



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0059FL-2 for School Board of Sarasota 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>This application lacks a comprehensive and coherent reform vision.</p> <p>(a) No clear understanding of what this program entails - there was a lack of details around the four core educational assurances. They were listed and spoken about with definitions of what is being talked about but no plan to implement. CCSS were mentioned and implemented per state requirement but no vision of how to proceed forward.</p> <p>(b) No clear evidence of deepening student learning and increasing equity</p> <p>(c) Lack of details concerning specific classroom experiences that students will experience or can be identified.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This application has a weak approach to implementing its reform proposal that supports a weak quality plan.</p> <p>No evidence of the process for selecting schools but a mention of which school will participate</p> <p>A list of schools is listed with no other information available about selection criteria or how they were chosen</p> <p>No mention of high needs and a clear definition of what that means</p> <p>No evidence of the number of educators or students participating</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This is a weak quality plan with lack of evidence to meet the criteria. Not all components of a high quality plan were present.</p> <p>There is data and research cited with no connection to how the plan will move forward.</p> <p>Lack of a high quality plan that shows no evidence of how it is being scaled up and translated into meaningful reform</p> <p>No clear evidence or support for how this plan will reach its goals</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicants vision does not include a high quality plan and is not likely to result in improved student learning. Goals are weak and vague as to how they will be achieved. Goals are listed in a table and addressed but lacking the connection with the plan. These goals in the table are listed and data offered as to the expectation of what students will achieve but not a path or connection to this plan for the implementation or how these students will achieve these goals. This application speaks to implementing Common Core which has been adopted by the state and is being mandated regardless of a plan. Assessments are mentioned but not expanded upon. Formative assessments are mentioned with no clear plan or vision. AMP plan speaks to students, parents and administrators accessing data but is not specific as to what data will be accessible. There is a table with data but no clear explanation of where those numbers will be generated.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	5
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is a weak track record of success in this application.</p> <p>(a) There is a mention of student learning and closing the achievement gap with a mention of programs that have been or should be implemented with no clear connection of programs, plans, or student learning outcomes.</p> <p>(a) Project based learning and CTE being implemented is a strength of this section but with no connection to the plan and how students will access these programs. Also CTE frameworks includes quite a few number of programs and none of these are listed or spoken to.</p> <p>(a) Parent involvement programs and outreach are in place and operative which does not connect to this program but does speak to improving participation and services for students.</p> <p>(b) There is no mention of school reform of lowest-achieving schools which weakens this application criteria</p> <p>(c) There were Multi Tiered System of Support available to families with struggling students which speaks to closing the improvement gap and improving graduation rates indirectly</p> <p>(c) Data is available on all students that are being targeted according to their table which speaks to their ability to track student success</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>All information is available electronically through the web site and for multi lingual populations. This speaks to all salaries for all school personnel. Also there is a way of tracking non-personnel expenditures at the school.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district does not mention community support and therefore autonomy is not clearly supported.</p> <p>"The FDOE strongly encourages public schools to provide students...." is unclear and different programs in the community are mentioned but not tied to the implementation plan which does not speak to the autonomy of this district to implement this program.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	5
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Evidence of direct engagement is present but unclear and there is a lack of evidence of how this program is being received by the staff and at what rate.</p> <p>Which high schools are participating and have been contacted was unclear and lacks information</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	2
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This application has no clear proposal of a plan which makes this application difficult to assess based on these criteria.</p>		

AMP is mentioned with little details as to exactly what is being implemented. There is research quoted in this section to support justification for the criteria with no clear pathway back to exactly what is being implemented.

No evidence of specific CTE programs which are wide and varied.

No evidence of how this will be implemented and which students these programs will be made available to

Digital content is mentioned but not specific and unclear as to the connection of what is being implemented

Lack of evidence of individual student data or any way that student performance will be improved

Mechanisms are mentioned but not expanded on and what the mechanisms are and what they are connected to in the program are unclear with no evidence

learning environments are commented on but not expanded upon which means that there is no clear vision of how each learning environment is going to be improved upon or any connection with student skills

What program is being implemented is vague and unclear and difficult to understand

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	0
--	-----------	----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
The answer is vague with no specifics as to the trainings or the evaluation system		
The answers to each question is non-existent or too vague to assign a score		

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:		
Flat management structure is vague and not specific or tied to any program or implementation		
No evidence of providing school leadership teams or their sufficiency		
Monthly meetings mentioned but lack of evidence of vision for these meetings		
Lack of evidence for students getting multiple opportunities and comparable opportunities for mastery		
Lack of evidence for learning resources and instructional practices and no evidence to tie it to the program		
This description is too vague to connect with any of the criteria listed with a vague mention of items not tied to the program		

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	1
---	-----------	----------

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
This plan is a weak quality plan which is lacking comprehensive policies and infrastructure to provide every student, educator, with the support needed.		
(a) Content tools are mentioned with no specific connection to students, parents or stakeholders and how they will have access to necessary content or tools to support implementation of this plan.		
(b) Access to technology and data is mentioned but not expanded upon which lacks clarity and how and what program is being implemented		
(c) Technical support lacks evidence but is mentioned. There is no tie to any of these criteria to a specific program.		
(d) Data system mentioned but not expanded on which lacks clarity as to how or what this program's vision is. There is no specifics that ensure the LEAs and schools are using connected data systems.		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	2
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Improvement plan lacks detail and specifics and is not clear as to what program is really being implemented or how it is connected to students, parents, teachers, principals or community.</p> <p>There is a mention of a plan but nothing specific that ties to any of the criteria for the four core concepts.</p> <p>There is no rigor or continuous improvement process mentioned in order to meet the need of the application.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Communication mentioned for district but not community members. The reference to CTE is vague with no specific programs mentioned or tied to the plan.</p> <p>Lack of plan for engagement other than mentioning it</p> <p>This program lacks clearness of purpose. There is nothing to suggest that the plan can be implemented or what exactly the plan entails. There is vague data available with no clear means of ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Vague comment on integrating improving outcomes. None of these items is addressed with any kind of clearness. The program itself is vague and how it ties to each of these outcomes is mentioned but not expanded upon which leaves the question of implementation. Without a clear goal for any of these criteria there is no implementation that connects the goal to the outcome.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Without a clear plan and what implementation looks like, it is difficult to evaluate this plan as rigorous or highly qualified. There is a vague outline of a plan and a mention of the four core areas.</p> <p>Formative and summative assessment listed but not specified with goals which does not speak to professional development and activities that will employ technology.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	3
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Applicant did not identify all funds that will support this project. The budget is vague which weakens this application.</p> <p>Vague referral to programs in the budget shows that the program has been thought out in order to implement this program but with no specifics as to how the money will support the program since the program is vague. Brief referral to CTE and STEM which could be any number of programs is vague with no connection as to a plan to implement CTE or STEM.</p> <p>No identification of one-time investments versus ongoing operational costs or a clear budget narrative that lacks specifics.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	1

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The sustainability plan presented was a weak quality plan and did not meet the criteria.

There is a mention of support from State and local government leaders with nothing stated as to how the applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments or use this data to inform future investments. There is no mention of evaluation of improvements in productivity and outcomes to inform post-grant budget or anything about the three years after the term of the grant.

Sustainability is mentioned but lacks evidence except behavioral goals and connections. This entire plan is vague and unclear as to exactly what is being implemented and how students, parents, teachers and principals will connect it to student growth.

There is a vague idea about connecting this plan to the four core areas with no evaluative improvement plans or how outcomes of the program will inform students or teachers about progress. Not plan for three years after the term of the grant.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Partnerships are made available and clear but not in depth. letters of partnership and support are a form letter lacking specifics.

The program and outcomes were vague with no clear high quality plan. The program was unclear as to what was being achieved and how the tracking was going to occur in the program.

No baseline data for many of the sections being tracked which is unclear how they will now be tracked and a lack of mention of this specific plan to get the needed data

Deliverables are vague and unclear and what the program hopes to accomplish is not addressed or exactly how the program hopes to accomplish the goals is missing.

No clear connection between program and implementation and data supporting the project which leaves this program lacking clarity, rigor, and an implementation process.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

This program was not clear and concise or connected to the implementation of the four core areas.

No data to support their goals or vision was a clear indication of a lacking plan to implement and exactly what was being implemented was unclear.

Total	210	49
--------------	------------	-----------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0059FL-3 for School Board of Sarasota County, FL

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is no reform vision - the applicant only states what they are currently doing or what has been done in the past. The issues that need reform are not discussed, nor is any vision on how to reform those issues.</p> <p>There is no evidence of a comprehensive and coherent reform vision, therefore (a), (b) and (c) are indeterminable. There is no evidence of a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement through personalized support</p> <p>The applicant discusses work in the area of education, but does not include information or evidence on how the project will reform the educational process</p> <p>There is a small amount of evidence describing the personalized learning for students and teachers, including CTE and small learning communities</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Since there is no reform vision, it is difficult to determine the extent to which the approach will support high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation.</p> <p>(a) There is no description of <i>how</i> the schools selected were chosen - only a list of the schools</p> <p>(b) There is a list of the schools that will participate - however, since there is no reform vision it is not possible to assess its affect on such</p> <p>(c) The total number of participating students from low-income facilities, who are high-need students and participating educators, however, however, since there is no reform vision it is not possible to assess its affect on such</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant cites much research regarding "blended learning" but does not explain how their proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform district-wide. It is still unclear exactly what the applicant is proposing to do. There is no evidence of a high-quality plan, which 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.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The charts reflect the annual goals of the LEA itself, with no indication of how the project would affect these outcomes. If these are the goals that are in place regardless of whether or not the RTT-D grant is awarded, it is unclear how the project would increase learning and performance for students. There is no evidence of ambitious yet achievable goals 		

- The achievement gaps goals are also those of the LEA that are in place regardless of the project. Again, what effect will the project have on these goals?
- Again, graduation rates for the LEA are listed, but there is no mention of how the project would have an impact on them.
- The college enrollment data is non-responsive due to not having any baseline data.

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	2
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>While the application lists programs that are going to be implemented or have been implemented, it does not provide any evidence that they have made any difference or have advanced student learning.</p> <p>There is no clear record of success for the past four years presented - including descriptions, charts or graphs or raw student data. The programs are listed, and the applicant tells about how the district is regarded highly by the FDOE and state, but no record of success is presented.</p> <p>Although high school graduation rates are stated as having increased by 7% from last year, there is no information for the past four years, so it is not possible to determine if there is a clear record of success</p> <p>There is no evidence of ambitious and significant reforms in lowest-performing schools - in fact the applicant seems to indicate that they do not have any low performing schools</p> <p>Student performance data is provided to parents and students, and low income families can get assistance with this by obtaining a computer for their home.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is evidence of a high level of transparency in LEA investments, including making available to the public, via website, actual school-level expenditures broken down by instructional support, pupil support and school administration. The minimum requirements are met. However, LEA processes, practices and investments were not discussed.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	4
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is evidence that the LEA has autonomy to implement lessons and curriculum, but since the applicant has not included what the personalized learning environments will look like or given details on the implementation of the personalized learning environment, it is not possible to determine if they would have the autonomy to implement it.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	3
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is no evidence that students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools were engaged in the development of the proposal how the proposal was revised based on their engagement and feedback. Instead, the applicant discusses how the process was conducted to write the RTTT grant, which does not satisfy all of the requirements. Nor does that process substitute for the required process for RTT-D.</p> <p>The only letters of support are from 3 high school principals - there is no evidence of letters of support from such key stakeholders as parents and parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, tribes, the business</p>		

community, civil rights organizations, advocacy groups, local civic and community-based organizations, and institutions of higher education.

There is no evidence of direct engagement and support for the proposal from teachers in participating schools.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	5

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- There is no evidence that the proposal would engage and empower students or that students would understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals. Rather they would be told what they were going to do and when they were going to do it.
- There is no evidence that students will be involved in deep learning experience or be able to choose areas of academic interest
- There is no evidence that students would have access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning
- While there is a small amount of evidence that students would be able to master critical academic content through blended instruction and direct instruction, the proposal does not state any evidence that students will develop skills and traits such as goal-setting, teamwork, perseverance, critical thinking, communication, creativity, and problem-solving;
- While there is some evidence that students will receive a personalized sequence of instructional content through CTE centered curriculum, there is no evidence that skill development designed to enable the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals, because there is no evidence that students have set individual learning goals or been involved in the process.
- There is evidence of a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments, including blended learning, online learning, and direct instruction
- While digital and blended contents were discussed, it is not clear how high-quality they are as details, references, etc. were not included. It is also not clear whether or not they are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements
- There is no evidence of ongoing and regular feedback, including, at a minimum—
 - Frequently updated individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice), or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice); and
 - Personalized learning recommendations based on the student’s current knowledge and skills, college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice), and available content, instructional approaches, and supports
- Accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements is not discussed
- There is no evidence that mechanisms are in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	0
--	-----------	----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

There is no evidence of a high quality plan for this criteria. The applicant has included only two short paragraphs to address this criteria, giving examples of teacher professional development already in place and a very vague description of professional development that will happen if the plan is implemented. The applicant was non-responsive to this criteria.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score

(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	0
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is no evidence of a high quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure. A high quality plan means a plan that 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.</p> <p>There are only a few short paragraphs to address this criteria, and they do not provide evidence of a high quality plan.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	2
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There is no evidence of a high quality plan, which 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, in regard to support of project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure.</p> <p>There are only two short paragraphs to address this criteria, and rather than discuss all of the required criteria they discuss technology systems already in place within the district.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	2
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Although the response involves a statement that the concept currently in place for the state of Florida will be used for the iLearn project, there are no details as to how this might work.</p> <p>There is no evidence of a high-quality plan, which 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.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Although the applicant discusses that an advisory board will be formed to identify external stakeholders and provide guidance, there is no plan for the implementation of engaging stakeholders or how their feedback will be used to improve the program</p> <p>The career pathways counselor will provide information to students and parents, but details about how feedback from this process will be solicited and used for improvement are missing.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The performance measures are missing data in some places, including baseline data and may be redundant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • performance measures 1 and 2 appear to be the same performance measure, but with different numbers • there is no baseline data available for performance measure 4 • there is no baseline data available for performance measure 5 - SWD and ED • performance measures 11 and 13 do not contain baseline data <p>While some of these measures are ambitious yet achievable, there is no evidence of the following required components of this criteria:</p>		

- (a) Its rationale for selecting that measure;
- (b) How the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern; and
- (c) How it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

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

5

1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

There is no evidence of a high quality plan, which 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.

The applicant merely provides information on the tasks that an external evaluator will perform, without the components of a high-quality plan.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

- The budget does not show evidence of all funds that will support the project
- The budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the proposal - it is sufficient to cover salaries and benefits and provide technical and equipment for the implementation
- There is no evidence of external funds that will be used to support the implementation of the proposal
- Funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs were not identified

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

10

2

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

- There is no evidence of a high-quality plan, which 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.
- The applicant only discusses technology that is already in place in the schools and how it will be used in the future, as well as a brief discussion about contacting stakeholders in the community

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

- There is a brief description of the partnership that would be formed with the Connections 4 Healthy Students Initiative, which already serves students in the schools and specifically high-needs students. This partnership would not provide any services to students that they do not already have access to through the initiative
- While 2 population-level performance measures were listed, there is no baseline data available for SWD or ED students

- (3) There is no evidence presented in the application for this criterion
- (4) There is no evidence presented in the application for this criterion
- There is no evidence of how the partnership would build on the capacity of staff, create a decision-making process or engage stakeholders
- There is no evidence that shows how the applicant would Identify its annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population-level and describe desired results for students

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant fails to coherently and comprehensively address how it will build on the core assurance areas. None of the applicants responses are in the form of a high-quality plan, which 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.

It is unclear whether or not students have a part in the personalization of their learning, based on their interests.

Evidence presented in performance measures is non-responsive in many places as there is no baseline data provided.

College-and-career ready standards and graduation requirements are not discussed in the application, state ESEA requirements and how the applicant will meet or surpass those requirements are not discussed.

There is no evidence of accelerated learning, how the project will expand student access to the most effective educators.

Closing of achievement gaps was not discussed.

Absolute priority 1 was not met.

Total	210	40
--------------	------------	-----------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0059FL-4 for School Board of Sarasota County, FL

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	2

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant provide a general description of activities related to two of the four RTTD core educational assurances: data systems that measure student growth and inform educators how to improve instruction and their early implementation of the state's teacher and administrator evaluation systems.

They propose that a RTTD grant will build on these initiatives to provide high school students with personalized learning environments. Their approach will be guided by two strategic elements: ensuring post-secondary readiness and creating a CTE centered curriculum.

Weaknesses

They failed to address this criteria to any extent by not:

- Articulating a clear and coherent reform vision for a RTTD funded program,
- Documenting how a RTTD project would build upon core educational reforms recently adopted by the county as a result of Florida's RTTT roll out, especially standards that would prepare students for career and college and (in Sarasota Cty) close a significant achievement gap since no school in the county is low-performing.

Stating two strategic elements for a project does not constitute a district-wide vision that guides program goals and stakeholder buy-in. The approach to develop iLearn was not clearly described or fleshed out.

No description of envisioned classroom or out of school experiences for teachers and students participating in personalized learning environments was provided.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant listed the 5 comprehensive high schools that will participate and noted that 1,600 of the "almost 10,000" students are high need based on their lack of proficiency in reading. School demographics for the 5 schools was provided in the required table showing totals for students, teachers and delineating numbers of high need students

Weakness

The applicant did not describe their approach to implementing their proposed reform to develop an iLearn initiative in support of personalized learning with enhanced C&T curriculum to increase career and college readiness.

Nor did they describe the process for selecting the 5 participant schools.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The district suggested that their theory of change for implementing iLearn and the associated blended learning strategies are grounded in research.

They further recognize for district wide change to be realized, the reforms must be extended to earlier grades.

Weakness

However, the applicant did not provide a high quality plan (as defined – Goals, objectives, rationale, timeline, responsible party, etc.) that describes how the proposed reforms will be scaled up and translated into district-wide change beyond the 5 comprehensive schools.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	2
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

General reference to ESEA targets in that FL's ESEA waiver allows for decreases by half the percentage of non-percentage students by 2016-17. HS math EOC data for overall and by sub group provided with 2 years baseline and four year plus post grant projected. Growth targets are reasonable. HS EOC comparison by subgroup against white student performance (closing the gap) also included.

Weakness

Applicant did not address this criteria to the extent required. Student growth tables that were presented - grades 3 and 8 were not relevant to the identified student population. Also, 10th grade FCAT reading not shown, relevance for HS EOC math not explained and no EOC English shown. EOC Math gap sub-group comparison did not have 2011-12 baseline data.

The applicant did not demonstrate how their project goals (of which none have been stated) and student growth targets relate back to the district's vision of how this RTTD project will improve student learning, increase equity that equal or exceed state ESEA targets. Data presented did not indicate equivalence to current ESEA ratings.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	8
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(b) Applicant describes in some detail the numerous improvement programs and strategies that have documented success in advancing student learning (Gradual Release, Differentiated Instruction, inquiry- based science supported by technology). The fact that the school district is the fourth highest performing in the state indicates that the professional development and focus on rigorous academics is achieving successful outcomes for most students.</p> <p>The district's CTE program is noteworthy as is their articulation agreements with local colleges. This comprehensive focus on career and college and real-life connections through career pathways, in both middle and high school, demonstrates a commitment to reforms that support student learning.</p> <p>(c) Parents and students are provided numerous and very available avenues for accessing multiple sources of student performance data that not only informs but encourages active participation. The on-line grade book, information nights, night media programs and parent training are examples. Most impressive is the understanding that some homes may not have ready access to on-line information. Through a community foundation, computers and low-cost internet connection provided to families in need.</p> <p>Weakness</p> <p>(a) HS data was limited to EOC rates and HS graduation data was not provided for all sub-groups (ELL, ED, Asian). Since HS students are the target population in this proposal, it is difficult to determine the extent to which the reforms described demonstrate a record of success in advancing student learning and increase equity in learning for all students.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district achieves a significant level of transparency in their LEA investments and complies with Florida's Funding Accountability Act by annually posting Comprehensive and Superintendent Financial reports on their website. District and school level financial expenditures are compared to state level expenditures and broken down by categories for teachers, administration, special programs, etc. Both the district and the state have policies in place that require the release of per-pupil investments and school level expenditures. The attachment showed that "educator salaries for all instructional staff" is released annually. A 2011-12 financial report was included in appendices.</p> <p>Weakness</p> <p>However, as required by the criteria, teacher and instructional salaries/benefits were listed in aggregate, but not shown as "teacher only" and "instructional staff only."</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	3
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district stated that the state and FDOE grant local autonomy for the design, adoption and implementation of state-wide initiatives such as RTTT, Common Core or LIIS standards.</p> <p>Weakness</p> <p>Specific examples of written statutory or regulatory requirements was not provided that must exist in state education code.</p>		

The state's RTTT application and subsequent state rules should have policy statements that grant autonomy to local school districts, but these have not been included.

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

15

5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant suggested that district and school-based personnel have been engaged in the roll out and development of the district's RTTT components. The district stated that CTE experts from C&I and local technical institute met to plan a program focused on expanding opportunities for post-secondary success. Principals in the partner schools were consulted and submitted letters of support.

Weakness

The extent to which meaningful stakeholder support and input into proposed program design was sought from students, families, teachers and meaningful stakeholders (like local business) was not provided.

No discussion that the local teacher union/association rank and file members at the high schools were included, had opportunities for input or had knowledge of the proposed RTTD project.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	6

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The iLearn project is generally described as a program designed to increase "every" student's post-secondary readiness. The applicant outlined a conceptual framework for the learning model that includes:

- students working on a single project-based assignment within the core and CTE classes tailored to their interests,
- Instruction supplemented with a blended on-line curriculum
- On-line supplemental support that individualizes student instruction

Conceptually, this approach to learning could potentially assist students to (Learning selection criteria):

- Identify and pursue learning and development goals that link to career ready standards,
- Be involved in deep learning experiences and areas of academic interest
- Master academic content through real-world experiences
- Have access to digital learning content and resources that can accessed anywhere at all times.

Weakness

This criteria was minimally addressed.

No context was provided as to the current leaning environment and challenges faced by students to access a rigorous course of study aligned to career and college readiness standards, meet learning growth targets when underachieving or have access to learning supports that make accommodations to meet learner needs.

No evidence that teachers, students or their families had input into the iLearn concept or design.

No discussion as to how the new CTE curriculum and blended learning interface with current courses of study that are typically provided by comprehensive high schools. State that "all" students will be engaged with no indication as to how learning will be individualized to provide a "personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development enabling students to graduate on time college and career-ready." The mechanisms to provide training and support to students to be active partners and access the blended learning tools and resources was not discussed.

The curriculum is to be developed by teachers using in-place pacing guides, but no indication as how teacher capacity (other than training) will be monitored to ensure the quality, rigor and relevance of the core content modules.

No high-quality plan was provided to explain how the roll-out of iLearn will be sequenced – e.g teacher training, units written for each core subjects, reviewed for quality and rigor, piloted, revised and eventually implemented “schoolwide.”

Changing a whole school instructional delivery model is a massive undertaking requiring careful management of personnel, vertical and horizontal articulation of content, pedagogy, instructional materials and resource support. No high-quality plan was provided to indicate how Sarasota Cty is prepared to be successful with this project.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	1
--	-----------	----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant acknowledged that teachers will need intensive training in instructional strategies, on-line learning, project-based learning and curriculum development.

Weakness

The applicant failed to address this selection criteria to the extent that they demonstrated specific actions, tools, resources and training for teachers and leaders to be effective in personalizing student's personalized learning environments and enable participating students to pursue a rigorous course of student aligned to career and college ready standards.

They mentioned that teachers would be provided training but did not describe which teachers would be trained (beyond stating “all teachers”), who would provide the training, or the content or focus of the training. Measures to determine the effectiveness or capacity of the teachers to deliver the CTE curriculum or support individualized student learning goals and college and career readiness was not described.

Further, evidence or description were not provided for how the sub-criteria would be addressed, such as (to cite a few):

- Supports for effective iLearn implementation of personalized learning environments ensuring students graduate on time college and career ready (a core project element)
- Frequently measure student progress towards meeting college and career standards
- Use of data to inform student progress and improvement of educator practice
- Provision of high quality learning resources, instructional content and assessments
- Use of information generated by the district’s teacher evaluation system that helps school leaders to improve individual and collective teacher effectiveness.

No high-quality plan was provided to illustrate the sequence and roll-out for building and monitoring teacher and leader effectiveness to design the curriculum and learning units, then deliver them and assess if teachers improved instruction and increased their capacity to support student progress toward meeting college and career ready standards.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) (b)The district acknowledges limited central office staff and additional burdens of the project on school administrators by establishing a project governance structure supported with RTTD funds. The proposed chain of command and accountability shown in the organization chart and described provides levels of both accountability, access to resources and sufficient school-based autonomy over decisions that impact daily school operations. These conditions are supported by a scaffold of structures starting with the in-school iLearn Project Facilitator who facilitates the iLearn School Leadership team. These individuals report both to their principals and to the central office iLearn Project manager. Who in turn is responsible to Central office High School and CTE directors all who serve on the iLearn Advisory Board.

The opportunity for teachers to step into iLearn school-based leadership roles, further enhances the connections to school-based needs, culture and knowledge of student learning needs and supports.

Weakness

No high-quality plan was provided to show goals, rationale, deliverables and identified personnel to support project implementation that delivers resources where they are needed to demonstrate individualized mastery of standards and content.

(c) (d) One statement made reference to student being able to demonstrate mastery of standards but no further description or details were provided in the narrative.

(e) The statement that iLearn ensures full accessibility to students needing accommodations was not supported by evidence or described in detail as to how the project will facilitate this student sub-group access to personalized learning supports.

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

10

4

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Sections c and d of this criteria were addressed. The applicant states that through the LIIS system stakeholders (students, families, school staff) can readily access learning resources and progress reports exported through an open access format. Technical support is available through an on-line Help system.

The applicant acknowledges that RTTD grant funds will be allocated to enhance the interoperability of data systems – full connectivity to the LIIS system allowing ready access to HR, electronic gradebook, educator evaluation, curriculum resources and PD.

Weakness

A high-quality plan was not provided to show how access to technology would enhance access to learning supports.

Sections a and b of this criteria were insufficiently discussed. While the applicant provided a list of digital tools and mentioned that technology was available in every classroom and teachers were provided summer IT refresher courses, this information did not indicate the specific nature or kind of support for individualized learning that these digital tools provided to students and parents. Only school-based supports were mentioned. Digital programs provide opportunities for 24/7 access to learning. Discussion of these opportunities was lacking.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	3

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant partially addresses this criteria by indicating the district employs the FDOE continuous improvement model that aids districts in focusing on measurable objectives to monitor instruction and improvement. Additionally, the LIIS will provide teachers and administrators and presumably project staff ready access to key performance indicators of student performance and career/behavioral outcomes.

The district also intends to secure the services of an external evaluator who will regularly collect data and generate progress reports.

Weakness

The required high-quality plan was not included to outline how timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and interim checkpoints will occur to facilitate mid-point corrections and share information that the RTTD investments in professional development, technology and project management are achieving the desired results.

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

5

1

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant partially met this requirement by indicating that:

- Regular group meetings would occur between project staff who would also participate in district leadership meetings.
- Principals will be tasked with sharing information with staff and the school community via school newspapers and e-mails.
- An iLearn advisory board will be established with stakeholder representatives.
- The project staff will have responsibilities to develop communication strategies and materials to be shared with students, families and important stakeholders.

Weakness

No high quality plan was presented to provide the rationale, specific activities, timelines, deliverables and responsible parties to ensure that ongoing, relevant and accessible to all audiences information is communicated about project purpose, goals and achievements.

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

5

1

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant listed 13 performance measures that addressed the required categories including a math indicator for each participant high school. Some measures met the criteria of presenting available baseline data for targeted population "overall" and ED and ELL students.

Four year targets plus post grant appear to be ambitions yet reasonable indicating ranges of 3-5% points of anticipated gain.

Weakness

The applicant failed to provide any description of a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improving their plan. In addition, as required, the applicant did not describe their:

- Rationale for selecting the measure (beyond those required),
- Approach as to how the measure would provide formative information tied to the theory of action, and
- Strategy to review and revise the measure if not sufficient to gauge progress.

Baseline data was not provided for PM 11 and 13. "Highly effective" and "effective" teachers and administrators was mislabeled.

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

5

2

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant partially met this requirement by stating that the project would engage the services of an external evaluator. They further provided four research questions, suggested possible data sources that "may" include both formative and summative student results, surveys, training sign-in sheets and interview findings as well as LIIS provided information such as linking student achievement to teacher professional development. They specified that regular formative and summative reports would be produced to present findings.

Weakness

The applicant failed to present a high-quality evaluation plan that outlined a comprehensive and rigorous evaluation design to evaluate the effectiveness of the district's RTTD project.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In line with criteria, an overall budget was submitted with project budgets for program management in each of the five participant high schools.

The project level management budget provided adequate rationale and reasonable costs for project staff, travel, etc. necessary to successfully manage a grant of this scale. The level of effort assigned to the external evaluator is very appropriate for a project this size.

The school-based project level budgets appropriately includes stipends for substitutes and teacher extra-duty pay for teachers to participate in planning, training and curriculum design. They also realize full-time project support in a project facilitator and technical support liaison is necessary to ensure fidelity of implementation.

Weakness

Funds allocated for one-time investment versus continuing were not specified. Nor whether any additional funds (all funds) such as external foundation support, State or other federal funds would be available to support the project.

Also not provided in the school-level project budgets are the number of faculty and students in order to determine if the personnel salaries and equipment and supply costs are accurate and realistic based on school size.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

It is feasible that the one-time investment in human capital and technology will result in building a lasting infrastructure for Sarasota Cty.

Weakness

A high-quality plan for sustaining the project's goals and evaluating the effectiveness of investments (past and future) and how to evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes to inform a post-grant budget was not included.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

Sarasota County plans to dovetail the resources and supports provided by their Schools and Mental Health systems grant to support the social, emotional and behavioral student needs. The grant created a coalition of 15 community organizations with the collective purpose of fostering linkages between service providers and the schools.

Two performance measures were provided for risky behaviors that the district intends to address – decrease absenteeism and out-of-school suspensions for all students and SWD and ELL students.

Weakness

Since this grant was awarded in 2010, no performance documenting results and providing verification of impact on reducing student's risky behaviors was included.

The target measures for the four grant years seem to be less than ambitious - .5 percent decrease in student absence from school. Base line data was incomplete.

No discussion was offered for how the district intends to integrate the Connections grant and RTTD project to offer wrap-around services to students and their families or scale a viable model beyond the grant period.

No description was offered as to how the "partnership" would build staff capacity to:

- assess student needs,
- align community resources to address those needs,
- create a decision-making process to identify, offer and evaluate services provided to address individual needs,
- engage student families in decision-making or meeting family needs, and

- routinely assess program's impact on student's and their family's challenges.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This proposal, while well-intentioned, did not provide convincing evidence that the Sarasota County school district has a thoughtful and strategic plan to execute a RTTD project. They failed to provide base line data for problem's to be addressed in the targeted high schools or trend data to document a strong record of reform. Further, there was no evidence, beyond principal support letters, that teachers, students, their families or key stakeholders had knowledge of or opportunities to provide input into the crafting of the project design, intended outcomes or approaches to achieving the grant's purpose – to demonstrate how the district planned to personalize education for all students in the targeted schools.</p> <p>While the applicant cited research about the benefits and best approaches that would create personalized learning environments designed to significantly improve teaching and learning, they did not provide convincing evidence of a clear, coherent approach or a clear vision for the project.</p> <p>The proposal did not provide information or specific strategies for their approach to coherently and comprehensively addressing the four core required elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · preparing students to meet college and career ready standards through exposure to aligned curriculum and assessments, · building a robust data system that would measure student growth against the new standards and seamlessly connect to the state's emergent educator effectiveness reporting systems, · recruit and retain effective educators · support low-performing schools, or in Sarasota, provide the necessary tools, resources and supports to close the achievement gap among the comprehensive high schools sub groups. 		
Total	210	59