



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1073NY-1 for Board of Cooperative Educational Services of Ulster County

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The reform vision discusses work in the four core assurance areas. Under the Common core area students will delve into areas that are of interest with the goal of creating an Inquiry Project. As choice is mentioned, a student working with a teacher on an area of interest is evidence that learning will be deepened. This will also create an opportunity for a personalized learning path.</p> <p>The robust data system will allow access by teachers and parents.</p> <p>Teacher development is provided by means of a summer institute. It was unclear if this was for all teachers, pilot teachers or volunteers.</p> <p>Although the turn around school does not fit the federal definition, the characteristic listed for a turn around school would result in a high performing environment. This would be evidenced by good attendance, excitement about learning, a comfortable place, learning centers and an environment that improved education by teacher to different learning modalities.</p> <p>The vision is coherent in that it is focused on the assurance areas and feasible by not being massive in its approach.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The approach to implementation is feasible since it targets middle school students in a six district, ten middle school program. This group qualifies as low income since the poverty rate is at 60% for the consortium.</p> <p>The number of teachers involved are listed.</p> <p>The process of selecting schools was rather simple in nature as it was a discussion among instructional leaders in the area. It was evident that these districts have similar economic problems based on the unemployment rate for the area,</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Plans to scale up the project are described. Internal capacity is developed by creating lead teachers who move toward facilitation. The project teacher classrooms become models, open for visitation. The final phase is where a school becomes a model site for the region and beyond. Leaders will share their experiences at a regional conference.</p> <p>Students will create a presentation of their work and present it to various groups in the school community.</p> <p>Principals will present on their findings.</p> <p>Short, medium and long term goals are listed. Long term goals look at improved achievement, narrowed gaps, more students on track for colleges or careers and students who complete high school and have success in the workforce or college. Some of those goals may be hard to define and the collection of data could be an issue.</p>		

The logic and theory of change is weak in this section. The connection to harder assessments with the common core and a shift to higher order thinking skills was undocumented.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Goals in literacy, math, science and social studies are based on state or end of course assessments.

A 10% increase in assessment scores for low income over the term of the grant is shown in the tables. A figure of 5% is used for all students. The reasoning for using these percentages is limited. Statewide data was not included so it was hard to see the connection between the baseline data and the goals used for achievement and closing gaps.

Graduation data is listed but since this is targeted at middle school, good data would not be available until year 3.

College enrollment data is not yet available.

The details of the data items was skeleton in nature. Baseline data for middle school science and social studies will be collected in the first months of the project. College enrollment data is not yet available. Plans will be made to create a system to collect this information.

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	7

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Ulster BOCES has participated in a number of grants over the past four years. Successes include Teaching American History Grants, federal Technology Literacy Challenge Funds, State Learning Technology Grants, TELL grants and a e3 grant. The grants are numerous but there was no data to support how the grants improved student achievement in the region. Data was provided on the TELL grant that showed more teachers integrated technology into lessons and their familiarity with technology increased.

The BOCES is working with a district on school-based cultures to strengthen capacity in the common core.

The BOCES also has a Bilingual Education Center and a principal leadership academy.

Student performance data was not presented in this part of the narrative. There was no description of how the BOCES has helped close achievement gaps or improve student achievement.

Nothing in the narrative described how the BOCES worked with persistently lowest achieving schools.

There was no mention of having data available to students, educators and parents.

An assumption is made that the BOCES is not directly responsible for sections a, b or c, however a statement from the partner schools would provide data on this section.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Data for this section is available on a web site managed by the New York State Empire Center. It includes individual salary data for public employees.

The individual school districts are required to break out and report expenses in the areas of administration, program and capital. These reports are mailed to the community. The other data is available and the process to gain access was described.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The lead agency supports a number of state and regional initiatives. The BOCES is authorized by law to assist its member schools in teacher and leader practice and student outcomes. This agency also keeps track of certifications and provides staff certification reports to the districts. The BOCES has a contract for the state Longitudinal Data System which is part of the statewide RTTT grant.

The BOCES has provided training to districts on the New York's teacher evaluation system. This includes connecting teacher and principal evaluations to student performance.

The vision did not address accelerated learning or gaining credit via mastery rather than seat time.

Although the ability to handle the personalized learning environment was not discussed, there is evidence to show that the BOCES has the capability to handle the project. The BOCES is offering Common Core workshops, provides technical assistance for principal and teacher evaluations, provides technology integration training and is involved with the state's process of linking teacher performance and student achievement.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	3
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Specific meaningful stakeholder engagement for this proposal does not exist. Instead it "...grew out of meaningful work over time." Soliciting feedback from students was discussed but it was not specifically done for the development of the proposal. Instead comments from summer sessions and the use of technology to deliver content was used as input in grant development.

There is evidence that teachers were at least exposed to the grant in most of the districts, by signatures on Memorandums of Understanding. The Hyde Park District lacked a teacher union signature and no explanation was offered. A critical piece of the grant is linking student achievement to teacher evaluations. Since New York is a collective bargaining state, the signatures of Teacher Union or Association Leaders is imperative.

There was no evidence that 70% of the teachers in each district supported the plan.

A comment in the grant--"the collective bargaining units in each district have given our approach to this grant their full support." This is an indication that the teachers of each district had little input into the grant proposal development. This along with the lack of evidence showing a 70% support by the teaching staff could lead to later implementation problems.

Letters of support were included but none were from local parents, student organizations, early learning programs, the business community or any other group listed in the section. Letters were from High Education, governmental leaders, school districts and the state Commissioner of Education.

Letters of support from two mayors were included in the application. A letter from the state commissioner of education was included. Dates on the letters from the Mayors indicate they were aware of the grant at least ten days prior to the submission date. There is no evidence that the State Department of Education had a chance to comment on the application. The letter of support from the commissioner did not indicate that a review of the application took place.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

Three sentences were used to present the needs and gaps that the plan will address. A new state required Performance Review is now being compiled but not yet available.

Literacy across all content areas, especially writing was a top priority need. The second was increasing students on the path to college and career readiness.

The logic or data behind the identified needs or gaps was not evident. Although needs to improve literacy, especially in writing and the low numbers of students on a college trajectory were stated, no data was provided to support the need. The identified needs and gaps were not tied to the overall proposal of creation of a personalized learning system. The section of the proposal was very sparse in content.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This narrative lacked details on how a personalized learning program would be operated in a middle school environment. Classroom strategies were listed without correlation to the goals of the grant or on how they would be implemented. Students will be given Chrome books but how they would be incorporated in the program and what content would be provided was not described. Summer school for students was listed but details on requirements, credit opportunities and relationship to the grant goals were not provided. Student portfolios were "encouraged" rather than mandated. This is an unclear use of portfolios. Acceleration of learning was not described in this section.

Engagement of students through individual, interest-based projects was described but lacked details on implementation. Working with the Common Core was appropriate in the design of individual learning plans. Timelines, specific measurement tools, the use of technology were not specific in nature.

A specific discussion on how high need students would be serviced by the project was not included.

Helping a student design an individual learning project with teacher guidance is used as the approach to a personalized instruction system.

The teacher must ensure that the student has access to diverse cultures. This topic is not developed.

The listing of instructional strategies does not provide the necessary detail on how a whole personalized learning system would work in a classroom environment. The details are sparse.

One sentence is used to describe the use of high-quality content. Details on implementation are missing. Data systems, the definition of high-quality content, the data systems that will provide individual student data are not described. The personalized learning feedback recommendations are based on a teacher looking at a number of assessments that are listed. How, when and where this data is scored is lacking.

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

20

6

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

A summer training session is designed to strengthen teacher skills, build curriculum modules and become part of a professional learning community. The link to building a personalized learning environment was unclear.

The concept of using a professional learning community with an instructional coach, data coach and positive youth development coach to improve academics has merit but details on implementation are lacking.

The acceleration of learning is not described in this narrative.

Information on how this project would close achievement gaps is lacking.

The training of teachers in good instructional design is a concept that can improve student achievement. The connection to the development of a personalized learning system is limited. The details in the plan are not evident. The narrative provides a sketchy overview of the area of Teaching and Leading. The target area of improvement is literacy yet the design does not show how the personalized learning system will prove student scores in that area.

The link between teacher and principal evaluations, student achievement data, student learning objectives and a personalized learning system is limited. There is no information on how student growth will be measured and the impact it will have on evaluations.

There is limited information provided to demonstrate that this is an innovative project.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	9
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The governance of the TEAMS structure is listed. Memorandums of Understanding are included. Information on a pre-agreed contact between LEAs was not in the Appendix.</p> <p>The role of school leadership teams is not defined. It was unclear as to their role in schedule changes, staffing, budgets or school calendars.</p> <p>The acceleration system for students is outlined in this section. Students with mastery will be able to challenge a course and advance to the next level or move to an accelerated course of study if mastery can be demonstrated. The details of the assessment or the measurement systems that will be in place are not described.</p> <p>The section on Adaptable and Accessible resources describes ways that the system can adapt the program to all students. The impact on IEP's or how special education teachers would fit into this program is not described.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	3
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Although mentioned only once before, this section describes how all students and teachers in the project will receive a Chromebook with cellular internet access. This will allow all students access to resources. A private network for the Chromebooks is mentioned but there are no details describing the content or resources available. The link between the personalized learning system and this tool is not made.</p> <p>Local technical support is offered by the BOCES. Specialists are available during the school day and "after school.." The after school hours are not specified so it is unclear if a problem came up in the evening hours that a technician would be available for help.</p> <p>The information covering the information technology systems is inadequate. The schools "have the capacity to remain on the cutting edge" but there is no information on what resources, systems or capabilities in existence. The ability to export information in an open data format is not mentioned.</p> <p>There is no evidence of an interoperable data system that includes human resources, student information data, and instructional improvement data that is in place. This section describes the development of a state longitudinal data system that will allow parent access. No information on deployment is offered. The section also says parent portals are in many districts, but does not specify if these resources are available for those working with this grant.</p> <p>Moodle is described as the management system that will provide learning supports to students. Details of implementation are limited.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	8
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Although an overall improvement strategy system is not described, the applicant is using a coaching team that will review work, analyze progress toward goals, and make instructional adjustments. Data walls are part of this plan and developed with conjunction with students. With the Compact for Learning the student will be able to monitor his or her own progress toward goals. Information will be presented at parent conferences. What is missing is how the outcomes of the grant will be shared with the public. The "quality of investments" shared with the public is an important element that is not covered.</p>		

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Moodle is the engine that the organization will use to provide ongoing communication. Quarterly meetings will be held to "ensure parent participation." This is a vague statement that does not address the issue of ongoing communication with external stakeholders.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The information in this section is sparse. Performance measures are listed but there is limited evidence on rationale. Numbers of students, percentages of students and baseline date is nonexistent.</p> <p>Because the target is middle school, there is not performance measure for Pre-K to 3. College and career ready standards exist for grades 4-8 but specific student numbers and percentages are not shown.</p> <p>No performance targets are listed for grades 9-12.</p> <p>Grade level advancement is used as a performance measure. It is questionable to use the measure for each grade level and count each as a separate performance measure. The same can be said for the end of year literacy score. If these two areas were compressed, the application would have only seven performance measures.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The effectiveness of the grant will be measured by looking at changes in the district schedules/structures and by the effectiveness of professional development. The discussion of schedules and structures is very limited throughout the proposal, yet it will be one of the outcomes that will be measured for program effectiveness. Professional development and its importance has been presented throughout the plan. Surveys will be used to gather data in this area.</p> <p>Since a change in school schedules was not discussed in the narrative, there seems to be a disconnect between selecting that as an area to check for effectiveness and the goals of creating a personalized learning system to improve literacy.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The budget was in the competitive preference priority section.</p> <p>The budget was broken into projects and detailed.</p> <p>Funds were not identified as one-time investments and ongoing expenses.</p> <p>A description of all other funds used in this proposal was not identified.</p> <p>Rationale was written into the itemized cost centers.</p> <p>The breakdown of costs and budget information was more detailed than much of the other sections of the proposal.</p> <p>The funds are reasonable and support what is proposed in the grant.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>There was no narrative on this section.</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: A copy of a performance measure for literacy from E-3 was the only item in this section of the grant. There was no narrative to support sustainable partnerships, or population-level desired results. The entire narrative has limited information on family or community supports. There is no evidence of partnerships with public or private organizations outside of the BOCES/District partnership		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: The overall scope of the grant is to provide teachers at the middle school tools to create and work with students to create personalized learning project that will help literacy skills and progress toward college readiness. The concepts presented were appropriate but the narrative was limited in scope. Important links between data systems, assessments, evaluations and achievement were unclear. The turning around of lowest achieving schools was not addressed. Parts of the narrative were missing or incomplete. Sustainability was not addressed.		

Total	210	104
-------	-----	-----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1073NY-2 for Board of Cooperative Educational Services of Ulster County

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	6
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: The TEAMS (Teaching Everyone and Making Strides) Consortium proposes to establish a Project Network Team that works with strategic school educators that will result in student demonstration of a greater enthusiasm for learning, improved attendance rates and grades, and increase the number of students on track for college and career. The applicant identifies CCLS as a foundation with specific attention to deepening student understanding, expanding student capacity to apply knowledge, acquisition of higher order thinking skills through research and inquiry, and demonstrate rigorous engagement in learning. Explorations intended to stimulate interest in learning and provide a context for application of skill and knowledge, such as inquiry-based projects and summer programming that includes exploration through visitations and projected, are planned.		

The applicant describes a systems approach to teaching and learning with application of theory assuming the presence of great teacher and leaders, i.e. learner centered (multiple learning styles, metacognition, feedback, interaction, relevance); knowledge centered (subject expertise, concepts, principles, subject pedagogy, structure; assessment centered (multiple types, understanding, concepts, principles, problem solving, transfer); and community centered (social context, cultural context, real world connection, relevance, interaction).

The applicant's vision includes frequent student assessment, a strong focus on literacy development and a focus on critical analysis. evaluation through a robust data system that captures student learning at intervals throughout the year, such as work samples, performance tasks and traditional assessments, is planned.

The proposal intends a focus on developing outstanding teachers and leaders and a school community that demonstrates a shared responsibility between teachers and leaders.

The applicant's vision addresses adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and compete in a global economy.

The applicant's vision includes building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction.

The applicant's vision minimally addresses recruiting, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most, but does convincingly address developing effective teachers and leaders.

The applicant's vision does not include turning around lowest achieving schools.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(A)(2)

(a) The applicant's process for determining the participating schools began with preliminary discussions among leaders from area districts, and districts with the highest rates of poverty were accepted in order to focus the initiative on those with the highest needs. Leaders from participating districts met and agreed to focus on middle school (grades 6, 7, 8) literacy development (all middle schools in the six participating districts). The participating schools collectively meet the eligibility requirements, impacting 5,936 students of which 3,589 are low income based on eligibility for Free or Reduced meals. Students from all participating schools will have the opportunity to participate and no subgroups will be segregated for instruction. While the intended goal is to improve learning outcomes for low SES students, all students in participating grades will be exposed to better learning environments through improved educator instruction, awareness, and skills.

(b) The applicant indicates that 10 middle schools will participate in the reform initiative.

(c) The applicant indicates the total number of participating students (5936), the number of high needs students (3589), the number of low income students (3589), and the estimated number of participating educators (240).

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
---	----	---

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

(A)(3) The applicant's plan includes a broad description of how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools and will help the applicant reach its outcome goals as indicated below, but supporting details are not included. Although initial and subsequent phases and goals are identified, timelines and activities are non-specific.

Shared outcomes, values, expectations, and instructional approaches through team meetings (teachers and administrators), frequent walkthroughs, co-teaching possibilities, development of common benchmarks and rubrics, and a Project Network Team to share ideas and approaches with administrators across buildings.

- Building internal capacity within each building by phasing in Lead Teacher capacity .
- A four-phase implementation plan to build capacity: Phase I- Project network Team serves as lead facilitator and applicant identifies Lead Teachers; Phase II- Year one Lead Teachers become facilitators with support from Project network Team; Phase III- administrators and teachers from across the districts are invited to view work through guided walkthrough and discussion; and Phase IV: project classrooms become a demonstration and visitation site for schools beyond the region.

Short- mid- and long-term goals are identified that focus on initially on developing teacher and administrator capacity to

implement the program objectives.

- Short-term goals are identified as developing CCLS modules of learning through summer institutes, administrator summer professional development to develop proficiency in recognizing student learning (with monthly support sessions), and summer programming for students that reinforces core knowledge, skill development, the value of learning, and exposes them to individualized and inquiry-based exploration.
- Mid-term goals are identifies as implementing the individualized programs for students, student development and community presentation of projects, emergence of Lead Teachers who become part of the culture of professional growth, improved student attendance, and administrator roles in ensuring data use to strengthen content and skill development and support flexibility for individual student programs.
- Long-term goals are identified as improved student achievement as evidenced by decreased gap between all students and SES students, improved student commitment o learning and school, increased percentage of students on track for college- and career- readiness, and students complete high school and have success in the workforce or college.

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

10

2

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(A)(4)

(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth).

The applicant provides baseline data for on summative assessments for the State ELA assessment for grades 6-8 (subgroups All Students and Low Income). The method for determining status is percentage of students scoring Proficient or Above and the method for determining growth is an increase in that percentage.

Performance data and annual goals are not submitted for each participating LEA.

(b) Decreasing achievement gaps (as defined in this notice).

The applicant provides baseline data for on summative assessments for grades 6-8 (subgroups All Students and Low Income) in the areas of Literacy, Mathematics, Social Studies and Science. The Achievement Gap is measured by comparing end of year course grades for the identified subgroups using State benchmarks of 75% or better for Literacy, 80% or better in Mathematics, and 75% or better for Science and Social Studies. The applicant indicates a higher rate of growth has been set for SES students to narrow the achievement gap, and that goals for later grades "do not enter into play until later years" as the work is being phased in at grade 6.

Performance data and annual goals are not submitted for each participating LEA.

(c) Graduation rates (as defined in this notice).

The applicant provides baseline data and goals for high school graduation rates that includes the subgroups All Students, SES, White, Black, and Hispanic. Data for other subgroups were not included (minorities and ELLs) due to small *ns*, and no data were provided for students with disabilities.

Performance data and annual goals are not submitted for each participating LEA.

(d) College enrollment (as defined in this notice) rates.

The applicant did not provide data for this criterion. The applicant states that during the first four project months a system will be established to assist districts in gathering the 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	3

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(B)(1) The applicant's lead LEA has demonstrated experience in administering multi-year, multi-county grant projects including Teaching American History, two federal Technology Literacy Challenge Funds, several collaborative Learning Technology Grants including the regional initiative, TELL, and EETT-AARA. The lead LEA uses an account management program that

allows multiple income and expense stream tracking and follows the Uniform System of Accounts as required by the State. Independent CPAs, NYSED, and Office of the State Comptroller audits internal controls and financial statements and the accounting system has been deemed compliant.

(a) The applicant does not specify how it has improved student learning outcomes and closed achievement gaps by raising student achievement, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment- no information was provided in terms of improved learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps.

(b) The applicant cites several reform initiatives such as improving literacy through technology for teachers through the TELL grant, , improving teacher capacity through the EETT-AARA grant, hosting the New York State Center for School Safety and Regional Bilingual Education Center, and establishing the Mid-Hudson Leadership Academy through Wallace Foundation funding.

The applicant does not include evidence of a clear record of success in the past four years in achieving ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools or in its low-performing schools- no information was provided.

(c) The applicant does not address how it makes student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services- no information was provided.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(B)(2)
The applicant indicates that the State Empire Center maintains a website that provides salaries of all public employees including instructional staff, support staff, teachers, and administrators. School districts are required by law to identify and report expenses for administration, program, and capital expenditures and districts include the categorized budget expenditures in mailings to the community/ Full budget documents, a component of the Tax Report Card, are available in school buildings.

The applicant does not provide school-level expenditure data.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

(E)(3)
The applicant submitted its application to the State Department of Education and received a letter of support as official comment indicating that the application demonstrates strong alignment to the State's Reform Agenda.
Additionally, the applicant's proposal indicates that it operates under the guidance of education regulation pertaining to curriculum and instruction provided by the State Education Department's Commissioner, the NYSED Regulation 100.2 for General School Requirements, complies with Federal and State reporting rules, and State laws and regulations pertaining to teacher and principal evaluations and requisite incorporation of student data.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	5
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(B)(4)
(a) The applicant states that the process of developing the project proposal has involved teachers, principals, parents and students in the eight participating districts. The applicant states that cross-district conversations among middle level principals and school improvement teams in some districts that focus on specific needs and accommodation methodologies occurred. The applicant identifies one method for obtaining student feedback from the summer academies as related to literacy, and the applicant indicates that students have provided feedback that they appreciate the use of technology to deliver content and opportunities for hands on learning.

However, specific evidence regarding the process involving students, families, and parents in the development of the proposal, how the proposal was revised based on their feedback is not provided.

(B)(4)(i) The MOUs have been signed by the collective bargaining representatives.

(B)(4) The applicant has received letters of support from IHEs (SUNY and Ulster County Community College), State and local

government (State Senator Bonacic, Mayor Gallo of Kingston, Mayor Kennedy of Newburgh), Liberty Center School District, and the State Department of Education.

Letters of support from parents, parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, tribes, the business community, advocacy groups, local community-based organizations or civil rights organizations are not included.

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

5

1

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

(B)(5)

The applicant states that information is currently being compiled within each district to set learning targets based on needs and gaps and the information will be compiled during the first six months of the project. The applicant indicated that planning sessions identified Literacy across all content areas, particularly in writing, was the greatest need, followed by the low numbers of students on trajectory for college- and career-readiness and the need for students to become excited about learning.

The applicant demonstrates minimal evidence of identifying its current status in implementing personalized learning environments, does not state the logic behind the reform proposal, and does not fully identify the needs and gaps that the plan will address.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	9

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(C)(1)

(a) With the support of parents and educators, all students—

(i) Understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals;

The applicant states that students will understand what they are learning through a team approach that includes administrators, teachers, students, families and communities through the implementation of classroom communities, sustained professional development, administrative understanding and communication, and family and community support. The applicant's rationale is that through professional development and project staff support, teachers and administrators will understand and learn what they need to do to support students in their learning and encourage them to be successful.

The applicant's response is vague and does not include actionable or measurable objectives. The applicant lists a variety of activities that involve parents and the community, but the activities do not specifically address how they will contribute to helping students understand that what they are learning is key to their success.

(ii) Identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice), understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goals;

The applicant addresses this criterion proposing that students and teachers will work together to identify and pursue learning and development goals, administration of student baseline assessments of interests and needs, regular individual conferencing, and development of a standards-based plan to identify specific goals. Throughout the process, students and teachers will evaluate and measure growth toward goals and teachers will receive ongoing coaching and support from project staff as needed for additional strategies and understanding. The applicant lists appropriate activities that involve parents and the community that could serve as a measure of progress toward their goals (Children teaching their parents at Family Night, stage performances, poetry presentations, art shows).

The applicant lists a variety of activities that involve parents and the community, but the activities do not specifically address how they will contribute to helping students understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals.

(iii) Are able to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest;

The teacher, with input from the student, will design deep learning experiences (unit modules) in the area of the student's academic interests. The modules will be literacy infused, multi-disciplinary, project based, include essential questions, and will be linked to the CCSS.

The applicant lists appropriate activities that involve parents and the community that could serve as demonstration of involvement in deep learning in areas of academic interest (Children teaching their parents at Family Night, stage performances, poetry presentations, art shows).

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

The applicant indicates that the teacher will ensure that learning involves access and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts and perspectives through readings, library research, and the classroom environment.

The applicant does not identify how parents will be involved in the process. The applicant's approach is not comprehensive and does not appear to be adequate in terms of addressing this criterion.

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

The applicant indicates that teachers will encourage students to develop skills and traits as described through Socratic Seminars, Think Pair Share, Peer Review, Classroom Communities, and Literacy Circles. Critical thinking will be addressed through unit modules and strategies such as essential questions, close reading, and reflective writing journals.

The applicant describes an adequate plan of action, but does not identify how parents will be involved in the process.

(b) With the support of parents and educators, there is a strategy to ensure that each student has access to—

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

The applicant indicates that students will have multiple and varied opportunities for personal growth and exploration as well as collaborative work with peers, teachers, and members of the school/community.

The applicant identifies 13 strategies that will be used ranging from personal inventories and exploration of learning styles, MI, and academic strengths to the use of digital technology and opportunities to explore career options through Community Mentor Programs.

The applicant's strategies are appropriate, but the applicant does not convincingly address how these strategies will be customized for individual students and does not identify how parents will be involved in the process.

(ii) A variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments;

The applicant lists 29 instructional strategies and one TBD Other that will be based on a needs survey. Many of the instructional approaches are conducive to creating high-quality environments, such as Inclusive Classroom Communities, Cognitive Coaching, Peer Review, Socratic Seminars, Habits of Mind and others. Tiered assignments and homework, compacting the curriculum, choice menus, flexible grouping and individual learning contracts indicate attention to PLEs.

The applicant proposes to provide exploratory, engaging, literacy-rich project-based units via an extended summer school program whereby students will attend demonstration lessons on college campuses and community venues related to their unit of study.

The applicant provides an adequate plan of action, but does not indicate how parents will be involved in the process.

(iii) High-quality content, including digital learning content (as defined in this notice) as appropriate, aligned with college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice);

The applicant states that this project will use high-quality content including NOVELNY databases, ebooks, teacher reviewed websites, and other content, and that this content can be shared electronically and downloaded to Chromebooks or/and other student devices.

The applicant does not indicate how parents will be involved in the process. The applicant provides insufficient evidence that the content identified is high-quality or a method for determining that the content identified is of high-quality.

(iv) Ongoing and regular feedback, including, at a minimum—

(A) 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; and

The applicant identifies appropriate assessments and states that teachers will provide ongoing and regular feedback through their use and through conferencing.

The applicant does not indicate the frequency of or timeline for assessment or how the assessment will be used to determine progress toward college- and career-ready standards or graduation requirements. The applicant does not indicate how this information will be collected or analyzed, or how data results will be used for instructional improvement. The applicant minimally indicates how parents will be involved in the process and how results will be shared with parents (teachers sharing and celebrating student success with families, performing arts events).

(B) 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; and

The applicant states that teachers will learn different strategies during the summer institutes and through working with the project team to make accommodations for high-needs students and that as individual needs arise, teachers will be provided additional support.

The applicant's response is vague and does not fully address the criterion. The applicant does not address how personalized learning recommendations will be made based on the identifiers mentioned in the criterion. The applicant does not indicate how parents will be involved in the process or how results will be shared with parents.

(c) 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.

The applicant indicates that students will receive training and support for their LEA-issued Chromebooks and all resources required. The library media specialist will provide student training on databases, ebooks, and other resources used in their projects and classrooms.

The applicant does not fully address this criterion. Training timelines and actionable deliverables are not included. Resources are minimally identified.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	9
---	----	---

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(C)(2) The applicant's plan does not include goals, activities, timelines, deliverables for each criterion.

(a) All participating educators (as defined in this notice) engage in training, and in professional teams or communities, that supports their individual and collective capacity to—

(i) Support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies that meet each student's academic needs and help ensure all students can graduate on time and college- and career-ready;

The applicant provides some evidence of capacity to support the implementation of PLEs through the creation of and Individualized Learning Compact. Through this Compact, students and their teachers will create individual learning goals and plans for reaching the goals. The applicant states that student results on standards-based assessments will provide the Compact's foundation, the particulars of the plan will be co-created by the teacher and student. Frequent teacher-student conferences will be held to determine progress and adapt the plan as needed. Teacher support will be provided by project coaches and school-based supervisors. Students will complete an Inquiry Project based on the students area of interest and include reading authentic text from the selected topic, partnering with a mentor/field professional, and develop and present a research project at various venues.

Timelines for identifying and creating goals based on interests, assessment timelines, conferences, and timelines for Inquiry Projects are not specific.

(ii) Adapt content and instruction, providing opportunities for students to engage in common and individual tasks, in response to their academic needs, academic interests, and optimal learning approaches (e.g., discussion and collaborative work, project-based learning, videos, audio, manipulatives);

The applicant indicates that students will be clustered based on skill and content level for foundational knowledge and, as needed, mini lessons will provide specialized instruction to ensure student capacity to engage on project teams. The applicant indicates that students will be exposed to a variety of ideas through different teaching strategies.

The applicant does not fully address adaptation of content and instruction, particularly for students with disabilities and ELLs.

(iii) Frequently measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice), or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice) and use data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators; and

The applicant indicates tracking of CCLS Literacy Standards through evidence in student work and "dipstick" assessment, and monitoring attendance and behavioral incidents. Writing benchmarks and student work samples will provide progress toward standards and inform instruction. PLCs will meet regularly and make instructional plans using the Bambrick-Santoya model of data-driven inquiry and educators will meet weekly to discuss individual student progress.

The applicant's plan for frequently measuring student progress and use of data to inform as indicated in this criterion is lacking in specificity. Timelines, goals, objectives, and specific strategies for data use are sparse or nonexistent.

(iv) Improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback provided by the LEA's teacher and principal evaluation systems (as defined in this notice), including frequent feedback on individual and collective effectiveness, as well as by providing recommendations, supports, and interventions as needed for improvement.

The applicant's participating LEAs have selected their principal and teacher rubrics and have participated in evidence collection to determine current levels of effectiveness. The principal lead evaluator will attend a day-long summer institute and quarterly reflection/training sessions that include evidence gathering and supervisory practices conducted by a principal lead evaluator coach. Principals will also meet quarterly to strengthen their skills.

The applicant indicates the selection of teacher and principal rubrics, but does not indicate if this constitutes their educator evaluation system and, in not, the timeline for implementation of such. The applicant does not indicate the planned implementation of a superintendent evaluation system.

The applicant does not indicate timelines for formative and summative educator evaluations, the frequency of feedback, or how recommendations, supports, and interventions needed for improvement will be determined, implemented, or measured.

(b) All participating educators (as defined in this notice) have access to, and know how to use, tools, data, and resources to accelerate student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice). Those resources must include—

(i) Actionable information that helps educators (as defined in this notice) identify optimal learning approaches that respond to individual student academic needs and interests;

The applicant identifies three teams comprised of two literacy coaches, two leadership coaches, an application specialist, a positive youth development specialist, and a data driven specialist working under the guidance of the PI to design and deliver summer institute training, work in schools to implement instructional modules, and support teachers and leaders.

Actionable information is described as a combination of school-based assessments and curriculum based measures including student work samples.

The applicant minimally provides actionable information that helps educators identify learning approaches. Timelines, goals, frequency of data collection or actions, and specific deliverables are not identified.

(ii) High-quality learning resources (e.g., instructional content and assessments), including digital resources, as appropriate, that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice), and the tools to create and share new resources; and

The applicant indicates that teachers will have the opportunity to participate in face-to-face and online training including NOVELNY databases, ASCD eBook collections, Moodle, Adobe Connect, Chromebook training, Google and other appropriate standards-aligned materials.

The applicant identifies some high-quality resources, but does not specify timelines, goals, activities, responsible parties, or deliverables,

(iii) Processes and tools to match student needs (see Selection Criterion (C)(2)(b)(i)) with specific resources and approaches (see Selection Criterion (C)(2)(b)(ii)) to provide continuously improving feedback about the effectiveness of the resources in meeting student needs.

Each participating LEA is establishing interim assessment procedures and some are developing their own tools while other are using prepared instruments. Coaches will provide strategies and appropriate resources that will be targeted to individual learner needs and documented by the quality of evidence gathered in the evaluation process as well as data analysis results. The improvement measure will be school-wide improvement on State literacy assessments. Processes to match student needs include deepening knowledge in CCLS, refining questioning techniques, recognizing student learning in action, and establishing collegial understandings-- these are stated to be more important than specific resources. Resources are identified as EngageNY, a State education web resource supporting implementation of CCLS, data-driven instruction cycle, school-based inquiry and educator performance management systems.

The applicant adequately addresses processes to address student needs and minimally addresses resources, but does not address specific approaches. Individual LEAs are developing or determining their own tools, and this does not indicate a consistent mechanism to attain project goals.

(c) All participating school leaders and school leadership teams (as defined in this notice) have training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment that meets individual student academic needs and accelerates student progress through common and individual tasks toward meeting college- and career-ready standards (as defined in this notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in this notice). The training, policies, tools, data, and resources must include:

(i) Information, from such sources as the district's teacher evaluation system (as defined in this notice), that helps school leaders and school leadership teams (as defined in this notice) assess, and take steps to improve, individual and collective educator effectiveness and school culture and climate, for the purpose of continuous school improvement; and

State growth measures and local assessment scores will be used to inform teacher and principal effectiveness. Baselines will be determined, growth targets set, and teachers will be evaluated on the actual growth of their students.

The applicant minimally addresses this criterion. Specifics regarding timelines and actionable measures are not provided.

(ii) Training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps (as defined in this notice).

The applicant indicates that a robust data system that captures student learning information at intervals throughout the year and is observable through student work will be developed as part of the evaluation. The proposed system will track student learning and progress through work samples, performance tasks, and traditional assessments. The proposed system will provide equal access to educators and parents in accordance with FERPA.

The applicant does not address how training will be monitored or formatively measured and evaluated.

(d) The applicant has a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals (as defined in this notice), including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects (such as mathematics and science), and specialty areas (such as special education).

The applicant indicates that districts will transfer high-performing assistant principals and principals to lower performing schools and teachers will receive support and training as needed from the project team and district coaches to increase effectiveness.

The applicant addresses low performing schools, but does not indicate a complete plan to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective or highly effective teachers, identify a process for hard-to-staff schools, subjects, and specialty areas.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	7

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(D)(1)

The applicant has practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning by—

(a) Organizing the LEA central office, or the consortium governance structure (as defined in this notice), to provide support and services to all participating schools (as defined in this notice);

The applicant's plan for organizing the consortium governance structure has been identified and appears to be sufficient for support and service provision.

(b) Providing school leadership teams in participating schools (as defined in this notice) with sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and noneducators, and school-level budgets;

The applicant's lead LEA assumes responsibility for all aspects of project administration, decisions related to the activities and expectations stated in the grant, policy and practices used in relation to implementing the grant, and funds due to the LEA will be billed to the lead LEA based upon contractual agreement.

Partner LEAS determine the participation of district staff and each will have a representative on the Advisory Committee, with responsibility of providing feedback and recommendations to the lead LEA through the project director. Each of the consortium members has its own schedule, calendar, staffing, and budget plans and systems. However, the applicant's consortium structure indicates that the lead LEA assumes the majority of responsibility for project direction, oversight, and decision-making. Partner LEAs appear to have limited autonomy based on the documentation provided.

(c) Giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic;

The project provides for an expansion of current online Credit Recovery programs, and districts will utilize online course material to provide a hybrid approach for enrolled students. The applicant has in place a plan that allows students to demonstrate mastery of content and related skills similar in design to independent study programs, and students will be able to "challenge" a course to advance to the next level by demonstrating content mastery.

(d) Giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways; and

The project provides for an expansion of current online Credit Recovery programs, and districts will utilize online course material to provide a hybrid approach for enrolled students. The applicant has in place a plan that allows students to demonstrate mastery of content and related skills similar in design to independent study programs, and students will be able to "challenge" a course to advance to the next level by demonstrating content mastery. [Note: response to (D)(1)(c) and (d) was combined]

How students are afforded the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times is minimally addressed.

(e) Providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners.

The applicant states that learning for student with disabilities and ELLs must remain high. The applicant

acknowledges that the aforementioned subgroups may require certain accommodations, such as vocabulary support, background knowledge support, extra time or access to materials in auditory formats. the applicant cites exceptions such as significant gaps in the student's ability to "deal with content or be at skill level," such as SIFE instances.

The applicant minimally addresses how it will provide learning resources and instructional practices that are fully accessible to all students.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
--	----	---

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(D)(2)

(a) Each participating student and teacher will have be provided a Chromebook with cellular Internet access, configured will requisite web applications, updates and licensing, and Google accounts to allow for full function and access to a private network.

It is unclear if cellular Internet access is the required access venue or how students without Internet access, cellular or otherwise, will gain access to the learning materials off-site. It is unclear as to how or if parents will have access to and/or monitoring responsibilities of student Chromebook content.

(b) All project participants will have access to the technical help desk during and after the school day and skilled specialists to support servers, technology, and infrastructure will be provided.

(c) (d) The applicant has a robust technology infrastructure in place, including broadband capacity, developed and maintained through district partnerships. The service includes technology plan development, and alignment of curriculum, assessment and instruction to technology, as well as planning, analysis, and recommended approval to SED (based on E-rate and SED requirements). The applicant utilizes Win-Cap account management which allows tracking of multiple streams of income and expenses on multiple and multi-year projects. The applicant follows the Uniform System of Accounts for internal and external auditing purposes in accordance with State law. Independent CPAs, the NYS Education Department, and the NYS Office of the State Comptroller audit internal controls and financial statements and the accounting system has been deemed fully compliant.

The State Department of Education is in the process of developing a LDS that will provide parents access to various student achievement points. Plans to build the educational context for parental use of information once the LDS is complete are indicated. Many districts have a parent portal that allows viewing of current homework assignments and, in some cases, provides venues for parent-teacher communication. The applicant indicates that the project will utilize data systems to provide parent and student data access while maintaining other student's privacy and will be secure/password protected. The applicant is currently involved in a template designed to extract 3-year longitudinal data and comparative data linked to CCLS to use for systemic and individual instructional improvement.

Timelines for full implementation of the data systems were not provided. Training for parents and students to access student data was not indicated.

The applicant's project will use MyLearningPlan and MyLearningPlan OASYS to address the great teachers and leaders requirement. Learning supports for students include the Learning Management System, Moodle, and online assistance and peer support is available to students. Participating teachers will will have assigned times to be available for support, and project staff will develop a FAQ section in Moodle to assist with common questions and refinement of resources.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	7

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(E)(1)

The applicant indates that coaching teams will be assigned to each building twice a year for periods of three weeks for co-teaching and support. A component of this process uses student work samples and video/audiotapes of classroom discussion to analyze progress towards goals in areas such as questioning techniques, evidence-based discussion, and writing to sources. Building-level teacher teams will meet monthly for the same purpose, and quarterly meetings will be held to analyze common benchmarks and student progress to determine instructional actions. Administrators will be invited to quarterly

meetings.

The applicant indicates a key component of the project approach as involving students in progress monitoring and goal setting, as identified in the Learning Compact described earlier in the proposal. Additionally, self-reflective strategies such as exit slips, learning logs, and other written and oral formative assessment structures will be used daily, and these strategies will be supplemented with a more comprehensive reflection. Progress monitoring and student self-evaluation notes will be a portion of the information routinely used during parent conferences.

The applicant addresses some elements for implementing a rigorous, continuous improvement process, but does not fully address the criterion. Goals, objectives, timelines, responsible parties, explicit monitoring processes and measurement identifiers for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant are not addressed. The applicant does not address how it will publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by RTT-D.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
--	---	---

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(E)(2)

The applicant indicates the use of Moodle as the Content Management System to develop a richly collaborative community among administrators, teachers, students, and project staff. Adobe Connect will be used for online instruction, virtual meetings, and virtual trainings. Quarterly project participant meetings will be held to analyze benchmarks and student performance involving teachers, students, administrators, project staff and students. The meetings will be held regionally to ensure parent participation.

The applicant's plan does not include specific timelines, goals, objectives, or deliverables and does not provide strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with external stakeholders.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
--	---	---

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

Ambitious yet achievable performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures. For each applicant-proposed measure, the applicant must describe—

1. The applicant does not provide the number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who are on track to college- and career-readiness based on the applicant's on-track indicator (as defined in this notice);
2. The applicant proposes at least one grade-appropriate academic leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan; and
3. The applicant proposes at least one grade-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator of successful implementation of its plan.
4. Rationale for selecting measures is not provided for all measures.
5. How the measure will provide rigorous, timely and formative information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action is minimally addressed or not addressed.
6. How it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress is not addressed.
7. Baseline data is not included.
8. Target goals are not included for all measures.

Performance Measure: Highly Effective Teacher and Principal

(a) Its rationale for selecting that measure;

No rationale is provided.

(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

No baseline data are provided and goals have not been set by the applicant. The intended outcome is to increase by 10% annually the number of students in classrooms with highly effective teachers. Although the performance measure includes highly effective principals, this measure is not indicated.

(c) How it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

The applicant does not address this criterion.

Performance Measure: Effective Teacher and Principal

(a) Its rationale for selecting that measure;

No rationale is provided.

(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

No baseline data are provided and goals have not been set by the applicant. The intended outcome is to increase by 20% annually the number of students in classrooms with effective teachers. Although the performance measure includes highly effective principals, this measure is not indicated.

(c) How it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

The applicant does not address this criterion

Performance Measure: On Track to College- and Career-Readiness- Grades 6,7,8 Literacy

(a) Its rationale for selecting that measure;

No rationale is provided.

(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

No baseline data are provided and goals have not been set by the applicant. The intended outcome is to improve by 10% annually on the discrepancy between current status of readiness and the ultimate goal of 100%.

(c) How it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

The applicant does not address this criterion.

Performance Measure: Evidence-based Argument-Grades 6, 7, and 8

(a) Its rationale for selecting that measure;

The leading indicator of research- and evidence-based inquiry writing, assessed as Evidence-based Argument will be indicators of student progress and school progress.

(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

No baseline data are provided. The intended outcome is to increase annually the percent of students scoring proficient or advanced. Samples will be collected from English, Social Studies, Science, and one other content area. Frequency of sample collection is not indicated.

(c) How it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

The applicant does not address this criterion.

Performance Measure: Health/Socio-Emotional Indicators- Attendance and Discipline- Grades 6, 7, and 8

(a) Its rationale for selecting that measure;

No rationale is provided.

(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

No baseline data are provided for either measure. The intended outcome for attendance is annual increases in student attendance ranging from 3%-5%. The intended outcome for discipline is an annual reduction in the number of discipline referrals ranging from 5% to 10%.

(c) How it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress.

The applicant does not address this criterion.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	2
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(E)(4) The applicant states two overarching intended outcomes and each will be evaluated independently.

Outcome I: Changes in District Schedules and Structures

"Pre- and Post-surveys will be administered to gather information regarding the district's use of technology, activities involving community partners, schedules, structures in place, etc." to participating districts commencing Winter 2013 (pre-survey) and annually at the end of each grant year (post-survey). The purpose of the survey administration is to monitor progress and changes.

The applicant does not specify how the surveys will be administered (online, paper, etc.) or to whom. The applicant does not specify how the survey results will be communicated to stakeholders or how it will use the acquired data to improve the program.

Outcome II: Effectiveness of Teacher Professional Development

The project director will use a combination of questionnaires, workshop feedback forms, and observations to assess the effectiveness of the summer institutes and supplemental professional development. These instruments are designed to determine participants' reactions.

The project director will develop and collect survey data based on ISTE and NETS for teachers to determine participants' learning.

To determine outcomes in terms of systemic change in participating districts and more productive use of time, staff and other resources, the applicant will use a combination of questionnaires and interviews to assess participant and district perceptions of 1) the adoption of the individual learning modules within the classroom; 2) the utilization of teaching strategies; and 3) the impact of content on districts' state performance.

To collect evidence of participants' use of new learning, the project director will conduct a limited number of classroom and district observations and interviews.

The applicant does not specify how the survey results will be communicated to stakeholders or how it will use the acquired data to improve the program. The applicant does not indicate specific goals, timelines, or performance targets.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	6

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(F)(1)

(a) the applicant identifies all funds that will support the project. All funds that will support the project are identified as RTT-D grant funds.

(b) The applicant's budget appears to be reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant's proposal. However, approximately 57% of the grant funding will be used for personnel and fringe benefits, i.e., ongoing operational costs.

(c) (i) The applicant provides a description of all of the funds, in this case all funds being RTT-D), that the applicant will use to

support the proposal, including total revenue from these sources.

(c)(i) The applicant identifies the funds that will be used for one-time operational costs versus costs that will be incurred during the grant period. The applicant does not identify funding or plans for the program post grant. The applicant does not provide a focus on strategies that will ensure the long-term sustainability of the PLEs.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0
--	----	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(F)(2) Although the applicant indicates in the Budget Subpart 4: Project-Level Narrative intent for sustainability plans, Section (F)(2) does not appear to be included in the proposal.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's Competitive Priority includes a single chart for Performance Measure Grades 6, 7, 8 Literacy. Students will demonstrate competency in their end of year course grade for Literacy of 75 or higher based on NYSED assessments with a goal of 85% of Low Income students reaching this target by 2015/16. The applicant's Competitive Priority Performance Measure does not include baseline data.

No other documentation or information is included in the application.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant demonstrated a strong vision for its reform initiative, but supporting documentation did not comprehensively and coherently, and for some criteria was not evident or documented, address how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready graduation requirements; accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student; increase the effectiveness of educators; expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. Specific areas in which the applicant did not comprehensively and coherently address the aforementioned are:

- LEA -wide goals for outcomes
- Clear track record of success
- Increasing transparency
- Analysis of needs and gaps
- Learning
- Teaching and Learning
- Performance measures
- Sustainability

Total	210	94
-------	-----	----



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #1073NY-3 for Board of Cooperative Educational Services of Ulster County

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>The applicant has poorly articulated a comprehensive and coherent reform vision and was awarded 2 out of 10 points in this section criteria. The overall vision was lacking in details and did not explicitly support how it would personalized student supported that are grounded in tasks based on students' academic interests.</p> <p>Across each of the four core assurance areas, the applicant has not articulated how it intends to build upon its current work across the districts' school sites nor how the strategies proposed would be connected to clear and credible goals.</p> <p>For example, in the area of adopting standards and assessments, the work on the Inquiry Project, student summer programs, and student assessments are weakly connected to the foundation of work the new standards. It is not clear the type of goals that are proposed in this area of work that would accelerate student achievement and increase equity across the system of schools.</p> <p>For core assurance number 2, the applicant describes the proposed data system in generalities. It is not clear what the current foundations of the data systems are in these schools and how these data systems are inter-related the work strategies proposed for adopting standards and assessments that support college and career readiness.</p> <p>The applicant has outline promising plans in how it intends to support its teachers and principals. However, it is not clear some of the proposed strategies presented would be explicitly used to increase equity in the classroom.</p> <p>The applicant has not addressed in its vision how it intends to support the lowest-achieving schools.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In regards to criteria A2a:</p> <p>The applicant aims to work with ten middle schools across six participating districts. It was not clear how the middle school grade band was selected as most high leverage and/or high need student populations. The data presented regarding the needs of the schools are not strongly presented. For example, the poverty rates presented are presented at the district level, and not at the grade span or school site level so it was not clear if the schools within the district would have been the competition's eligibility requirements. It is not clear if there were additional middle schools that are part of these districts so its not clear how these schools were selected as the larger context has not been detailed.</p> <p>The role of Newburgh City School District is also not clear as limited data was presented as to how this district would work with the districts that are part of BOCES.</p> <p>In regards to criteria A2b:</p> <p>The applicant has presented the names of each of the ten schools.</p> <p>In regards to criteria A2c:</p> <p>The applicant provides the data that is requested in criteria A2c. However, the applicant does not differentiate how the approaches would be varied to meet the needs of the student populations. As a result, the applicant did not present enough evidence that would support high-quality LEA and school level implementation of the proposal.</p>		

Overall, the applicant received a score of 3 out of 10 points in this selection criteria because it was able to meet parts of the criteria found in A2b and A2c. However, the applicant does not discuss its approach to implementation at these selected school sites. Consequently, there was a lack of connection between the proposed approaches and how these schools and student populations would benefit from the proposed approach.

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

10

2

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not have a high-quality plan in place in terms of how its reform efforts would be scaled up and support improved student learning outcomes for all students. The selection criteria was addressed poorly by the applicant. Two points were awarded to this section as general activities and goals were presented as ways to improve student learning outcomes.

The activities proposed hold promise but they are specific to any district or school context based on the needs at the student level. While the applicant has proposed short-, mid-, and long-term goals, they are not connected to any specific timelines. The goals and activities proposed are also not connected to specific persons or teams who are responsible for the work. Consequently, many components of a credible implementation plan were not addressed.

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

10

2

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has not provided the necessary subgroup data across each of the four sub-criteria listed in A4 (a-d). It is not clear how the proposed vision would impact the listed subgroups across each of the grade levels. While the baseline data is presented for criteria A4a in literacy, it is unclear how other subject areas may be impacted by the proposed work as there is not baseline data that is presented. For example, the applicant has only presented anticipated growth data in the area of ELA, but it is not clear whether other subject areas may also be impacted in positive ways.

The approach in how the applicant is approaching measurement and growth in criteria A4b is unrealistic. Growth measures at the higher grades can be determined if all students are participating in the proposed activities in year one. It is not clear whether the applicant intends to work with all grades 6-8 in year one of work or if the work would only be targeted at the sixth grade level. There is not enough clarity in the proposed plans as to how the two subgroups presented would have differentiated supports.

The graduate rates listed for criteria A4c are ambitious. It is not clear how the applicant intends to work with the feeder high schools in supporting these ambitious graduation goals. For criteria A4d, the applicant currently does not have the tools necessary to collect college enrollment data. As a result, goals were not set for this criteria A4d.

Overall, the applicant poorly described how its expected goals would be met by its vision of improved student learning and has earned a low score of 2 out of 10 points in this selection criteria.

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	3

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In regards to criteria B1a:

The applicant has described the prior successes in various grants the districts have received that have supported teaching and learning. The grants received list is a promising start as it demonstrates that the district has had prior evidence in applying for supplementary funds to support its core work. However, the applicant presents very limited data and evidence in how these proposals have advanced student learning and achievement. The grant data that was presented provided modest growth and it was not clear how this work promoted an increase in equitable practices in the schools and districts. Other data that was presented are not linked explicitly to teaching and achievement outcomes. For example, participating data by teachers is not an accurate reflection of success in advancing student learning. No student level or teacher survey data were included as part of the evidence in demonstrating that the applicant has had a clear track record of success.

In regards to criteria B1b:

The applicant has not presented evidence in how it has achieved ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools or in its low-performing schools.

In regards to criteria B1c:

The applicant has not presented evidence in addressing criteria B1c.

Overall, the applicant poorly addressed this selection criteria as it does not address two out of the three components in this criteria and it addressed component B1a poorly as described in the comments above.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant was given 5 out of 5 points for this criteria because it has provided clear evidence as described the state level policies that are in place to support the criteria subparts found in B2(a-d). All four categories listed can be found across the state, district and school site level as described by the applicant.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant has provided reasonable evidence that it has worked close with state requirements in the area of teacher evaluations, longitudinal data systems and leadership development. However, the applicant poorly describes how this relationship under the state context would promote its proposed personalized learning environment. For example, the applicant discusses the use of the State's syllabi and the flexibility that is present for schools to deliver instruction in a variety of ways. However, the applicant does not discuss explicitly how this type of autonomy would support the activities that promote personalized learning across its target schools.
 Consequently, the applicant was awarded a low score of 3 out of 10 because it did not make a strong argument as to how these state conditions would be supported of the proposed activities by the applicant.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	3
---	----	---

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 In regards to criteria B4a:
 The applicant present weak evidence in how it has engaged with student populations in the development of this RTTT-District proposal. The evidence presented for the student engagement point more to the student needs rather than getting them explicitly engaged in how students were engaged in the development of the proposal. The applicant has not presented any evidence of how it has engaged families in the proposal development.=
 The applicant has demonstrated evidence in gaining teacher and school leadership support by the signed letters of support found in the appendix. It is not clear what types of feedback have been from teachers and principals as the processes of engaging in these populations have not been specified.
 In regards to criteria B4b:
 The applicant has included letters of support from local government officers, higher education institutions and from one of the member school districts. This set of support letters is not comprehensive and does not represent a cross-section of stakeholder groups that could support the proposed work. For example, the applicant does not have evidence that it has engaged with parent organizations, early learning programs, business communities, and civic organizations. As a result the applicant has poorly addressed this sub-criteria B4b.
 Overall, the applicant poorly addressed criteria B4 and scored a 3 out of 10. The applicant did not present enough evidence across the various stakeholder groups to demonstrate that they took part in the development of the proposal. Some engagement was present with the local teachers association as they signed agreements of support for this proposal. However, this is one of many stakeholder groups that exist in the system and the applicant did not present clear evidence of engaging meaningfully with a cross-section of stakeholder groups needed in this criteria.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	0
--	---	---

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:
 The applicant does not present evidence that it has a plan for an analysis of its current needs and gaps. The applicant alludes to possible plans for understanding its needs and gaps, but does not provide any detail of what that plan would entail.

Consequently, the applicant has not earned any points in the criteria because it did not demonstrate any evidence of a plan based on an analysis of needs and gaps. The applicant only presented possible needs but does not provide how these needs have been determined based on quantitative or qualitative data collect at the target schools and districts.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	3
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In regards to criteria C1a:</p> <p>The applicant has not presented a high-quality plan focused on approaches that engages and empowers all learners. The strategies that are presented are described in generalities and do not include key goals, clear rationale for the proposed activities, timeline of work or parties responsible for the work. As a result, the activities do not come together in forming a clear, coherent, and comprehensive plan that supports personalized learning. Some of the activities found in C1a.v proposed hold promise. They include activities such as Socratic Seminars, "Classroom Communities" and Literacy Circles. There are no explicit strategies proposed to support criteria C1a.i. The plans listed to support criteria C1a.ii are promising, but it is unclear how this work proposed here is connected to the larger literacy focused goals. It is also not clear what structures and systems would be in place to support the level of one-on-one conferencing that is proposed for criteria C1a.ii.</p> <p>The applicant does not clearly address sub-criteria C1a.iii and C1a.iv. The applicant does not present clear strategies of work in terms of how these activities would be enacted over the grant period across the target schools.</p> <p>In regards to criteria C1b:</p> <p>The applicant has described a series of activities that may be promising in supporting students' personalized learning. However, it is not clear how these approaches are part of a sequence of instructional content and skill development. As these approaches are written, they represent more like principles of personalized learning, and not a coherent and comprehensive strategy for each student in the district. The instructional approached that are listed to address criteria C1b.ii are an impressive list of strategies. Again, the applicant does not clarify how this set of approaches would work together in supporting personalized learning.</p> <p>For criteria C1b.ii, it is not clear if the programs proposed are of high-quality as there are not enough evidence presented to make a qualified judgment on the soundness and rigor of some of these instructional tools such as NOVELNY databases, ebooks, and teacher related websites.</p> <p>For criteria C1b.iii, the feedback list is a promising start in how the applicant is thinking about providing ongoing and regular feedback to students. However, the applicant has not presented details as to how the feedback would take place nor how the data collected would help determine progress toward master of standards. The applicant has also not addressed criteria C1b.iv.B.</p> <p>The applicant does not fully address criteria C1b.v. The applicant has not clearly identified the subgroup populations of high need students and have not provided a strategy to address this criteria.</p> <p>In regards to criteria C1c:</p> <p>The applicant vaguely addresses how it intends to train student through the use of Chromebooks that are available to students. There is little evidence that the applicant has provided regarding proposed mechanisms of training students so that they know how to utilize the tools and resources to keep them on track with their own learning.</p> <p>Overall, the applicant poorly addressed this selection criteria and was given 3 out of 20 to reflect the lack of evidence presented in supporting a plan that promotes students' personalized learning. The applicant has some budding ideas and activities listed but they do not come together to form a comprehensive plan in supporting students' personalized learning.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	5
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In regards to criteria C2a:</p> <p>The applicant has presented some strategies that would support the effective implementation of personalized learning environments for their students. The summer institute program is moderately clear in that the teachers will work together in</p>		

learning how to best support students as well as co-develop some tools together during that time. It is not clear what the summer program of learning would be over the course of the grant period and how the work would be varied across the differing student needs.

The applicant has included a common writing and research task that is centered around students' interest in reading. However, it is not clear what the role of the school leader or other content teachers would be in this school wide effort. It is not how the formative assessment work would in turn guide instruction in the classroom to support personalized learning.

In regards to criteria C2b:

The applicant provides basic structures as to how the teams would work together in using data to accelerate student progress outcomes. However, the overall plan for data and feedback is lacking in specificity and does not provide enough evidence of how that feedback would be systematically part of students learning environment.

In regards to criteria C2c:

The applicant does not provide enough details as to the types of training, policies, tools, data, and resources that would enable the districts to support an effective learning environment. The tools that are presented are generally described and are not connected to any goals or outcomes of work. The applicant does fully not address C2c.i and C2c.ii with enough details or evidence that would support its proposed work.

In regards to criteria C2d:

The applicant does not fully address this sub-criteria. The applicant has not presented a plan as to how it intends to increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals. The proposed strategies of moving effective principals to lower performing schools and providing teachers with additional professional development is not a comprehensive strategy.

Overall, the applicant does not have a high quality plan presented in improving teaching and learning by personalizing the learning environment. The strategies proposed are not comprehensive and do not provide enough details as to how they would work with one another as part of a larger plan so that students can accelerate their own learning. As a result, the applicant was awarded 5 out of 20 points as the evidence for this criteria was under-developed.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	2

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

In regards to criteria D1a:

The applicant provides limited details as to how the lead team would work with member districts over the course of the project timeline. The governance structure is limited in details and does not provide enough evidence that this structure would facilitate personalized learning. It is not clear how support and services would be implemented and delivered across the member school districts.

In regards to criteria D1b:

The applicant has not provided examples of practices, policies and roles that would clarify or strengthen how school leadership teams would have the flexibility and autonomy needed to support personalized learning.

In regards to criteria D1c and D1d:

It is not clear how the process of Credit Recovery would be a strategy for students to demonstrate learning. There is not enough description of how this strategy would work in the middle grades to support students' mastery of content. Similarly, the idea of students "challenging" a course holds promise but there are not enough details as to how this process would work at the school site level.

In regards to criteria D1e:

The applicant has not clarified the types of resources or instructional practices that it uses across the LEAs to support special populations.

Overall, the applicant has poorly addressed this selection criteria and has earned a 2 out of 15. There is not enough specificity across all of the sub-criteria listed and the strategies proposed are not connected to the various needs at the school site or student level.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

In regards to criteria D2a:

It is not clear how the applicant intends to provide Chromebooks with internet to all 5936 participating students and all participating teachers. While having the access to a Chromebook is needed for students access some of the proposed activities for personalized learning environments, it is not clear how students will be trained in other strategies or tools over the course of the grant period.

In regards to criteria D2b:

It is not clear how large the technical staff will be that can provide the technical support across multiple districts and multiple school sites. It is also not clear if the technical staff proposed is focused on the technology aspect and/or the educational aspect of tool support.

In regards to criteria D2c:

The applicant does not explicitly address this sub-criteria. The information technology system is vaguely described by the applicant and it is not clear how this system would be used in an open data format in supporting personalized learning.

In regards to criteria D2d:

The applicant does not fully describe how MyLearningPlan and MyLearningPlan OASYS would be fully deployed and used across each of the districts' schools so that the data would be interoperable.

Overall, the applicant poorly describes how LEA and school infrastructure supports personalized learning across all four of the sub-criteria. The applicant has some promising ideas but they are not part of a high-quality plan that would support personalized learning.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	0

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided evidence of how students would be responsible for its own progress and learning. The applicant has not addressed this criteria E1. That is, no strategies were presented in how the applicant intends to monitor, measure, and publically share information on its own progress and/or the quality of its investments. Consequently, no points were awarded for this selection criteria.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided modest strategies in how it intends to engage with school level stakeholders through the use of Moodle as a tool for supporting communication. It is unclear how the applicant intends to organize these communications over the course of the grant period as the Moodle tool by itself will not support engagement with key stakeholders. The applicant does not have a clearly thought out engagement plan in communicating with its key stakeholders. The strategies presented are weak and are not described fully to understand the ongoing nature of the communication and engagement work over the funding period. Consequently, this selection criteria was award 2 points out of 5 because it poorly addressed this sub-criteria.

(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	0
--	---	---

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant fails to address this criteria E3. There is no rationale presented in how the selected measures were determined now how the measure would produce information for the applicant in tracking implementation success of its theory of action,

and the applicant does not specify how it would review or improve the proposed measures over time.

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

5

1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant presents a minimal two-part plan in how it intends to evaluate the effectiveness of its activities. Both parts of the plan involve teacher survey measures. The description of the types of surveys to be administered are in general terms and are not connected to specific proposed activities. It is not clear how each of the proposed activities would be evaluated under a comprehensive plan. As a result, the applicant received a poor score of 1 out of 5 in this selection criteria.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has not addressed criteria F1a.

The applicant has not provided an explicit narrative as to how it intends to support the development and implementation of the proposal in a comprehensive way. The budget narrative is not complete as many of the items do not have clear justifications or rationales behind the each project activity.

The applicant has not addressed criteria F1c.i and F1c.ii

Overall, the applicant has poorly addressed this selection criteria. It is not clear if the proposed budget would be reasonable or sufficient to support the proposal as there is not a strong or clear budget narrative associated with each piece of the budget. Consequently, applicant has received 2 out of 10 in this selection criteria.

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

10

0

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has not addressed this selection criteria.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

This competitive preference priority is not addressed by the applicant.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Not Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Overall, the applicant has not met absolute priority 1. The applicant has not presented a coherent and comprehensive plan in addressing the needs across its 10 schools in six different districts in the middle grades. The proposed activities focused around literacy and the use of the Chromebooks are disconnected and there was not strong evidence that the applicant clearly understood the needs of the 5936 students across these 10 schools.

Total	210	39
-------	-----	----

Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)

	Available	Score
Optional Budget Supplement (Scored separately - 15 total points)	15	0

Optional Budget Supplement Reviewer Comments:

The optional budget supplement was not included in the proposal.