



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0226NY-2 for Madison-Oneida Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES)

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The grant expressed a very clear vision in the four core areas. The Personalized Learning For Unlimited Success (PLUS) Program aims to transform the educational experience so that each student's educational path, curriculum, instruction, and schedule are personalized to meet his or her unique needs, competencies and interests. There is a solid description of the personalized learning environment that will be built on Flexible, Anytime, Anywhere Learning, Redefining the role of teacher, Project-based and Authentic Learning Opportunities, Student-Driven Learning Path, Fostering student life skills and attributes and use of data to guide the reform process. The grant included a comment that "all schools within each LEA will participate in the PLUS program" indicating that the schools do not have a choice with the PLUS Program but should be able to select and modify programs that meet the immediate need of the students in the school building</i></p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	9
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The grant indicated that all school districts and buildings within each LEA in the BOCES will participate in the PLUS (Personalized Learning for Unlimited Success) Program and this is a whole-school, preK-12 approach to changing learning and teaching in the region. Charts are included that delineate the staff and students in each of the district and match the numbers presented in this proposal. The grant proceeded to describe the unique makeup of each of the districts in the service area and included the goals, activities, timelines, deliverables and who will provide the leadership and coordination of the various programs. The description includes the PLUS Program, Flexible, Anytime, Anywhere Learning, Redefining the role of teacher, Project-based and Authentic Learning Opportunities, Student-Driven Learning Path and Use of data will guide the entire reform process. These key components of the grant provide for a systematic approach to implementing programs that will meet the needs of students and reduce the achievement gap in the school buildings. While, these programs and strategies provide the school buildings with many alternatives, the grant indicated that all of the schools will participate in the PLUS program without any choice in the implementation process or approach.</i></p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>The grant states that the goals of this are to improve student performance and graduate more students who are college and career ready. The different components are described and provide the guidelines and strategies that will be used with the participating schools. The grant provides a high quality plan and describes four major areas for improvement based on multiple and inter-related issues adversely affecting student and school achievement. The four areas are: (1) general lack of resources, both financial and cultural; (2) the region has pockets of best practices but they are neither pervasive nor consistent; (3) student performance is below expectations and there remains an achievement gap for student subgroups: economically</i></p>		

disadvantaged and students with disabilities; and (4) students don't clearly see the connection between the skills they learn in school and the skills necessary to succeed in college, career or community. These are the common concerns across all of the districts and for each one the proposal describes potential solutions that will allow for the scaling up of the various programs described in the grant. There is a plan and the plan is very good but lacks details on midcourse corrections, the unique approaches the school buildings will use to meet their specific needs. The issue is that not all of the schools will adopt/adapt the program(s) the same way with the same process and this is not mentioned in the grant. *Additional details on the theory of change and plan would have been helpful.*

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:
 Charts and data represent each district's results and graduation rates. There was no indication on college enrollment or degree attainment. Some comments explaining trends would have been helpful in deciphering the data. The achievement levels in the chart demonstrate an increase on a yearly basis and are projected to increase by approximately 8% at the end of grant period for each group and subgroup of students. This is an achievable goal based on the key components and assessments strategies described in the grant. Some of the goals (increase in percentages) could have been higher in some ELA and Math areas at the various school buildings. The measures appear reasonable and the strategies designed and developed in the grant should reduce the achievement gaps with the various student populations.

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	9

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:
The grant indicated that seven schools within the participating LEAs have transitioned off of New York State lists of Schools Identified in Need of Improvement since 2008-2009. Only one school is currently identified. Progress has been made but the grant does not address directly the gains made by each district. The grant did indicate that the student performance data through the Parent Portal is available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. There was no indication on the type of data that is available, frequency and other related information. A statewide system (IRIS) will serve as a single platform providing access to educational data and applications for use by local education agencies and all stakeholders.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4
---	----------	----------

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:
The grant indicated that the school district budgets are available for review and then it is voted on by the Board of Education. The purpose of the BOCES annual meeting is to present the tentative administrative, capital, and program budgets of the BOCES to school board members of component school districts prior to the vote on the tentative administrative budget. Madison-Oneida BOCES hosts work sessions, in which component superintendents participate, to develop the BOCES program budgets. In addition, the BOCES administrative and capital budgets are presented at most component district board meetings prior to the annual meeting. No mention of salaries was included in the grant. The grant did not include actual salaries for all school level instructional and support staff but did indicate that the websites were listed in Appendix 2.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:
BOCES is a voluntary, cooperative association of school districts in a geographic area that share planning, services, and programs to provide educational and support activities more economically, efficiently, and equitably than could be provided by an individual district. Each district appears to be autonomous but there is no indication of such in the grant.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	8
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The consortium established the Regional Instructional Leadership Team (RILT), a cross-section of its stakeholder group representatives including superintendents, assistant superintendents, elementary and secondary principals, teachers, guidance counselors, and committee on special education chairs, technology coordinators, union representatives, and BOCES staff. The purpose of the RILT is to work collaboratively is a significant means of regional stakeholder involvement. This Race to the Top District Competition proposal reflects their action planning and input. The RILT will also serve to advise, guide, and monitor the implementation of the PLUS Program. The membership description is very broad and does not include the selection process, meeting agendas (i.e.. how often, where, size of group, length of participation, coordinator of group,etc.) and how effective is this group in making decisions and distributing the appropriate information.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	2
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The grant identified a couple of areas but did not specify the needs of the district nor was there an explanation on how the priorities were established.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	12
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>Page 65-68 indicates four learning objectives but only lists three (number 3 is not listed). The three learning objectives are very specific and provide steps and guidelines for implementing the PLUS Program. While this program has many positive attributes and outcomes, it may not match the needs of all school buildings in the BOCES service area. The PLUS program will engage and empower all learners, particularly high-need students, in an age-appropriate manner. The response in the grant is broad and does not include comments on deep learning and exposure to diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives that motivate and deepens individual student learning. Additionally, the Learning Objective 1 emphasizes life skills, positive habits and personal responsibility through the Covey Foundation program. These approaches should decrease the achievement gap with the various student groups based on the information provided in the grant. The activities and outcomes are explained but there is minimal connections to the other programs and how all of these programs are interrelated. It appears as if there was a selection of programs and no explanation on how these programs were selected or are interrelated to support the efforts on the part of the student and the school building.</i></p> <p><i>In the 11th grade, students will be given the ACCUPLACER® tests is to provide the student and teacher with useful information about academic skills in math, English, and reading in relation to what is expected at the freshman college level. There is no mention of parents but the grant does indicate that there will be monitoring of academic progress through ongoing and regular feedback using multiple tools, including formative assessments, daily reporting, 3C Skills pre and post tests, the State and district's growth/local measures, and summative New York State standardized assessments and Regents exams. No mention of any training for students in understanding the system and tools.</i></p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	8
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p><i>There are three objectives, which address personal skills development, implementation of personalized learning and teaching for all students and establish an adequate regional infrastructure to support district implementation of program activities and build capacity for future sustainability. While each objective has outlined items of activities, the response is unclear and does not respond to the criteria in this section. There is very little mention about instruction using feedback and other items included in the criteria.</i></p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	8
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Madison-Oneida BOCES, the lead LEA of the Consortium, will provide support and services to all participating member LEAs. The BOCES identified a high quality plan in the grant that included support and services to all participating member LEAs. As the grant indicated the services for the high quality plan includes the establishment of an LEA central office to support implementation of program activities and build capacity for future sustainability. BOCES will hire a Program Director to oversee the day-to-day operations of the program, hire and supervise staff, coordinate activities, maintain communications with district administrators and liaisons, monitor the budget, and ensure regulatory and programmatic compliance. Regional Instructional Leadership Team (RITL) will serve in an advisory capacity to the program and provide feedback and guidance to the Chief School Officers and program staff. The school leadership teams will retain autonomy over school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school-level budgets. The LEAs and the Consortium will work with the BOCES labor relations and policy service to review existing policies and explore new policies as necessary related to online learning and the personalized learning environment and make recommendations to their respective Boards of Education. The administrative plan for the grant is sufficient in providing guidelines and a structure for the grant. There was no mention about providing learning resources and instructional practices to students including special education students.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	8
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The PLUS Program provides for multiple pathways for students to achieve success and this includes giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of knowledge at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways. All learning resources and instructional practices will be adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners. Additionally, ensuring that all participating students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders (as appropriate and relevant to student learning), regardless of income, will have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school. The response did not describe "how" the training will be delivered to parents, students, educators and other stakeholders in using the technology. There was mention of a help desk but no comment on how it will be staffed and when it will be available to the community at large. There is no direct description or comments on the use of interoperable data systems except to discuss the New York State Education Department developing the IRIS system which will include all of the key components for allowing third party software to work on this system.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	7
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The BOCES will retain an independent evaluator to refine and administer the evaluation plans. Evaluator will be responsible for developing the evaluation tools, collecting and analyzing data, providing program recommendations throughout the project duration, and completing interim and final reports. The program evaluator will regularly consult with the program personnel to ensure that relevant course corrections are made based on stakeholder feedback. The evaluation component is well defined but continuous improvement needs additional comments and specifics to determine how it will be implemented in the districts. The proposal indicated that the external evaluator would provide feedback to the group and present progress towards the goals.</p>		

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	4
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: The grant identified different methods of communications, which does provide the bridge between the grant and the stakeholders. The grant did not describe how the communications would be disseminated to all of the other stakeholders that are located within the various communities. The different districts in the BOCES can and may use unique approaches for implementing these various programs and the communications needs to be "targeted" to the stakeholders in the communities rather than having a generic announcement.		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	0
(E)(3) Reviewer Comments: The grant presented some baseline data but did include additional data and did not respond to the following key items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Its rationale for selecting that measure; (b) How the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information tailored to its proposed plan and theory of action regarding the applicant's implementation success or areas of concern; and (c) How it will review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gauge implementation progress. 		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	4
(E)(4) Reviewer Comments: The grant did include an external evaluator with specific guidelines for the evaluation process and providing timely feedback to the stakeholders. The response discussed the continuous improvement process and presenting the findings of various activities every five weeks. A shorter time period for providing input and feedback would provide timely adjustments and revisions during the grant duration.		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: <i>The budget is described in detail with good supporting information. The costs associated with each participant of \$1727.00 appeared to be in the high range and the costs for the Covey consultants also appeared to be expensive.</i>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: <i>The grant identified three critical areas that will support sustainability once the funding cycle has been completed. The professional development provided to teachers is critical and this will be provided to all staff. The evaluation plan should also provide mid course corrections that can be used to sustain the program as well. The grant did not include additional training or support for the district if the liaison in the school building leaves the district. This part also mentions for the first time the local evaluation function but did not provide any explanation on how this will be implemented and its relationship with the overall project evaluation plan</i>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not include or describe any public or private resources designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students, giving highest priority to students in participating schools with high-need students. There was some mention of healthcare and housing services available in three of the districts but it was not connected or included in the outcomes of the grant.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The proposal provided addressed the four core educational assurance areas by developing strategies to improve teaching and learning through the personalized learning programs, support for teachers and students that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards, increased effectiveness of educators through professional development in order to raise student achievement, decreased through various tools and strategies the achievement gap across student groups; and established approaches and steps to increase the graduation rates to prepare students for college and careers.

Total	210	132
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0226NY-3 for Madison-Oneida Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES)

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium consists of 10 school districts united through the regional education services delivery area. The consortium frames its vision for reform as Personalized Learning for Unlimited Success (PLUS). PLUS includes several dimensions that correlate to three of the four required core educational assurance areas in the application. For example, the core assurance related to effective teachers and principals is partly described in the PLUS

components of "Redefining the role of teacher" , while the core assurance related to standards and assessments for college and career is more amply described in the PLUS components of "Flexible, Anytime, Anywhere Learning", "Project-based and Authentic Learning Opportunities", and Student-Driven Learning Path". Data is described adequately in the PLUS component related to data.

Unfortunately, this section makes no reference to the fourth core assurance area, turning around low-performing schools, which is a key part of this application.

In Section A(1) of its proposal, the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium scores in the middle range.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium proposal describes the demographic and geographic characteristics of each of the participating districts and the BOCES itself. From the data presented, it appears that five districts are considered rural, four are suburban, and one is urban. The Consortium has determined that all of the students in all the schools in participating districts will be part of the proposal, and all are eligible to do so. The Consortium identifies the PLUS Program as being Pre-K through grade 12 in nature, which adds to the proposal's sense of inclusion and coherence. The table for A(2) provides demographic information on all the schools in all 10 districts.

In Section A(2) of its proposal, the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium scores in the high range.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium clearly describes its theory of change for reform, based on a set of issues affecting all ten of the districts. These issues include lack of resources, inconsistent/isolated best practices, low student performance, and lack of connection for students between schoolwork and their futures. This list could have been a strong starting point for a coherent implementation/scale-up plan.

This section in the application calls out for a high-quality plan, including goals, activities, timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. No such plan is provided, although the narrative does indicate some activities which could be part of a successful scale-up and implementation plan. For example, the inclusion of a life skills and attributes element could certainly act as a strong basis for common efforts across the districts. However, the challenge of implementing high-level reform in ten districts with one intermediary service provider really requires a coordinated, comprehensive plan of action (particularly for timelines and responsible parties.) It is unfortunate that this level of comprehensiveness was lacking.

In Section A(3) of its proposal, the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium scores in the low range.

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

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The Consortium describes well the summative assessments to be used (state assessments) and the methodology for determining status (meeting proficiency) and growth, where possible.

In its table on summative assessments, the Consortium relies on grades 4 and 8 state assessments in ELA and mathematics and the secondary state assessments in ELA and math. Only 3 grade levels are listed. Each district has its own baseline and goals, and the goals vary from 39% to 100% proficient in the grade levels and subject areas. There is no explanation for such discrepancies in goals. Each district appears to be looking towards a two-point gain in proficiency per year, which is not ambitious. A rationale for determining targets would have been very useful, but was not present in the materials.

In its table on decreasing achievement gaps, the Consortium lists each district's information, and the Students with Disabilities and Economically Disadvantaged students are compared with the ALL students category for the district. Again, a two point percentage gain is expected per year, with little diminishing of achievement gaps anticipated. The severity of

the gaps are also somewhat masked by using the ALL students group as the base of comparison, in which the two subgroups are already included. Therefore, the goals for decreasing the achievement gap do not appear to be ambitious.

In its table on graduation rates, the Consortium again lists each district's information, for ALL students and Students with Disabilities and Economically Disadvantaged students. Again, there is a real discrepancy in the goals for these groups of students for the most part. Typically, there is a two-point percentage point gain expected for each group. There are some serious inconsistencies in the table. For example, Students with Disabilities are listed at one level for the baseline year, but then can be forty points higher or lower in the next year. This makes interpretation of the table very difficult and leads the reader to conclude that gap reduction is not a strong priority for the proposal.

The table on college enrollment lists the rates for each district individually, without subgroups. Again, a flat two-point gain is expected per year, ranging from a goal of 66% for one district and 84% for another. The table appears to reinforce prior and present achievement patterns, rather than speak loudly for markedly improved achievement as a result of this grant.

In Section A(4) of its proposal, the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium scores in the low range.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	5
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Consortium states that seven schools in the participating districts have moved off the NY lists of Schools Identified in Need of Improvement. Only one school is currently in that status across the ten districts. However, the narrative does not cite any evidence as to what the successes were in those schools, nor how they were achieved. The proposal does not offer any examples of reforms used in its low-performing schools, required in this section as indicators of a successful track record in working with low-achieving schools.</p> <p>The Consortium does appear to have adequate venues for student performance data to be shared with stakeholders, using Parent Portal systems, student progress reports, and state assessment results. The Consortium will be a part of the NY State Instructional Reporting and Improvement System (IRIS), as a result of the NY RTTT initiative. This will substantially increase the districts' abilities to share information which can be put to instructional use.</p> <p>In Section B(1) of its proposal, the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium scores in the middle range.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal describes how the districts' budgets are shared within their communities, as required by state law. The BOCES also provides public notice and meeting concerning the budgets. The narrative states that the budget information includes administrative salaries, but does not mention dissemination of instructional and teacher salaries, as required in this section.</p> <p>In Section B(2) of its proposal, the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium scores in the low range.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The narrative defines the authority for each school district in the Consortium and the BOCES itself to provide and deliver services. The application cites state Education Law as evidence. However, the narrative does not include any examples or evidence of how the districts and BOCES have provided any services using autonomy in the past.</p> <p>In Section B(3) of its proposal, the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium scores in the middle range.</p>		

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)	10	7
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Consortium describes its Regional Instructional Leadership Team (RILT), which acts as a cross-district body to identify common issues, develop regional goals, and do common action plans. This appears to be an effective way to bring together leadership from across the districts on a regular basis.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the narrative does not state how any stakeholders were involved in the development of the RTTT-District proposal for the consortium, as required in this section. While it does have appropriate MOUs from all the bargaining units and local governments, and letters of support from a variety of community organizations, this does not answer the question about stakeholder engagement in the proposal proposal itself.</p> <p>In Section B(4) of its proposal, the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium scores in the middle range.</p>		
(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section of the proposal is intended to highlight what the Consortium sees as its strengths and gaps in conducting its high-quality plan for implementing personalized learning environments. Because there was no plan included, this section does not identify in what areas the Consortium sees the PLUS Program as being easy or difficult to implement, where it anticipates obstacles or has identified contingencies. The narrative does describe how the Consortium has functioned with other grants successfully, but without reference to this grant.</p> <p>In Section B(5) of its proposal, the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium scores in the low range.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Consortium's proposal outlines some aspects of a high-quality plan, including goals and activities linked to the goals. The four goals (learning objectives) are directly related to the required elements of this section in teaching and learning and are well thought-out. However, it is unfortunate that the goals and activities are not accompanied by timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. Only a few activities say "every year" or give some idea when the activity will take place. In a consortium setting such as this proposal, the inclusion of responsible parties is particularly important, and would have been a strength area.</p> <p>In Section C(1) of its proposal, the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium scores in the middle range.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	12
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Again, the Consortium's proposal outlines some aspects of a high-quality plan, including goals and activities linked to the goals. The three goals (teaching and leading objectives) are directly related to the required elements of this section in teaching and leading and are well thought-out. Again, it is unfortunate that the goals and activities are not accompanied by timelines, deliverables, and responsible parties. The proposal does not address element (d) of this section.</p> <p>In Section C(2) of its proposal, the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium scores in the middle range.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	11
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The BOCES organization will establish an LEA central office for oversight of the grant and will hire a program director for the project. The Consortium will also identify district liaisons from each district, and will utilize the RILT as an advisory body. The proposal indicates that school leadership teams will maintain their autonomy over most school-level decisions, and will also have the resources of the BOCES labor relations and policy service to explore new areas. These planning steps all add credibility to the feasibility of a ten-district consortium.</p> <p>This section of the proposal does not provide any detail about the ways in which students can progress, earn credit, and demonstrate mastery in multiple ways; however, the (A) and (C) sections do provide some detail about how the PLUS program will open up access in these areas. There was no information provided about what resources are made available for students with disabilities and English learners.</p> <p>In Section D(1) of its proposal, the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium scores in the middle range.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	3
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This section asks for a high quality plan on ensuring access to learning resources via comprehensive policies and infrastructure, including goals, activities, timelines, deliverable, and responsible parties. Unfortunately, no such plan is provided by the Consortium in this section.</p> <p>The response appears to merely repeat the first three elements of the section, with some brief detail as to the Consortium's plans. The fourth element, concerning interoperable data systems, is addressed more fully. The Consortium will be part of the NY state's Instructional Reporting and Improvement System (IRIS) from its RTTT grant..</p> <p>In Section D(2) of its proposal, the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium scores in the middle range.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	15
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The Consortium's strategy for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process responds directly to the project's goals and activities. The strategy includes hiring an independent evaluator to refine/administer the evaluation plan. The objectives of the evaluation plan are listed in the Consortium proposal and include both process and outcome components.</p> <p>The narrative provides information on how the Consortium will publicly share information about the grant. All aspects of this response are fully-formed and appear to be feasible, particularly for a consortium setting.</p> <p>In Section E(1) of its proposal, the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium scores in the high range.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal provides a reasonable set of strategies to provide ongoing communication and engagement. These strategies include within-district, cross-district, and BOCES-level initiatives, appropriate to a consortium approach.</p>		

In Section E(2) of its proposal, the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium scores in the high range.

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

5

1

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

In the first two tables of the ALL students performance measures, the proposal provides a template for examining high quality teachers and principals by schools and subgroups, but provides only one year of data (grades 4-8) with no expectations/targets for future years. The reader cannot make any determinations about goals being ambitious or achievable

The tables on PreK-grade 3 do indicate applicant-proposed performance measures. The academic measure is meeting proficiency on Grade 3 NY State ELA and mathematics tests for ALL students and appropriate ESEA subgroups. The social/emotional performance measure has not been identified, but will come from the Personalized Learning Inventory (TBD). No data are provided in any of the tables. The reader cannot make any determinations about goals being ambitious or achievable

The table on the Grades 4-8 performance measure on on-track readiness states that the measure to be used will be the NY State Student Growth Percentiles for ELA and Math, for ALL students and for appropriate ESEA subgroups. At this time, there are no baseline data for this measure from the state, so no data are provided in the table. The tables on Grades 4-8 do include applicant-proposed performance measures. The academic measure is meeting proficiency on Grades 4 and 8 NY State ELA and mathematics tests for ALL students and appropriate ESEA subgroups. The social/emotional performance measure has not been identified, but will come from the Personalized Learning Inventory (TBD). No data are provided in any of the tables. The reader cannot make any determinations about goals being ambitious or achievable

For grades 9-12, the required tables on FAFSA and on-track readiness are provided for ALL participating students and for appropriate ESEA subgroups. The first on-track indicator is listed as the AccuPlacer Assessments at grade 11 and the second is the ThreeC's Skills for grades 9-12. However, no data are provided in any of the tables. The reader cannot make any determinations about goals being ambitious or achievable

The tables on Grades 9-12 do include applicant-proposed performance measures. The academic measure is meeting mastery level on the NY State Regents' exams for ELA and mathematics tests for ALL students and appropriate ESEA subgroups. The social/emotional performance measure has not been identified, but will come from the Personalized Learning Inventory (TBD). No data are provided in any of the tables. The reader cannot make any determinations about goals being ambitious or achievable

In Section E(3) of its proposal, the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium scores in the low range.

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

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The proposal has laid out a thorough and well-conceived plan to evaluate the effectiveness of its plan, as described in an earlier section of (E). The strategies include internal initiatives plus the services of an external evaluator. The strategies listed in this section seem reasonable and feasible, and likely to be successful.

In Section E(4) of its proposal, the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium scores in the high range.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

The budget proposal is clear and the budget summaries are directly related to the proposal's goals and activities as outlined throughout the sections. The majority of the budget categories are for ongoing expenses, with similar figures across the years. There are no funds listed from other sources to support the project. Rationales for the expenses in the sub-budgets are well-explained and appear to be appropriate. The bulk of the grant is dedicated to the Personalized Learning Portal and Content, about \$21 million of the \$30 million requested. While this seems out-of-balance at first, this area includes the development of curriculum and content modules for five different areas in a variety of grade levels. This is the bedrock of the whole proposal, and an appropriate way for ten small districts to collectively gain access to high-quality curriculum work.

In Section F(1) of its proposal, the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium scores in the high range.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5
---	-----------	----------

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section requires a high-quality plan for sustainability, including goals, activities, timeline, deliverables, and responsible parties. Unfortunately, no such plan is provided, although the proposal describes how several of the PLUS Program activities can be/will be sustained beyond the scope of the grant. For example, the development of the mobile learning environment is clearly a deliverable for sustainability

In Section F(2) of its proposal, the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium scores in the middle range.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

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

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The proposal did not include a Competitive Preference Priority section.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The proposal has many strengths, including the Consortium's vision, the infrastructure of the Consortium itself, the development of the PLUS program as a PreK-12 model, the teaching and learning goals and activities, the process for monitoring continuous improvement, the well-crafted evaluation plan, and the detailed and appropriate budget. Where the proposal is lacking is in the full development of high quality plans for the three required sections (C, E, and F). While some aspects of the plan information are present, no plans are fully fleshed out with all the elements, which makes them less comprehensive.

Another area of weakness concerns the performance measures. No data were provided in the tables, so there was no clear path provided as to the improvement in student performance that these personalized learning environments should lead to. It makes it appear that the Consortium does not really know the current state of student performance, and that it cannot project what its future state should be.

Despite the absence of fully-developed plans and the lack of information in the performance measures, this proposal does meet the absolute priority to create learning environments to improve learning and teaching. The Consortium is to be

commended for working across ten districts, focusing on common issues and goals, to develop a proposal with great promise for its collective students.

Total	210	122
--------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0226NY-4 for Madison-Oneida Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES)

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant, Madison-Oneida Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES), has developed this proposal to build a comprehensive and coherent reform vision for ten (10) LEAs, which include 16,049 students. This comprehensive and coherent reform across the region builds on the New York State Race to the Top program, its ongoing work in the four core educational assurance areas, and the research base relating to personalized learning environments and college and career readiness. The applicant clearly indicates that the goal of this program is to honor the principle that all children, regardless of demographics or background, deserve a quality education. The vision for this reform is to provide a rigorous education that prepares all children to be productive members of their families, neighborhoods, and the global community.

The applicant describes a comprehensive reform vision of the Personalized Learning for Unlimited Success (PLUS) Program that aims to transform the educational experience so that each student's educational path, curriculum instruction, and schedule is personalized to meet his or her needs, competencies, and interests. The applicant thoroughly demonstrates that through personalized learning environments, the paradigm will shift from an institution and teacher-centered approach to a student-centered approach. The students will take ownership and engage in their learning so that they are prepared for meaningful work, citizenship, and life.

The applicant thoroughly demonstrates a vision and program design that are aligned with the key findings summarized in The Innovate to Education: System [Re]Design for Personalized Learning, A Report from the 2010 Symposium (Wolf, 2010). This symposium was co-sponsored by The Software and Information Industry Association, ASCE, and the Council of Chief State School Officers.

The applicant has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform vision that will be built on:

- Flexible, Anytime, Anywhere Learning;
- Redefining the role of teacher;
- Project-based and Authentic Learning Opportunities;
- Student-Driven Learning Path;
- Fostering student life skills and attributes; and,
- Use of data.

The vision for the PLUS program is to not only graduate students from high school, but to change the education system to consistently prepare young people for success in college, career, community, and life.

The applicant thoroughly articulates a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support by demonstrating the following vision:

1. Standards: Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy - The reform vision includes the implementation of the Common Core Learning Standards where students become active learners as they read, write, and analyze evidence; seek solutions to real problems; and research and debate. Students learn 21st century skills that will prepare them for college and career.
2. Data systems: Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction - The use of data will guide the entire reform process, including the following: identifying student needs, skills and interests; matching student learning styles to instructional modalities; developing and using formative assessments to provide timely and accurate information so that teachers can meet individual student needs; measuring academic and personal growth; and providing student and family access to their data so they can track progress toward their identified goals.
3. Strong teachers: Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most - The applicant articulates the redefining of the role of teacher from leader and lecturer to that of a facilitator of learning. The teacher assumes the role of coach or facilitator while students work collaboratively.
4. School improvement: Turning around the lowest achieving schools. The applicant provides a vision that indicates that today's industrial-age, assembly-line educational model based on fixed time, place, curriculum, and pace is insufficient in today's society and today's economy. We must turn our education system into a student-centered, customized learning model to address the diversity of students' backgrounds and needs as well as our higher expectation for all students.

The total Race to the Top - District grant funding requested is \$29,999,566.

This criterion is scored in the high range because the applicant has described a comprehensive reform vision that clearly builds on its work in the four educational assurance areas.

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

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant, Madison-Oneida BOCES, demonstrates a comprehensive approach to implementing its reform proposal. The Madison-Oneida Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) Consortium is comprised of ten Local Education Agencies (LEAs) that will collaborate in the Race to the Top - District project. The applicant's approach to implementing its reform proposal will support high-quality LEA-level implementation of the proposal.

(a) The applicant indicates that Madison-Oneida Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) will be the lead agency of this reform proposal. This lead agency is a regional educational entity that serves nine school districts in Madison and Oneida Counties of New York State. The mission of BOCES is to cooperatively provide educationally focused programs and services that enable learners to excel. The applicant indicates that the BOCES model is cost-efficient and saves money for school districts to collaborate. The applicant indicates that all schools within each LEA will participate in the PLUS Program. The applicant indicates that four of the districts in the southern tier of Madison County are small, rural communities and are high need districts with free and reduced lunch rates ranging from 28% to 49%. Three of the districts are along the Route 5 corridor, are suburban districts, with reduced lunch rates ranging from 38% to 43%, with some schools exceeding 60%. Two of the districts are located in Oneida County, which is rural and isolated from more populated communities, with free and reduced lunch rate of 51% district-wide, with the four elementary schools averaging 57%. One of the districts, Rome, is a mid-size city with approximately 39,099 residents, and is an economically distressed community. More than 52% of Rome's students are eligible for free and reduced lunch, two of the larger elementary schools have rates in excess of 81%, another is at 66%, and four or more are above 50%. Although the applicant provides a description of the schools that will participate in the grant activities, the applicant did not provide a description of the process that the applicant used to select schools to participate.

(b) The applicant provides a clear list of the ten LEAs, located in central New York State, that comprise the LEAs in the Madison-Oneida Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) Consortium, that will participate in this reform proposal. They include the following:

- Camden Central School District;

- Canastota Central School District;
- Hamilton Central School District;
- Madison Central School District (rural as defined in the RFP);
- Morrisville-Eaton Central School District;
- Oneida City School District;
- Rome City School District;
- Stockbridge Valley Central School District (rural as defined in the RFP);
- Sherrill City (Vernon-Verona-Sherrill) School District; and
- Madison-Oneida Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES)

(c) The applicant thoroughly aligns each of the participating LEAs, and their participating schools in each LEA to the number of participating educators, number of participating students, number of participating high-need students, number of participating low-income students,

This criterion is scored in the high range because the applicant describes a comprehensive approach to implementation.

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

10

7

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The district describes a very general plan to address district-wide reform and change in order to reach outcome goals. The applicant generally indicates that the PLUS Program will address the full integration of the Common Core Learning Standards, AP courses, professional development, the use of technology to work collaboratively, and empowerment of every student to take an active role in his or her education and set goals to be prepared for success in all aspects of life.

The applicant clearly describes the approach that will be used to incorporate life skills that promote personal efficacy, resiliency, persistence, and ethics. The approach selected is from the Covey Foundation work: *The Leader in Me* (Stephen Covey, 2012), *The 7 Habits of Happy Kids* (Sean Covey, 2008), *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective Teens* (Sean Covey, 1998), and *The 6 Most Important Decisions You'll Ever Make* (Sean Covey, 2006).

This criterion is scored in the medium range because the applicant describes a very general plan for reform and change in the targeted school districts, but the applicant did not provide the details of the reform or how meaningful reform will help the applicant reach its outcome goals. The applicant did not provide the details on how its plan will improve learning outcomes for all students.

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

10

7

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant clearly describes the vision for the following areas:

(4)(a) Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth): The summative assessments being used are the NYS 4th Grade ELA Assessment, NYS 4th Grade Math Assessment, NYS 8th Grade ELA Assessment, NYS 8th Grade Math Assessment, NYS English Language Arts Regents Exam required for Graduation, NYS Math Regents Exam Required for Graduation. The applicant indicates that the methodology for determining growth (value-added, mean growth percentile, change in achievement levels):

- For buildings with greater than 30% of students taking the NY State 4-8 ELA or Math Assessment, baseline building data was derived from the August 2012 NYS District Growth Report.
- For all other buildings, principals and teachers, the specific growth methodology will be determined pending district negotiations and NY State Approval of each District's Annual Professional Performance Plan in accordance with New York State Education Law §3012.c and the Commissioner's Regulations.

(4)(b) Decreasing achievement gaps: The district's goal is to decrease achievement gaps in all students, students with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged. The applicant indicates that in most of the participating districts, no other subgroup is large enough or even present to be reported. The exception is Rome City School District, which has identifiable groups of Black-African American and Hispanic or Latino subgroup.

(4)(c) Graduation rates: The district clearly describes its plan to provide instruction for every student so the graduation rate, the four-year or extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as defined by 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1), will increase.

(4)(d) College enrollment: The district has clearly defined its vision and learning targets in order to increase college enrollment rates.

This criterion is scored in the medium range because the applicant provides charts with some of the increasing percentages for the four (4) years of the grant and the post grant year, but the applicant did not state specific LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes. It is difficult to assess whether annual goals are ambitious yet achievable when some of the baseline data is deemed confidential.

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:		
<p>The Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium generally indicates that seven schools within the participating LEAs have transitioned off of New York State lists of Schools Identified in Need of Improvement since 2008-2009. Only one school is currently identified as a School in Need of Improvement.</p> <p>(1) The applicant did not present demonstrated evidence from each LEA indicating a clear record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching, including a description, charts or graphs, or raw student data.</p> <p>(a) The applicant did not provide evidence that demonstrates the applicant's ability to improve learning outcomes and close achievement gaps, including raising student achievement, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment rates. The applicant indicates that as part of the NYS Race to the Top initiative, the New York State Education Department is creating an instructional Reporting and Improvement System (IRIS), which shall include instructional reporting, collaboration, and platform features. The applicant indicates that IRIS will serve as a single platform providing access to educational data and applications for use by local education agencies as well as across New York and in other states.</p> <p>(b) The applicant did not provide demonstrated evidence of the applicant's ability to achieve ambitious reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools or in its low-performing schools.</p> <p>(c) The applicant indicates that each participating LEA makes student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services. Each district utilizes the Parent Portal component of their student management system to make grades, attendance, and assessment scores accessible to parents and students. The applicant also clearly demonstrates that individual student progress reports and state assessment summaries and data are mailed to each parent or guardian. The applicant also indicates that each LEA communicates aggregate student data through district and school websites and data is included in board and community presentations.</p> <p>This criterion is scored in the medium range because the applicant provides some general information stating seven schools within the participating LEAs have transitioned off of New York State lists of Schools Identified in Need of Improvement since 2008-2009. However, the applicant did not demonstrate clear evidence of improving student outcomes, closing achievement gaps, including raising student achievement, high school graduation rates, and college enrollment.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	2
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The Madison-Oneida Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) Consortium, comprised of ten Local Education Agencies (LEAs), generally indicates that Education Law requires that the annual budget is presented to the district voters</p>		

for their approval. A public hearing, when the board presents the budget to voters, must occur seven to 14 days before the annual meeting and election. In addition to a detailed budget plan, attachments available for the public to inspect must include: a statement on administrative salaries, a school district report card, a property tax report card, a tax exemption report, and a school leadership and school progress report card.

Although the applicant indicates that there is transparency in the participating LEAs budgeting decisions, the following four categories were not specifically described in the proposal:

(2)(a) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for school-level instructional and support staff were not described as already being made available.

(2)(b) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff were not described as already being made available.

(2)(c) Actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers were not described as already being made available.

(2)(d) Actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level were not described as already being made available. The applicant generally indicates that each participating LEA in the Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium makes all budget information available on their respective district website.

This criterion is scored in the medium range because the applicant has not demonstrated evidence of a level of transparency by making public the actual personnel salaries at the school level for all school-level instructional and support staff, actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff, or actual personnel salaries at the school level.

Therefore, the applicant does not already demonstrate evidence of a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments.

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

10

8

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant indicates that each of the participating school districts is a LEA and has evidence that it is suitable to participate in the Consortium and the Race to the Top - District competition, as well as to deliver the services that are described in the proposal. The applicant indicates that a board of cooperative educational services (BOCES) is a voluntary, cooperative association of school districts, located in a geographic area in which they share planning, services, and programs. The applicant indicates that BOCES are organized under section 1950 of the Education Law (5:1-4) and are recognized as a local educational agency by the New York State Education Department. The applicant indicates that the grant activities related to the implementation of personalized learning environments are in accordance with the state's current legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements and are aligned with the New York State Race to the Top and Regents Reform Agenda initiatives.

This criterion is scored in the high range. The applicant indicates that a letter of support and documentation of the required 10-day review process from the New York State Education Department is enclosed in the Signature Pages. However, the only letter from the New York Education Department enclosed in the application is the letter designating the restricted indirect cost rates.

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

10

6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium describes the comprehensive review process that the LEAs completed to determine if it should move forward with the proposed RTT-D application. The LEAs comprising this consortium have worked collaboratively for more than forty years to meet learner needs across the region. The applicant indicates that the following formal and informal methods have been utilized for engaging stakeholders in the development, implementation and evaluation of educational programs: public board meetings, shared decision teams, community meetings, parent teacher association meetings, and superintendent blogs and online surveys engaging parents and community residents.

(a) The applicant describes demonstrated evidence of engagement and support by educators in the participating school districts. In 2011, the consortium established the Regional Instructional Leadership Team (RILG), a cross-section of its stakeholder group representatives including superintendents, assistant superintendents, elementary and secondary principals, teachers, guidance counselors, committee on special education chairs, technology coordinators, union representatives, and BOCES staff. The purpose of the RILT is to work collaboratively to identify common issues or trends facing educators, develop regional goals and action plans based on the issues and data, draw on local experts to share best practices, and to maximize limited resources. The RILT has established two regional goals: to improve literacy rates for K-3 students and to increase graduation rates. The applicant indicates that this Race to the Top - District proposal reflects the action planning and input of regional stakeholders in the RILT. The RILT will serve to advise, guide, and monitor the implementation of the PLUS Program. The applicant did not indicate how student or families were involved in the development of this proposal.

(i) The applicant has provided a Memorandum of Understanding indicating the support of the collective bargaining unit from all participating school districts.

(b) The applicant provides a Memorandum of Understanding from each participating school district, with signatures from each superintendent, local school board president, and president of the local teacher's union, or association. The applicant indicates that signature pages signed by mayors is included in the proposal but these letters or support or signature pages were not located in the application for the grant. The applicant did not provide letters of support from key stakeholders as parents and parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, the business community, advocacy groups, local civic and community-base organizations, or institutions of higher education.

This criterion is scored in the medium range because the applicant has demonstrated clear evidence of the engagement of educators in the development of the proposal, but did not describe engagement of students or parents. The applicant did not provide letters of support for the proposal from key stakeholders.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)	5	1
---	----------	----------

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant did not provide demonstrated evidence of a high-quality plan for an analysis of the current status in implementing personalized learning environments and the logic behind the reform proposal, including identified needs and gaps that the plan will address.

The applicant briefly explained its experience with virtual learning, including the following:

- U.S. Department of Agriculture Distance Learning & Technology Grants, 2003 and 2005, \$1,000,000
- Learning Anytime, Anywhere project, 2005
- Enhancing Education Through Technology, 2009, \$2,700,700

The consortium has recently applied to the New York State Education Department for a Virtual AP Program grant that would provide for the development and delivery of three virtual AP courses to 300 students in the region.

This criterion is scored in the low range because the applicant did not demonstrate an analysis of needs and gaps or a plan for the analysis of the applicant's current status in implementing personalized learning environments.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has described a quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. The applicant describes the goals, activities, and deliverables for a high-quality plan, but the applicant did not provide the timelines or the responsible parties for a high-quality plan. The applicant provides a comprehensive plan that includes mechanisms in place to provide training and support to students that will ensure that they understand how to use the resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning. The applicant describes Learning Objectives 1, 2, & 4, but omitted Learning Objective 3.

(a)(i) The applicant describes a plan for students to understand that what they are learning is key to their success in accomplishing their goals. The applicant describes Learning Objective 1: Students will develop life skills, positive habits, and personal responsibility so that they are prepared for success in college, career, community, and life. The applicant will hire nine (9) staff developers, three for each grade level: PreK-3, Grades 4-8, and Grades 9-12 who will be responsible for working with the Covey Foundation model, including providing professional development, guidance and monitoring related to the full implementation of the model.

(a)(ii) The applicant describes a comprehensive plan for students to Identify and pursue learning and development goals linked to college-ready curriculum, understand how to structure their learning to achieve their goals, and measure progress toward those goals. The applicant describes Learning Objective 2: Students will utilize a personalized learning platform to initiate their own student-driven learning path and access a myriad of engaging learning content, resources, and service opportunities that match their unique needs anywhere, anytime. The applicant will issue a Request for Proposal that complies with BOCES procurement policy and is consistent with the standards in Section 80.36 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations [EDGAR], for the development or customization of the personalized learning platform. The applicant will create curriculum and content modules, including connections to community service and learning opportunities available to the following:

- STEM: Science, technology, engineering, and math with a focus on nanotechnology, gaming, and cyber security and utilizing regional resources
- CTE: Career and Technical Education with a focus on hands-on, project-based learning with regional connections
- Arts: fine, visual and dramatic arts with a focus on creativity and expression
- Language, Literature, and Culture: reading, writing, and social studies with connections to local historical societies, national parks, and museums
- Engagement: Life Skills Inventory and lesson plans relating to ten skill sets necessary to prepare students for college, career, and community

(a)(iii) The applicant describes a clear plan for students to be involved in deep learning experiences in areas of academic interest. The applicant clearly demonstrate that all curriculum and content will integrate the Common Core Learning Standards; align with college-and career-ready standards; link students to community and virtual resources, and connect them to service or learning opportunities within the region.

(a)(iv) The applicant provides a plan for students to have access and exposure to contexts and perspectives that motivate and deepen individual student learning. The applicant clearly describes Learning Objective 4: Students will have access to multiple, alternate pathways to personalize their learning; meet individual needs for remediation and enrichment; and prepare for college and career. The applicant indicates that students will be able to experience before school, after school, and summer enrichment activities to enhance learning and to continually engage learners.

(a)(v) The applicant describes a comprehensive plan for students to master critical academic content and develop skills and traits such as goal-setting. The applicant indicates that all students in grade 11 will take the ACCUPLACER assessment for the purpose of providing the student and teacher with useful information about academic skills in math, English, and reading in relation to what is expected at the freshman college level. The results of the assessment, along with a student's academic background, goals, and interests, will be used to identify areas in need of support or remediation and determine course selection. This will assist students in goal-setting. The applicant did not specifically describe a plan for students to have exposure to learning environments that deepen and develop critical thinking.

(b)(i) The applicant thoroughly demonstrates that each student will have access to a personalized sequence of instructional content and skill development designed to enable the student to achieve his or her individual learning goals and to ensure he or she can graduate on time and college- and career-ready. The applicant describes in Learning Objective 2, a plan to monitor the academic progress through ongoing and regular feedback using multiple tools. including formative assessments, daily reporting, 3C Skills pre- and post-tests, the

State and district's growth/local measures, and summative New York State standardized assessments and Regents exams. The Individual student data will be used to determine progress toward the mastery of college- and career-ready standards.

(b)(ii) The learning plan clearly provides evidence that students will experience a variety of high-quality instructional approaches and environments. The applicant describes a variety of curriculum and content modules in Learning Objective 2, which is described in (c)(a)(2).

(b)(iii) The applicant describes a clear plan for students to be involved in high-quality content, including digital learning content aligned with college- and career-ready standards. The applicant describes in Learning Objective 2 that iPad carts will be provided to each of the participating LEA elementary schools so that students can become familiar with and start to use the technology. Each year, the applicant will provide every incoming 6th grader in the region with a personal learning device that they will keep and use through 8th grade. Each year, the applicant will provide every incoming 9th grader with a personal learning device to be kept and used through 12th grade allowing all students access to a personalized learning environment anytime, anywhere. By the end of the four-year grant period, the consortium will have achieved a one-to-one mobile learning environment for every student in the region.

(b)(iv)(A) The applicant generally indicates that individual student data will be frequently updated so that students can determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready graduation requirements. The applicant plans to monitor academic progress through ongoing and regular feedback but did not provide the plans or the precise tools that will be used for students to track and manage their learning.

(b)(iv)(B) The applicant demonstrates plans for students to receive personalized learning recommendations based on the student's current knowledge and skills, college- and career-ready graduation requirements. Students will be provided with an Interest/Learning Style Inventory that will match their options to pursue their learning, such as content modules, teachers, and available instructional modalities to make personalized learning decisions based on their current knowledge, skills, and progress toward college- and career-ready standards.

(b)(v) The applicant demonstrates a plan to provide accommodations and high-quality strategies for high-need students to help ensure that they are on track toward meeting college- and career-ready graduation requirements. The applicant indicates that traditional and virtual English language arts and math remediation opportunities will be provided for students based on ACCUPLACER results.

(c) The applicant generally indicates that teachers and students will be trained and supported to ensure that they understand how to use the tools and resources provided to them in order to track and manage their learning. The applicant did not clearly describe the mechanisms that are in place to provide the training and support.

Overall, the applicant provides a quality plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. This criterion is scored in the medium range because the applicant describes many instructional strategies for preparing students for college and careers. However, the applicant did not provide the details for many of the strategies, a timeline for the strategies to occur, or the individuals responsible for the training and support.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	7
--	-----------	----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a very general plan for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready. The applicant generally indicates that the PLUS Program will increase teacher and leader capacity to support progress toward meeting college- and career-readiness.

(a)(i) The applicant generally describes the process of teacher training to 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 generally indicates that each teacher in the region will engage in at least 25 hours annually of training related to personalized learning environments; online learning and content development; the Common Core Learning Standards; and the tools, data, and resources necessary to accelerate student progress toward college and career readiness.

(a)(ii) The applicant generally indicates that training will be developed for teachers to be able to 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. The applicant did not describe the strategies or the approach for this training.

(a)(iii) The applicant generally indicates that training will be developed so that teachers will be able to frequently measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards, or college- and career-ready graduation requirements and use data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators. The applicant did not describe the strategies or the approach for this training.

(a)(iv) The applicant generally indicates that training will be developed to Improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback provided by the LEA's teacher and principal evaluation systems. The applicant did not describe the strategies or the approach for this training.

(b)(i)(ii)(iii) The applicant did not describe a plan on how the participating educators will have access to, and know how to use tools, data, and resources that will help them identify optimal learning approaches that will respond to individual student academic needs and interests. The applicant did not describe high-quality learning resources, including digital resources, that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards. The applicant did not describe specific processes and tools to match student needs with specific resources and approaches.

(c)(i)(ii) The applicant indicates that LEAs are in the process of negotiating what their teacher/principal evaluations will look like. On March 14, 2012, the New York State Assembly and Senate passed the revised teacher and principal evaluation law proposed by the Governor. On March 27, 2012, the Governor signed the revised teacher and principal evaluation law as Chapter 21 of the Laws of 2012. At its March meeting, the Board of Regents adopted regulations to implement Education Law 3012-c, as amended by Chapter 21 of the Laws of 2012, effective April 4, 2012. The applicant indicates that the Appendix contains the 'Purple Memo, which provides a summary of the regulations adopted by the Board of Regents to implement Education Law 3012-c.

(d) The applicant did not describe a plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals, including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects, such as mathematics and science, and specialty areas, such as special education.

This criterion is scored in the medium range because the applicant repeated the selection criterion without providing the details on how this applicant will work with the participating LEAs to provide the necessary training and professional development. The applicant did not provide an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students that enable participating students to pursue a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards and accelerate his or her learning through support of his or her needs.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	8

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Madison-Oneida BOCES, the lead LEA of the consortium, has described a very general plan plan to support project implementation. The applicant did not adequately describe comprehensive policies and infrastructure that facilitate personalized learning.

(a) The applicant did not adequately describe the practices, policies, and rules that will facilitate personalized learning by organizing the consortium governance structure to provide support and services to all participating schools. The applicant generally indicates that BOCES will establish an LEA office to support the implementation of program activities and to build capacity for future sustainability. BOCES will hire a Program Director to oversee the day-to-day operations of the program, hire and supervise staff, coordinate activities,

maintain communication with district administrators and liaisons, monitor the budget, and ensure regulatory and programmatic compliance.

(b) The applicant generally indicates that the Chief School Officers of the participating LEAs will use a consensus process for making decisions related to vision, policy, finalized and adjusted goals, activities, and outcomes. The Regional Instructional Leadership Team will serve in an advisory capacity to the program and provide feedback and guidance to the Chief School Officers and program staff.

The applicant did not identify the members of the Regional Instructional Leadership Team or clarify how individuals are selected to be members of this Leadership Team. The applicant provides information indicating that member LEAS and the consortium will work with the BOCES labor relations and policy service to review existing policies and to explore new policies related to online learning and the personalized learning environment and make recommendations to their respective Boards of Education.

(c) The applicant did not provide a plan to give students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic.

(d) The applicant did not provide a plan to give students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways.

(e) The applicant generally indicates that the PLUS Program will provide multiple pathways for students to achieve success, which generally means that all learning resources and instructional practices will be adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English Language Learners.

This criterion is scored in the medium range because the applicant generally described the organizing of the consortium, but the applicant did not provide an adequate plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	4
---	-----------	----------

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Madison-Oneida BOCES, the lead LEA of the Consortium, has provided a very general repetition of the selection criterion without providing the details that describe the LEA and school infrastructure that will support personalized learning.

(a) The applicant generally indicates that each year the PLUS Program will provide individual learning devices, applications, and content to all incoming 6th and 9th grade students for use in and out of school.

(b) The Mohawk Regional Information Center (MORIC) will provide technical support services that include technical oversight of the infrastructure (servers) including back-ups and assuring an estimated 95% up time. MORIC technical support will be available to assist users with technical difficulties through an online help desk. The applicant is not clear on how students, parents, educators, and other stakeholder will be able to receive appropriate levels of technical support through the Mohawk Regional Information Center.

(c) Each of the participating LEAs has a wireless infrastructure and broadband capacity of at least 100 megabit in every building. The applicant indicates that the personalized online learning platform will have the ability to provide access to parents and students.

(d) The applicant indicates, that as a part of the NYS Race to the Top initiative, New York State Education is creating an Instructional Reporting and Improvement System (IRIS) which will include instructional reporting, collaboration, and platform features. IRIS will serve as a single platform providing access to educational data and applications for use by local education agencies as well as across New York and in other states.

This criterion is scored in the medium range because the applicant provides very minimal details on the policies and infrastructure that will support personalized learning.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	9

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a very general continuous improvement process for the proposed project. The applicant, Madison-Oneida BOCES, will issue a Request for Proposal to secure an independent evaluator to refine and administer the evaluation plan upon the awarding of the grant. The applicant indicates that the individual hired must possess a Bachelor's degree in program/policy analysis, statistics, research, education or related field, graduate degree preferred and two years experience conducting program evaluation. The evaluator will be responsible for developing the evaluation tools, collecting and analyzing data, program recommendations throughout the project, and completing interim and final reports.

The applicant describes an evaluation plan that will address the following objectives: to determine whether program activities provide greater access for all students to academically-rigorous personalized learning environments; to determine whether program activities produce a positive impact on student achievement and progress toward college and career readiness; to determine whether program activities produce a positive impact on school district capacity of providing personalized learning environments and virtual learning opportunities; to assess the impact of resources and professional development on teacher and leader capacity to develop and deliver personalized learning environment in the district; and to conduct ongoing assessments of project and student data every five weeks that project staff and stakeholders can use to refine the program and to increase sustainability. These objectives were not described in the narrative of the proposal except in this section, the continuous improvement process. It is difficult to assess objectives that have not been specifically described and developed in the proposal.

The evaluation design will include the following features: multiple data sources, quantitative and qualitative data, comparison/experimental design, and consumer-friendly reporting. The program evaluator will regularly consult with the program personnel to ensure that corrections are made based on stakeholder feedback. Data and recommendations will be provided to program staff, district liaisons, and the Regional Instructional Leadership Team every five weeks.

The applicant generally indicates that the consortium will monitor, and publicly share information on the quality of the investments through the posting of information to their respective district websites. The applicant did not describe the strategies that will be used to monitor or measure the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top - District, such as investments in professional development, technology, and staff.

This criterion is scored in the medium range because the applicant did not describe a high-quality plan that includes timelines for the progress toward project goals or strategies on measuring the quality of its Race to the Top - District investments, such as professional development, technology, and staff.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Madison-Oneida BOCES describes clear strategies for ongoing communication and engagement:

- The in-district liaisons will serve as a network to share information and to communicate across the region to all participating LEAs.
- The Regional Instructional Leadership Team will monitor and advise the PLUS Program staff and serve as the primary vehicle for two-way communication.
- Independent evaluator reports will be shared with stakeholder groups every five weeks. The applicant did not provide information on the responsible staff who will be responsible for sharing the independent evaluator reports.
- The PLUS Program will be listed as an agenda item at monthly stakeholder meetings, such as the Chief School Officers, Assistant Superintendents, Secondary Principals, and Elementary Principals.
- The BOCES website and a dedicated PLUS Program page will be used to share information.

- The BOCES Public Information Office will develop media releases, publications, and communications to parents, districts, and the general public.

This criterion is scored in the high range because the applicant describes clear strategies for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.

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

5

2

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes performance measures, overall and by two subgroups (students with disabilities; economically disadvantaged), without annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures.

The performance measures that will measure progress toward college- and career-level mastery include the following assessments: NYS Grade 3 ELA Assessment - Proficiency, NYS Grade 3 Math Assessment - Proficiency, NYS Assessment: Grade 4 ELA, Grade 8 ELA, Grade 4 Math, Grade 8 Math proficiency, NYS ELA Regents Exam required for graduation, NYS Math Regents Exam required for graduation, and an age-appropriate health or social-emotional leading indicator will be identified as part of the Personalized Learning Inventory (to be developed as part of the grant).

For each applicant-proposed measure, the applicant did not describe:

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

All Population (Required Performance Measures): The applicant did not provide the annual targets for:

- a. The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup whose teacher of record and principal are a highly effective teacher and a highly effective principal); and
- b. The number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, whose teacher of record and principal are an effective teacher and an effective principal.

The applicant provides performance measures (Prek-3 a.b.; 4-8 a.b.c.; 9-12 a.b.c.d.e.), overall and by some required subgroups, but did not provide annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures. It cannot be determined if performance measures are ambitious or achievable because the baseline and the annual targets are not identified.

Although the applicant has developed performance measures, the applicant did not identify all of the required subgroups, the baseline, or the annual targets. The applicant did not answer the three (3) questions describing the applicant-proposed measures. Therefore, this criterion is scored in the medium range.

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

5

1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant generally indicates that the consortium will monitor, and publicly share information on the quality of the investments through the posting of information to their respective district websites. The applicant did not describe the strategies that will be used to monitor or measure the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top - District, such as investments in professional development, technology, and staff.

The evaluation design will include the following features: multiple data sources, quantitative and qualitative data, comparison/experimental design, and consumer-friendly reporting. The program evaluator will regularly consult with the program personnel to ensure that corrections are made based on stakeholder feedback. Data and recommendations will be provided to program staff, district liaisons, and the Regional Instructional Leadership Team every five weeks.

This criterion is scored in the low range because the applicant did not describe a high-quality plan that includes goals or strategies on measuring the quality of its Race to the Top - District investments, such as professional development, technology, and staff.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) The applicant, Madison-Oneida Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES), provides a budget narrative and tables that identify funds that will support the project.</p> <p>(b) It is unclear if the budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and the implementation of the applicant's proposal because many of the details are not included in the narrative.</p> <p>(c)(i)(ii) The applicant did not provide the rationale for the investments and priorities, including a description of all of the funds that the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal. The applicant did not describe the funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grant period.</p> <p>The applicant demonstrates a description of all the funds that the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal in the following Race to the Top - District electronic budget spreadsheets:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall Budget Summary <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Subpart 1: Overall Budget Summary Table b. Subpart 2: Overall Budget Summary Narrative 2. Project-Level Detail <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Subpart 3: Project-Level Budget Summary Tables b. Subpart 4: Project-Level Budget Narratives <p>The applicant is requesting the following Race to the Top-District grant funds: Year 1 (\$8,450,372); Year 2 (\$7,148,148); Year 3 (\$7,182,832); Year 4 (\$7,218,214), for a total of \$29,999,566.</p> <p>This criterion is scored in the medium range because the applicant was very detailed in the budget tables, but the applicant did not provide a thorough budget narrative clearly describing all of the line items. The applicant did not provide the rationale for the investments and priorities, including a description of all of the funds that the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal. The applicant did not describe the funds that will be used for one-time investments versus those that will be used for ongoing operational costs that will be incurred during and after the grant period.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	5

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant, Madison-Oneida BOCES Consortium, generally describes the sustainability of the project after the term of the grant.

- The resources purchased through the Race to the Top - District grant will allow the regional partners to create an infrastructure that they can utilize in the future. At the end of four years, the applicant will have established a one-to-one mobile learning environment for every student across ten LEAs in central New York.
- The program includes extensive professional development for all teachers in the region that educators will continue to use in the future. Program staff and consultants will provide expertise, training, and support and teachers will learn as they develop content and curriculum models.
- The program incorporates a local evaluation function that will assess the consortium's success in meeting student performance outcomes. The applicant generally indicates that it will be able to communicate its efforts and results which is an element to sustaining a successful program.

The applicant generally indicates that the proposed project will be funded with Race to the Top District Competition grant funds that will also be aligned with and supported through BOCES services, LEA budgets, and each district's New York State Race to the Top dollars. The applicant did not provide a clear plan for support from State and local government leaders and financial support. The applicant did not provide a plan for a budget for the three years after the term of the grant that includes budget assumptions, potential sources, or uses of funds.

This criterion is scored in the medium range because the applicant did not provide the details for sustainability of all of the project's goals after the term of the grant. The applicant did not provide a plan for support from State and local government leaders.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:		
The applicant did not provide information on the Competitive Preference Priority. Therefore, no points were given.		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:		
The applicant, Madison-Oneida Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES), addresses how it will build on the four core educational assurance areas to create personalized learning environments that are designed to improve learning and teaching.		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant provides general information on how the district will adopt standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy. The PLUS Program will align college preparation standards and postsecondary learning objectives with assessment tools. The applicant will implement the Common Core Learning Standards where students become active learners. 2. The applicant generally indicates that the district will build data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction. The applicant will use data to guide the reform process, including identifying student needs, skills and interests; matching student learning styles to instructional modalities; developing and using formative assessments to provide information so that teachers can meet individual 		

student needs; measuring academic and personal growth; and providing student and family access to their data so that they can track progress toward their identified goals.

3. The applicant generally demonstrates how the district will recruit, develop, reward, and retain effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most. The applicant will redefine the role of a teacher from a leader and lecturer to that of a facilitator of learning.
4. The applicant generally indicates that it will turn around the lowest-achieving schools. The applicant indicates that seven (7) of the participating schools have transitioned off of the New York State lists of Schools Identified in Need of Improvement since 2008-2009. Only one school is currently identified as a School Identified in Need of Improvement.

The Madison-Oneida Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) Consortium describes a vision to build on the New York State Race to the Top program, its ongoing work in the four core educational assurance areas, the the research base relating to personalized learning environments and college and career readiness. The applicant indicates that the Personalized Learning for Unlimited Success (PLUS) Program will transform the educational experience so that each student's educational path, curriculum instruction, and schedule is personalized to meet his or her unique needs and interests. The personalized learning environment will be built on flexible, anytime, anywhere learning; redefining the role of a teacher; project-based and authentic learning opportunities; student-driven learning path; fostering student life skills and attributes; and use of data.

Therefore, the applicant, Madison-Oneida Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES), has met Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning.

Total	210	118
--------------	------------	------------

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 applicant did not describe an Optional Budget Supplement. Therefore, no points were given.