but there is no clear timeline or responsible party identified.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	1
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>DCPS did not include an appropriate plan for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process. The identified process is specifically geared toward instructional continuous improvement for educators. The plan does not identify any of the components of a high quality plan to evaluate the continuous improvement of the project goals. The continuous improvement plan is not included in the appendix.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The proposal discusses the importance of each of the external stakeholders (DTU and PTA) but no plan is presented for ongoing communication and engagement. This is not a high quality plan because it lacks each of the required</p>		

components, there are no key goals, activities/rationale, timelines, deliverables, or responsible parties.

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

5

1

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

It is not clear why each of the specific performance measures is included as a rationale was not provided. For example there is a performance measure “number and percentage of students by subgroup who decrease suspension and expulsion” which is not linked to a specific project goal. Additionally, the table included does not include separate columns for number and percentage and the targets are Baseline +. The proposal does not include a process by which the district will review and improve measures over time if they are insufficient.

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

5

1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

DCPS did not provide a high quality plan to evaluate the effectiveness of the investments. The section mentions “research questions” but does not indicate what this specifically means, thus there are no clear goals. Activities include special communication forums and formative and summative evaluations but there is no detail as to how these forums will be structured nor what the formative and summative evaluations will look like. There is no timeline, deliverable, or responsible party cited.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The budget presented includes primarily personnel and technology costs. Technology and materials costs were developed using existing quotes. Personnel costs are based on average salaries and benefits derived from human resources. The proposal did identify the source of all funds and is reasonable and sufficient. There is a clear and thoughtful rationale and a description as to which are one-time investments. There are several problems with the individual budget tables though. Tables 2.1 and 3.1 do not align with 4.1. The Project Manager costs are not identified as grant costs and table 4.1 is overstated by 1.9 million dollar.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>DCPS did not include a sustainability section. Thus no high quality plan is in evidence.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	1
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:		
<p>DCPS identified the implementation of a Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) curriculum. No specific partner was identified, but the proposal does reference some pre-existing partnerships at individual schools.</p> <p>DCPS identified 3 population-desired results, but two are identical and none are sufficiently detailed.</p> <p>The selected indicators are aggregated, but it is not clear how they would be used to target resources, be scaled beyond the participating students, or improved over time.</p> <p>The proposal does not indicate how the project would integrate education and other services that address socio-emotional and behavioral needs since specific measures and outcomes are not identified.</p> <p>There is no indication that DCPS will build the capacity of their staff to assess the needs of students in the program,</p>		

identify the needs and assets of the school and community, create a decision-making process, engage parents and families, or routinely assess applicant's progress.

DCPS did not identify ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the population.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>DCPS has proposed an intervention that includes the expansion of a one-to-one learning environment for all middle school students in the district. The intervention will occur specifically in math and science classrooms.</p> <p>The DCPS interventions that are not in full alignment with all of the four core educational assurances.</p> <p>1) Students are instructed via curriculum that is aligned with Common Core State Standards;</p> <p>2) The district uses a tiered system of assessments that include student-level data analysis that measure student growth;</p> <p>3) It is unclear how the district rewards and retains effective and highly effective teachers and administrators, nor how their evaluation is tied to student growth.</p> <p>4) DCPS has prepared a proposal that can impact the district's ability to turn around the lowest achieving schools.</p> <p>The DCPS proposal includes core assurances 1, 2, and 4, but it is not clear how fully the proposal meets core assurance 3.</p>		

Total	210	66
--------------	------------	-----------



Race to the Top - District Technical Review Form

Application #0098FL-3 for School Board of Duval County, FL

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Overall, the applicant provides a reform vision that sets forth a general outline of RTT-D initiatives that will continue expansion of integrating student-centered digital curriculum, blended learning and personalized learning options to allow for true differentiation, thus accelerating achievement for every middle school student in Duval County School District. However, the applicant does not provide examples or thorough descriptions of how the RTT-D initiatives will accomplish the following: build on the four core educational assurance areas, such as measuring student growth and success to inform instructional practices, thus turning around the lowest achieving schools; articulate a credible approach to accelerating student achievement in all participating middle schools and scale up; and describe what the classroom experience will look like for participating students and teachers.</p> <p>a) Although, the applicant provides statements referencing core beliefs, Common Core Standards, Superintendent's theme</p>		

for 2013-14, and a chart with district goals, strategies to support and connect to 1:1 learning; a comprehensive narrative describing how each would accelerate student learning and interests was not presented. A thorough explanation of how the adoption of standards would impact teacher instructional practices and prepare students for college was not discussed. The applicant discussed the need to keep with advancements in technology in the 21st century, as justification for the blending of online and traditional instruction to personalize student learning.

To retain, recruit, and reward effective teachers and principals the Duval County Public School (DCPS) offers a stipend to educators who accept to work in hard to staff schools. The applicant does not provide any information on participating middle schools that are hard to staff. The DCPS provides on-going professional learning and support to develop all teachers, instructional leaders, and staff. However, a thorough description of professional development initiatives that are aligned to the RTT-D reforms were not discussed in the proposal.

Furthermore, the existing data system does not provide full access to parents and students regarding academic performance. Therefore, a large portion of the RTT-D budget is allocated to equipment. Also, all middle schools in Duval will be participating in the grant. The curricular focus is on math and science. Every participating middle school will be equipped with a full time science and math specialist. This will greatly impact budget sustainability.

In addition, students do not select an area of interest. The applicant does indicate that students will have a decision in how their personalized instruction is delivered. However, the applicant does not thoroughly describe how this will be done and the role of the teacher. Lastly, the applicant did not identify, if any, low performing or persistently performing middle schools that will be addressed in this proposal.

b) The applicant does not provide information that articulates a sound approach to accomplishing the RTT-D goals. A description of how resources will be realigned and evaluated; and individual tasks that are based on student academic interest was unclear. The applicant indicated that the RTT-D project proposal focuses on the implementation of Individual Inspired Instruction for Reflective Learning Choices (i3RLC) across all participating middle schools. The applicant describes this approach as the central reform initiative that will continue the expansion of integrating student-centered digital curriculum, blended learning and personalized learning options to allow for true differentiation and higher student achievement. Missing from the RTT-D vision is a comprehensive plan detailing how student interests in other subjects will be integrated into the reform process.

C) The applicant does not provide detailed evidence of what the classroom experience will look like for participating students and teachers. Although, the chart located in the RTT-D proposal indicates that students will be individually inspired and motivated to personalize the investment in their academic success when multiple opportunities for enrichment are made available to them by one to one learning choices, the applicant does not describe how the supporting strategies would be delivered and persons responsible for services. For example, to develop the whole child the applicant proposes to address the needs of all students with multiple opportunities for enrichment but does provide evidence of how this will be accomplished. More specifically, the applicant does not discuss the high-needs or low performing students.

Overall, the applicant presents a RTT-D vision that lists goals, strategies, and connection to learning, however the evidence described does not thoroughly support a high quality RTT-D plan that demonstrates a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that responds to criterion a, b, and c. More specifically, how the deliverables and parties responsible for implementing activities, what the classroom experience would look like, addressing participating high needs and low performing students was not thoroughly discussed in section A1. Therefore, the applicant's score is 3.

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

10

3

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a) Overall, the extent to which the RTT-D reform proposal will support a high quality district and school level implementation is unclear. The applicant's RTT-D implementation process does not address how the reform initiatives will target high-needs students and low performing schools. This is apparent in the lack of specific evidence detailing instructional practices and resources that focus on high-needs students. Also, the applicant does not provide information on the parties responsible for implementing RTT-D in participating middle schools. The applicant relies heavily on research to support the RTT-D focus on math and science and not the academic interests of students.

Because the applicant's reform proposal is a district-wide initiative targeting all 24 middle schools in Duval County School District a selection process was not provided. However, the applicant is in the process of currently addressing the needs of 10 middle schools. The 10 schools were not identified. A description of the curricula and teacher instructional practices for the 10 schools and remaining 14 were not discussed.

b-c) The applicant provides a list of the participating schools. However, there appears to be a discrepancy in the total number of participating middle schools. The applicant provided the following total of schools as : 24 and 28. The chart located in A2 totals 28. The total number of participating students, participating students from low-income families,

participating high-needs students and participating schools is also illustrated in the chart.

Due to the limited evidence provided by the applicant to support a high quality implementation of RTT-D reform initiatives, the score for this section is 3.

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

10

3

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's RTT-D proposal focuses on i3RLC as the initiative to scale up reform in the Duval County Public Schools. However, the i3RLC goals, activities and timeline, deliverables and responsible parties presented in Appendix C are vague. The applicant presents a chart but does not thoroughly discuss the contents of it in relationship to accelerating student learning, implementing personalized learning environments, and scaling up. Also, the applicant does not describe what reflective learning or professional development from the district office will look like in the personalized learning environment.

According to the applicant, students will master state assessments through the i3RLC program by having equitable access to customized goal setting and instruction based on their learning styles, however, examples were not presented.

Overall, based on the limited evidence provided in this section to support the scale up of meaningful reform initiatives beyond the participating schools, the applicant's score is 3.

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

10

3

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Overall, the applicant's does not provide sufficient evidence to support criteria a, b, c, and d. Although, i3RLC is the central reform initiative for the RTT-D proposal, it is unclear how the i3RLC program will support or evaluate the annual performance goals.

a) Although, the applicant provided tables to illustrate performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth) in reading and math for students in grades 7 and 8, a narrative was not provided. Also, summative performance data for 6th grade reading and math was not presented.

B) The applicant provided tables illustrating data to decrease the achievement gap among subgroups in reading and math. Subgroups are compared to the state average for subgroups. The applicant proposes to decrease in six years, 50% percentage of students scoring below grade level. The annual goals presented in the RTT-D grant for each subgroup are not ambitious but achievable.

c) The overall graduation rate for Duval County Public Schools is 67.7 %. The applicant proposes to increase the graduation rate by 20 % in six years. In section B1, the applicant targeted five middle schools to receive a significant portion of the previously allocated RTT funds to support dropout prevention strategies. The applicant described several organizations that assisted students throughout the year with attendance, behavior, and academic achievement. However, the applicant did not present an evaluative measure to determine the effectiveness of each agency or organization, and the impact of services on students and the dropout rate. Over time, the annual goal for each subgroup is reasonable and achievable.

Baseline data from 2011-12 was presented. Data for 2012-13 was not provided. Based on the 2012-13 data, the applicant does not provide a clear process or identify specific RTT-D strategies that would increase the graduation rate for ELL (55.1), students with disabilities (35.6), Black (62.3), and Hispanic students (63.8).

d) The applicant did not present data for college enrollment. The following statement was provided: Due to an expired contract, DCPS currently does not have access to this data.

Optional -Post-Secondary Degree Attainment Information was not provided.

Based on insufficient evidence to support each of the criterion in this section, the applicant's score is 3.

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	5
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>a) The applicant provides data on student performance and annual measures on tables that are extremely difficult to read. The applicant does indicate that the Duval County Public Schools 2012-13 data revealed a widespread improvement and progress as released by the Florida Department o Education. However, data demonstrating the advancement of student learning and achievement over the last four year were not discussed in this section. The applicant provided the following 2012-13 academic successes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased reading performance in grades 3, 5, 6, and 10 exceeded the state average; • Students in grades 6 and 8 increased their proficiency levels in math, exceeding the state average; and • Approximately 56% of student demonstrated proficiency in geometry and 63% in Biology. <p>b) Although, the applicant presented the preceding data, many of the DCPS have mixed results. High school have seen a dramatic improvement. Elementary and middle schools have little improvement even with reconstitution and incentive efforts. This information is disturbing. The applicant does not provide an explanation for not focusing on the elementary schools or the effect the RTT reform funds had on the elementary and middle schools, and persistently lowest achieving schools or low-performing schools. Only five middle schools were mentioned. The applicant describes a feeder pattern process for students to enter middle schools as: minimizing barriers commonly associated with transitions, encourages alignment, renewed ownership, and accountability for each student.</p> <p>The RTT funds are currently used to support dropout prevention strategies in secondary schools. Partnerships are integrated and expanded to support student achievement and success. For example, Talent Development, a research based initiative offers problem-solving strategies to use data analysis to identify the most at-risk students for support. The Talent Development currently serves one high school and one middle school.</p> <p>c) The applicant presents evidence to demonstrate how students and educators will have access to performance data but parent access appears to be limited and not thoroughly described. For example, the applicant provides student performance data to educators through Pearson Inform, the current tool used in DCPS for school data analysis. Pearson Limelight Inspire platform makes real-time assessment and intervention a reality. In addition, teachers have access to Learning Guides and Learning Guide Assessments. The Guides were created for core academic areas and focused on aligning state standards and specific benchmarks. Teachers and students receive feedback on the current level of proficiency linked to a specific benchmark. The data was used to promote intervention.</p> <p>Gaggle will be used to increase online support and interaction for students, parents, and educators. Students and teachers will be provided with interactive online technology access, such as assignment drop box, portal that allows students to access their grades, a digital locker to store, share and edit files with Google Docs, etc.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant does not provide sufficient evidence to demonstrate a clear track record of success, such as: state assessment data over the last four years were not included, limited data on each of the participating middle schools, no timeline, lack of access to student performance data for parents, and no information on ambitious reforms currently existing in DCPS that have informed the RTT-D grant or those that may need further development. Furthermore, the applicant does not present demographic data on the lowest performing middle schools and persistently lowest performing middle schools. Additional recognitions and awards pertaining to the schools or district were not highlighted. The applicants score for this section is 5.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The extent to which the applicant demonstrates a high level of transparency in processes, practices and investment is described below. Overall, the information presented does not provide sufficient information on how the applicant ensures transparency in the preceding areas mentioned. For example,

a,b,c,d) The Duval County School District provides the public with access to district budget online or in person. Individuals

can view details of the operation plan showing estimated expenditures and revenues, personnel salaries, and the rationale for new and expanded programs. However, the applicant does not discuss whether personnel salaries at the school level for all school -level instructional and support staff, teachers and non-personnel expenditures are accessible.

The applicant does mention that internal and external stakeholders were engaged in developing a strategic plan with a key focus on equitable and efficient use of resources to provide students with the tools and resources necessary to improve learning. Furthermore, the applicant describes the role of the Duval County Public Schools Communication Department as being the central source for district communication. Examples of public information programs are:

- media relations and external communication
- internal communication and publications
- district website
- television production airing School Board meetings, monthly talk show, and other topics

The applicant notes that the Communication Department serves the district's communication needs by increasing the public's awareness. However, The applicant does not provide specific examples of how each communication initiative is used to ensure a high level of transparency in the areas identified above. Therefore, the score for this section is 3.

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

10

6

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided the following information to demonstrate successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory and regulatory requirements as:

- Under the authority of the Florida Department of Education (FDOE), Duval County Public Schools (DCPS) ensures the development, evaluation, and revision of comprehensive district and school improvement plans and initiatives.
- School Improvement plans and District Improvement and Assessment Plans are made public,
- Previous funding from RTT allowed DCPS to create favorable conditions for reform to support student achievement and acceleration, such as a STEM academy at one high school, expand components currently assessed on the DCPS Teacher Assessment System, turn around lowest performing schools.
- All Duval County Public Schools are fully accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Council on Accreditation and School Improvement.

The applicant also described the timeline for the prior RTT initiatives. Upon reviewing the RTT, the district realized that many of the listed deliverables were already fully implemented or partially established in the district. The applicant further added that this is true of the RTT-D i3RLC proposal. Systems and support units are in place that will lead into the transition to personalized and blended opportunities for participating middle school students.

Overall, the applicant presented some evidence to demonstrate prior conditions for reform, as stated in the preceding paragraph. The applicant does not discuss the successes associated with the RTT funding cycle. Also, a needs assessment of all district reform initiatives was not discussed to eliminate duplication of deliverables.

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

15

4

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

a,b) The applicant does not present sufficient evidence to demonstrate the engagement of all stakeholders, more specifically parents, students. Although, the applicant recognizes the need to work with Duval Teachers United, teachers, students, and local universities to transform traditional instructional practices, letters of support from these stakeholders were not included in the application. A description of how students were involved in the RTT-D process was not included in the application. However, the Duval Teachers United did collaborate with the district on the RTT-D proposal to identify potential bargaining issues that need to be negotiated in advance to eliminate potential barriers to success. However, it is unclear whether Duval Teachers United is a bargaining unit. The applicant did not provide information related to other RTT-D topics discussed with Duval Teachers United. Also, there was no evidence that at least 70 percent of teachers from participating schools supported the RTT-D proposal. Letters of support included in the RTT-D proposal are from technology companies, and the mayor. Therefore, the score for this section is 4.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	10

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

C 1 (a) (i) The applicant provided the following approaches as instructional processes to ensure that all participating students are engaged and empowered learners:

- Academic coaches, instructional specialists will work directly with classroom teachers to analyze school wide and subject specific data, thus having the ability to communicate and determine the levels of personalized support needed by each student.
- Through equity in academics the I3RLC program will empower students to take leadership of their personalized learning experience.
- Pearson Inform is the district-wide tool used to guide formative analysis of school data and discussions.

Although, the applicant presents the preceding strategies as approaches to help participating students understand their role in learning, a thorough explanation of what it will look like for the learner is not provided. In addition, the applicant does not describe how equity in academics will help participating high- need students, SWD and ELL accelerate their performance, accomplish their goals, pursue learning and develop goals linked to college.

C 1 (a) (ii) The Duval County School District tracks achievement objectives, problems of persistently low-achieving students, teaching and learning fundamentals for each subgroup, and strategies specifically for addressing those needs. However, the applicant does not provide an example of the specific instrument used and evidence demonstrating the effectiveness of the instruction.

The applicant does present one method of analysis as the District Improvement and Assistance Plan, as an on-going tool that monitors teaching and learning progress. How the DIAP data is accessed and used to inform instruction and engage students was not discussed.

C1 (a) (iii) (iv) The applicant describes the implementation of blended learning, systematic and intentional design processes that will improve individualization, differentiated instruction and learning choices for students. By combining online and traditional instruction to personalize the way middle school students learn the applicant will build upon digital curriculum practices that exist within the adopted curriculum to enhance reflective learning choices.

C1(a) (v) The applicant presents a sufficient description of how students will master critical academic content and develop skills and traits as:

- Students will master Florida’s academic standards through the i3RLC program by having equitable access to customized approaches;
- Goal-setting and the delivery of instruction will be based on the students’ learning styles;
- Flexible content and themes based on critical academic lessons;
- Student driven participation in developing the learning process and critical thinking opportunities;
- Personal learning networks and learning communities to enhance teamwork and communication.

C 1 (b) (i) (v) The applicant does not explain how participating students will understand and access the appropriate instructional approach. For example, the applicant provided examples of evidence-based instructional interactions, such as gradually-released instruction, interdisciplinary teaching, cooperative learning, adaptive instruction, inquiry, lesson study observation, and team teaching/modeling using the coaching cycle. . Furthermore, an example of what interdisciplinary teaching or lesson study observation would look like in the participating school classroom was not presented.

The use of one to one devices will enable the implementation of blended and personalized learning. Personalized learning will extend beyond the classroom and school campus, transforming the traditional limitations to allow students to develop deeper more meaningful connections between standards and across content areas.

C1 (b) (ii) (iii) The applicant does not provide sufficient documentation for the criteria that support a high-quality plan that includes definitive approaches to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students. For example, science teachers collaborate to develop strategies and techniques for integrating digital technology in their lessons. A sample lesson was not provided to demonstrate content that reflects high quality instruction and personalization of

learning. The applicant indicated that digital and interactive learning already exists in math and science classroom in DCPS. However, access to classroom computers and computer labs are extremely limited.

C1 (b) (iv) Information for this section was limited. For example, students in the DCPS have the opportunity to master math and science curriculum using interactive online choices. The DCPS piloted i3RLC in a district high school with cohorts of students in Physical Education. The applicant provided an example of one cohort of students instructed using a blended curriculum. Data on the demographics of the cohort were not presented, therefore it was unclear whether the applicant addressed accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-needs students.

C) In an effort to clearly communicate academic performance and data, teachers conduct data chats with students. Current technology in place to support this process includes the Inspire platform which helps make real-time assessment and meaningful intervention discussions possible. However, the applicant does not describe specific mechanisms that are in place to provide training and support to students, thus ensuring that they understand how to use the tools and resources to track and manage their learning. More specifically, the access students have to the Inspire platform, form of training and level of supports were not provided.

Overall, the applicant does not present a high-quality plan that demonstrates thorough approaches to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students that will enable them to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college-and career-ready standards. For example,

- A description of parties responsible for implementing activities;
- Examples of deliverables-----lesson plans, instructional strategies, and how the student would actually be engaged in personalized learning beyond the classroom; and
- Process to ensure that all participating students have access to instructional strategies, resources, and activities.

Furthermore, the applicant does not thoroughly address the most at-risk participating students, student subgroups, SWD or ELL. In section C (i) and C (ii), the role of parents in supporting students is not addressed. Data connecting existing RTT teaching and learning initiatives outcomes and proposed RTT-D reforms identified in this section were not presented. This would be an opportunity for the applicant to discuss RTT-D strategies that are effective and can be built upon or remain the same. Therefore, the applicant's score for this section is 10.

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

20

10

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

C2 (a) (i) (ii) The applicant describes an approach to teaching and leading that will engage participating educators in training and PLC to effectively implement personalized learning environments as: District-wide instructional specialist, as well school level coaches will provide professional development. Professional development occurs during faculty meetings and/or common planning. Specialists review their assigned coaches' logs on a weekly basis and provide feedback. The applicant presents a process for professional development but does not provide examples of the types of workshops for ELL, SWD or high needs students.

a(iii) The applicant demonstrates an evaluation process for participating educators that is inclusive of feedback. For example, to address this section, the applicant indicates that learning must be active where students are challenged and engaged by meaningful rigorous activities, such as digital activities. Teachers will use assessments as learning tools to guide student reflection on progress. Real-time feedback will allow teachers to adapt curriculum and instruction to students individualized needs. Overall, the applicant presents statements on what students and teachers will do but does not thoroughly discuss the instructional students that will be used for all participating students and subgroups. Furthermore, the applicant does not address how teaching and learning in personalized environments will decrease the achievement gap and drop out rate, ensure all participating students are college and career ready.

a (iv) Teachers and administrators in DCPS are formally assessed using the Collaborative Assessment System for Teachers and the School Based Administrators' Performance Assessment, a value added model aligned with the districts strategic plan. Administrators are evaluated multiple times annually. Teachers also participate in the coaching model cycle consisting of: Pre-Conference, Modeling, Debriefing and Planning, Collaborating Teaching and Debriefing, and Observation and Feedback. The i3RLC project will engage teachers in training. Superintendent and Chief Academic Officer have direct input into principals and assistant principals evaluations.

C(b) (i, ii, iii) The information provided in this section is sparse. For example, the applicant indicates that initiatives and budge priorities were developed with a student-centric focus to ensure that high quality learning resources, processes, and tools are made available to match student needs. Secondly, teachers and students will be provided tools and resources to meet the demands of the state standards. However, the applicant does not provide detailed examples of high quality

instructional content and assessments that will be used, specific types of digital resources, instructional approaches, processes and tools to match students' individual needs. Lastly, a thorough description of actionable information that will help educators identify optimal learning approaches and individualize instruction was not presented.

C(c) (i,ii) The applicant presents the School Improvement plan as the guide used by school leadership teams and administrators for problem-solving and planning. The reflective component of i3RLC is significant in evaluating the success of students, educators, and support systems working to combine online and traditional instruction. The use of one to one devices will improve access to real time data, thus expediting the manner in which administrators and teachers can provide feedback or align instructional support to improve the quality of instructional delivery and student outcomes. However, the applicant does not discuss training system or practices that will be put in place to continuously improve progress in RTT-D reform areas such as, closing the achievement gap, decreasing the drop out rate, ELL, SWD and high-needs students. Also, the applicant did not describe how information from the teachers evaluation will help administrators and school leadership teams take continuous improvement actions in educator effectiveness, school culture and climate.

C(d) The applicant indicated that it is the priority of the DCPS to develop great educators and leaders by recruiting, employing, and retaining high quality diverse staff. Stipends and increased classroom support are offered to hard to staff schools and subject areas. In an effort to increase the number of effective and highly effective teachers and principals, priority schools receive precedence in the placement of academic coaches and instructional interventionist. the applicant does not discuss what each of the supports actually looks like in the school environment. Also, missing from the plan is a process for retaining effective and highly effective teachers and principals.

Overall, the evidence the applicant has presented for each of the sections lacks specific information to demonstrate the extent to which the RTT-D plan is of high-quality and would improve learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment. Therefore, the score for this section is 10.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	5
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>a) The applicant provide the DCPS Leadership Organizational Chart. The DCPS proposes to structure governance practices to ensure its mission of promoting educational excellence in every school, classroom, for every student, everyday. Structuring the Duval School District's policies, practices, and rules around student centered priorities aligns the daily work of the educators to provide high quality educational opportunities to prepare students for success in college or career. The Duval County Public School District has organized central office to support the implementation of the RTT-D initiatives in participating schools.</p> <p>b) The extent to which each participating school and leadership team assumes autonomy and flexibility over school schedules and calendars, personnel decisions, staffing models, school level budget is described as: the i3RLC will be implemented in all 28 participating middle schools in math and science. Technology will be infused to provide flexibility and autonomy that will advance each students individualized achievement goals. Participating school leadership teams will make informed decisions based on access to timely data. Teachers capabilities will be enhanced to support student needs and professional practice, students will receive information to set goals and participate in their education.</p> <p>c,d) Although, the applicant states that students will be provided with the information they need to set goals and participate in their education, a clear description of a process for students to earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic was not presented. Students will be able to work on digital devices with integrated software, tools and services at their own pace and space of mastery. The applicant does not provide a detailed procedure that will allow students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways.</p> <p>e) To provide students with learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible the applicant will integrate technology choices that provide individualized, fully accessible learning paths, and self-guided exploration options to participating students. A research based customized digital curriculum will be implemented to meet the individual students learning styles, strengths and needs. Overall, the applicant has provide adequate information to support criteria a-e, thus resulting in a score of 5.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	2

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

D2 (a,b) The extent to which the applicant demonstrates a infrastructure to support personalized learning to ensure that all participating students, teachers, parents, and administrators have access to necessary content, tools and learning resources is as follows:

- The Instructional Technology department will plan and design one to one transition to connect technology with meaningful instruction;
- Align professional development to be school based and job embedded; and
- i3RLC will be implemented in all 28 middle schools focusing on math and science.

Although, the applicant indicates that technology support for stakeholders is integrated within the district project management plan (located in appendix C) the information provided is sparse. For example, the applicant will provide technical support in and out of the classroom to students. Also, the applicant notes that students will be provided with information to set goals; parents will have the opportunity to be involved in the everyday process of their children; and instruction will become aligned and differentiated. The applicant does not describe the levels of technical support that will be available to participating parents, students, teachers and administrators.

c,d) The applicant proposes that teaching, learning, and data will be integrated using high-quality, research-based solutions that integrate formative assessment tools data management and reporting, instructional support, curriculum management, student and parent access, and educator development.

The school infrastructure is limited and does not fully support parents and students ability to export information in an open data format. For example, the current information system Genesis has not proved to be effective in meeting the needs of the district. More specifically, the applicant is unable to refine and update data to improve access and user functionality with real time data via enhanced features and interoperability.

Overall, this section does not include all the key components of a high quality plan; for example, the applicant clearly describes in criteria a, b, c, and d, areas of weakness in the infrastructure that will be addressethe RTT-D funding. However, a thorough explanation of parties responsible for implementing the reform initiatives was not discussed. Furthermore, the existing processes for exporting data are not accessible to parents and students. Therefore, the score for this section is 2.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>Although, the applicant describes the implementation of a continuous improvement feedback loop as the process for informing educators, administrators and the public on evaluation strategies and decisions related to RTT-D performance measures; it is unclear how this process demonstrates a high-quality plan. For example, the continuous improvement feedback loop includes a coaching model as an on-going guide, pre-conference, modeling, teaching, debriefing, observation and feedback for teachers. Furthermore, the applicant provides a model and description but not a timeline of professional development activities aligned to the RTT-D reform initiatives. For example, the applicant refers to technology as being integral to instruction but does not discuss the approach and type of professional development for participating teachers.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant has not presented sufficient evidence to describe key elements of a high quality plan. More specifically, the applicant does not provide a continuous improvement process plan in this section or the appendix. There was no evidence of a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve the applicant's RTT-D plan. The applicant does not discuss sustainability of the reforms and responsible parties. Lastly, the applicant does not describe processes that would ensure timely and regular feedback on RTT-D activities, professional development, technology, and staff. Therefore, the applicant's score for this section is 3.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant presented a list of internal and external stakeholders who will engage in a collaborative network to support, monitor and evaluate the RTT-D implementation project as: Duval Teachers United, PTA, Principals' Professional Learning Communities, and school level Advisory Council. The applicant also indicated that the DCPS strategic plan articulates a clear direction to all stakeholders regarding expectations and a process for executing the plan. However, the applicant did</p>		

not include a copy of the plan or cite excerpts, thus illustrating an alignment to the RTT-D proposal.

Overall, the applicant does not thoroughly explain how other partnerships, such as faith-based organizations, higher education institutions or health agencies as stakeholders will become engaged in the RTT-D communication process. Furthermore, the applicant does not provide sufficient evidence or a thorough description of a high-quality approach to ensure on-going communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. Therefore, the score for this section is 3.

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

5

2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

a) The applicant did not provide a rationale for selecting applicant-proposed measures.

b) Overall, the applicant does not describe how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan or theory of action. For example, the applicant identifies each performance measure on the i3RLC chart, rationale and evaluative process to review improvement.

Performance measure 1.3: The number of overall teacher turnover. The review performance evaluation was described as the principal and teacher evaluation systems (formative and summative) frequent support and Mentoring Induction for New Teachers (MINT). However, the preceding evidence does not address criterion b.

c) The applicant does not describe how the plan will review and improve the measure overtime. For example, the applicant presented a description of the process for evaluating the i3RLC program not the applicable population. Therefore, this criterion was not addressed.

Based on the lack of evidence presented to address criteria a, b, and c, the applicant has not demonstrated ambitious and achievable performance measures with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measure. Therefore, the applicant's score is 2.

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

5

3

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's approaches to rigorously evaluating the effectiveness of the RTT--D initiatives are:

- An external evaluator will be hired for i3RLC;
- Evaluation team of internal and external stakeholder will be formed;
- Formative and Summative evaluations will be prepared by the internal and external evaluation team; and
- Students and educators will respond to questions focusing on fidelity of the RTT-D initiatives, continuous improvement of academic performance and social/emotional engagement of students.

Overall, the applicant presents appropriate strategies, however the extent to which they will thoroughly evaluate the effectiveness of the RTT-D funded activities was not discussed. For example, the applicant will hire an external evaluator, a clear description of the role of the internal and external evaluation team is vague. Also, the applicant does not present a clear description of how the external evaluator will oversee the evaluation process, assessments, communication, and engagement of all stakeholders. Therefore, the evidence described does not fully support a high quality plan. The applicant's score is 3.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a, b, c) Overall, the budget submitted by the applicant includes budget tables and narratives. However, the applicant does not describe funding sources that will support and sustain the RTT-D project. More specifically, the budget tables do not reflect post-grant funds, funds allocated for one-time versus those to be used for on-going operational costs, and a description of external foundation supports for the reform initiatives.

Furthermore, the applicant does not provide information on in-kind contributions; and funds or resources from partnerships that will assist in ensuring on-going services to participating schools and participating students to sustain personalized

learning environments. However, the applicant does indicate that district funds and Qualified Zone Academy Bond (QZAB) would be used to support the reform initiatives. The applicant did not identify the funding amount from QZAB in the budget tables. In addition, on-going funds to support the RTT-D personnel after the funding cycle was not discussed in the budget narrative, thus impacting long-term sustainability of the reforms. Therefore, the evidence presented in the budget narrative to support and ensure sustainability of the RTT-D project is insufficient. Therefore, the applicant's score is 2.

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

10

4

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Duval County School District will use existing funding sources and Qualified Zone Academy Bond (QZAB) to help support implementation of the RTT-D initiatives. However, the applicant does not describe the sources of the existing funds. For example, the applicant does not explain funding sources that will maintain the on-going maintenance of equipment, licensing of curricular products, math and science coaches, technology specialist and project manager after the RTT-D grant cycle. Also, external funding sources, such as partnership in-kind contributions or private funds were not mentioned.

Although, budget tables were provided the applicant does not present a high-quality plan that addresses how evaluation improvements in productivity and outcomes will inform a post-grant budget and an estimated budget for the three years after the grant cycle. For example, the RTT-D budget tables delineate RTT-D reform expenditures but not post-grant funding to sustain reform initiatives. Based on the lack of evidence needed to ensure sustainability of the RTT-D reform initiatives, the applicant's score is 4.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	3

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

1. Overall, the applicant has identified several organizationThe applicant identified Individual Inspired Instruction for Reflective Learning Choice (i3RLC) as the collaborating partner to provide student and family support that will address the emotional, social, behavioral needs of participating students and participating schools with high-needs students, it is unclear whether i3RLC is a project or entity. The applicant does not provide background information on i3RLC, such as: past and present statistics, past and current clients, track record, etc. Also, the applicant describes the Department of Community and Family Engagement as the lead partner responsible for contacting community organizations or individuals to provide assistance to school principals and their staff who have identified specific needs.The applicant does not describe how i3RLC and the Department of Community and Family Engagement will work together to prevent duplication of services and provide specific support to each participating school, participating students and families.

The applicant provided an example of a successful partnership with the Raines Nation Partnership, a collaborative effort between Raines High School and the Jacksonville Resource Center of the Church of Jacksonville. Other partnerships include faith-based organizations, Blessings in a Bag, Boxes of Love Program, and the Christmas Angels.

2. The applicant identified three population -desired results for students in grades 6, 7, and 8 in the participating schools and the type of results and desired results that are aligned to the RTT-D reform proposal. For example, the applicant's goal is to expand and connect school and community referral and intervention systems for academic support; and improve quantitative and qualitative data sharing between students, parents, and the community to inform and respond to the needs and well-being of students.

3. (a) The applicant does not describe how the partnership will track the selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all participating students. For example, teachers will identify positive replacement behaviors and suggest evidence-based interventions and strategies. Behavior will be progress-monitored using actionable data to assist the engagement of parents in the educational experience and behavioral intervention process of their children. However, the applicant does not identify the partnership responsible for collecting and assessing data. Duval County School District will also facilitate the implementation of a Social and Emotional Learning (SEL) curriculum using a proactive framework at the school and classroom level in organizational structure, behavior of administrators, teachers, and support staff.

4. The applicant described the process to integrate education and other services to participating students within participating schools as : The Department of Community and Family Engagement oversees partnering community organizations with school principals and staff who have identified specific needs for students. However, the applicant does

not provide sufficient information on partnerships that currently exist in some of the participating middle schools and whether they will continue during the RTT-D funding cycle.

5. (a-e) The Duval County Public School District facilitates the initial meeting between community organizations and the school to monitor, support, and leverage sustainability of partnerships. The Duval School District will implement a Social and Emotional Learning curriculum. DCPS will also investigate a program that identifies the student's current level of social and emotional development through the application of a universal screening program. The school principal and staff will be responsible for identifying the needs of participating students or participating high-needs students and families.

The applicant does not discuss how data will be used to target resources in order to improve results for the following participating students: ELL, low-income, participating students, and students with disabilities. Furthermore, a detailed process to evaluate the effectiveness of the partnership in supporting the implementation of the RTT-D reform initiatives was not included in the RTT-D proposal.

Overall, the applicant presents three processes for securing partnerships for schools as: i3RLC, the Duval District, and the Department of Community and Family Engagement. Unless there is a clear process on how each of these entities will interface with one another, participating school principals and staff will be confused, thus affecting the implementation of the RTT-D initiatives. Also, organizations are encouraged to reach out to school principals directly to offer assistance and specific resources. The applicant does not describe an infrastructure for overseeing partnerships that will be involved in servicing the participating middle schools students. A process for evaluating the progress of the RTT-D initiatives was not presented.

6. The applicant identified type of results and desired results but does not present ambitious or achievable measures for the proposed population-level of participating students in grades 6, 7, and 8.

Although, the applicant identified several partnerships and the resources provided to specific schools, a description of how each would augment the schools' resources with additional student and family supports was not presented. The applicant did not identify any existing partnerships in the participating middle schools.

The information provided by the applicant does not support the extent to which the partnership will address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of participating students. Therefore, the score for this section is 3.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided general statements describing how the Duval County School District RTT-D proposal would address the four core educational assurances defined in the grant criteria. For example, the applicant discussed how the RTT-D reform initiatives would be implemented in areas, such as accelerating student achievement and deepening student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student; increasing the effectiveness of educators; decreasing achievement gaps across student groups; and increasing the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. Overall, the applicant presents a RTT-D reform proposal that will create learning environments. Therefore, Absolute Priority 1 was met.

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

