



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0078NY-1 for Binghamton City School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(A)(1) _</p> <p>(a) The application lacks coherence to the extent the district articulates a vision that will build off the four core assurance areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The link between the adoption of transdisciplinary vision of reform and the IBB model and college and career ready standards is not well formulated. Moreover, the district appears to be adopting a number of old initiatives (IBB in the middle years, Project Lead the Way). - The district's plan to build data systems is full of boilerplate language and lacks specificity. A number of initiatives are linked together in the narrative, but it is unclear how they will be used in a specific manner. - The district's application does provide for an innovate way to use the grant money (peer coaches). Yet, oddly, the district omits a clear discussion of its teacher evaluation system which presumably would be used to improve teacher quality. <p>(b) The application's approach, again, lists a number of initiatives however the coherence is lacking and it is questionable as to how effective the approach will be with respect to satisfying the objectives under subpart (b). Again, the application presents a list of a number of initiatives, but it is not clear how each of these alone, or together, will meet the goals of the subparts.</p> <p>(c) The classroom experience is lacking in terms of a more complete and rich description. As written, it describes the models that will be implemented.</p> <p>In sum, the application should be credited for listing a number of approaches and philosophies that have merit. That said, it fails to adequately connect these, resulting in a low range score.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) The applicant has identified <u>all</u> schools as participating on the basis that it is a Focus District. Its reasoning is sound in that it has a high rate of intra district transfers. It is certainly ambitious in the sense that it proposes to add all schools. Yet, importantly, it has provided a number of layers of implementation that will improve the chances of the success of the reform, including, spending the first year reviewing data, leading to years 4 & 5 for full implementation. This is a cautious but credible approach to try to implement the reform across a district of 5400 students.</p> <p>(b) The schools are listed.</p> <p>(c) The components of this subpart are provided.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	3
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The application is deficient in a number of respects in this portion

- The application lacks a close linkage between the logic model/theory of change. At best, its reference to the IBB model could be a proxy for a theory of change.
- The application discusses reform initiatives in vague terms (e.g., social and behavior supports will be implemented through the development of social workers" at a nearby university). It is unclear how this is implemented and, moreover, the extent to which it will improve student learning outcomes.
- The application asserts that the Comprehensive District Education Planning Committee and the Building Leadership teams will "take the lead" in reviewing data and implementing strategy. This is problematic in that it seems to potentially confuse respective roles. Significantly, the timeline then refers to a "steering committee."
- With respect to scalability, the district's plan seems to assume that the program will proceed on a natural, lineal connection, however, resulting in implementation in all schools by year 4&5. Yet, a pilot program may fail and the application needs to reflect that the plan may, in fact, not work (as demonstrated in the pilot). Thus, while the scale up/phase in proposed here is cautious, it may need more opportunities for feedback, etc., such that it can make adjustments as the program advances to full-implementation.

Because of these reasons above, the application deserves a lower score.

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

10

3

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The application is weak in a number of important respects set forth below and therefore deserves a low score.

(A)(4)

(a) Performance/Summative Assessments:

- It is questionable as to whether improving 2% /year for students to attain proficiency in math and reading is ambitious enough, given that the scores are generally in the middle when compared to state. The likelihood of achieving significant gains is more questionable in the reading area, given the STEM focus of the application. The links between the state targets are not clear in the application.

- The application lumps on one sentence two very different outcomes for special education -- passing exams and graduating -- the increase of 10% to both is arbitrary because they do not provide a nuanced rationale as to why 10% would apply to both.

(b) **Achievement Gaps.** The application is vague in this regard. To be sure, it lists a number of techniques/ frameworks that may have merit, but it lacks specificity. A more thorough discussion of the particular subgroups and their goals is warranted.

(c) **Graduation.** The application goal of improvement here is modest, at best. Its link to "hands on application of literacy and math" as the key to this improvement is vague and questionable.

(d) **College.** The rate of improvement chosen here -- going from 50% to 75% is commendable. However, the link between this and the application's vision is weak and vague. Moreover, the district suggests that a separate program, apparently unconnected to its vision (Pathways to Technology) will provide this improvement.

Although the programs/initiatives may have some positive impact on student learning and performance its score should be in the low range because of the lack of specificity regarding some of these impacts on the district.

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

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	3

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The application should receive a low score for the following reasons:

(1)(a) The district lists a number of apparently innovative programs/schools it has started. While they should be commended, unfortunately, the application does not support the notion that these programs - or the district- has a "clear record" of success in the past four years. To begin with, the district is under forced state oversight it is a Focus District and admits that it has had challenges meeting accountability demands. Moreover, the application lacks specific data over the requested time period (4 years, as some of the metrics chosen do not use data that far back) linking the mentioned program to the stated metrics of the application.

(b) Again, the district has a number of reforms that, from the narrative, appear positive. However, the extent to which these programs are "ambitious" is questionable (e.g., Reading First) because, although these programs are important, they are not particularly ambitious in the current market of reforms efforts.

(c) The application is severely lacking in its attention to this prong in this section of the application. It is unclear as to how students and parents will have data access that will improve instruction, participation. They may have data available, but the effective use of the data is not apparent in the application.

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

5

1

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The application is deficient in a number of respects and warrants a low score:

- The actual salaries (at school level for instructional and support staff) are not made apparent in this section of the application and connected to the F-33 survey.
- The application does not address that overall requirements of this section and, instead, begins with a discussion of the budget process, and continues with several non-sequiturs (e.g., the collective bargaining agreement controls the hiring process).
- The application suggests that the districts is in compliance with the reporting of salaries as requested in (b)-(c) because a local newspaper apparently reports the salaries. This may allow for some degree of transparency, but it is not "high" as required.
- The district refers to a newly launched website, but then at the same time notes that it is still in the process of assessing the effective use of the social media tools it has. Thus, this calls into question whether the district has demonstrated evidence of transparency, at least as it relates to use of the website.

In sum, the district does not appear to have a commitment to the transparency of the minimum categories noted in the application and thus deserves a low score.

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

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The district demonstrated evidence of operating in a state that has successful condition for implementation. Specifically, NY has adopted a number of reforms (e.g., Common Core) that the district can implement. For instance, according to the application, NY has implemented a new teacher evaluation that links observations and specific student achievement to teacher performance. This is one of the most effective mechanisms, if done well, to assist in ensuring students have personalized learning environments. The applicant states applicable laws and regulations that would permit it to operate autonomously to initiate reforms. In addition, the state also seems to be setting the conditions for successful reform where it is designing/developing a longitudinal data system. The district has flexibility with respect to scheduling, class size, etc. which are not regulated, according to the application.

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

15

3

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The application speaks in generalities about its engagement of stakeholders and lacks robust detail of how its community is connected to this proposal. For instance, it refers to surveys and data that "was examined." Yet it does not describe in sufficient detail how it was revised.

(i) The district asserts that the it has signed "Required assurances"

(b) The application provides minimal letters of support from local stakeholders and appears to be omitting a number of key stakeholders (civic groups-. Indeed, it appears from the application materials that the mayor of the city did not respond to the inquiries for support, although he was given the opportunity to review the application.

The application lacks specificity with regard to the above prongs. The description is vague at best and in particular lacks a clear discussion as to how its application was revised and it is weak with respect to critical and meaningful engagement of stakeholders. Therefore, a low score is warranted.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	7

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has numerous initiatives and lists them here and elsewhere. As a preliminary note, there are so many initiatives and programs that it is questionable as to whether the applicant has a "high quality plan" that engages and empowers learners. More specifically, the application is lacking in a number of respects, as bulleted below and therefore deserves a score in the low range.

(C)(1)(a)

- In theory, the IB model may provide some of the learning goals described in the application notice. However, it is not clear that the IB programme may support students who may be in subgroups (e.g., economically disadvantaged, special education). Thus, the application's reliance on IB - while perhaps commendable - tends to overlook the more nuanced call of the application, requiring a learning approach that "engages and empowers" all learners. Thus, the application is deficient in its attention to how to engage perhaps non-traditional learners, or learners in subgroups, through the IB program. Indeed, this is one criticism of this method. See (C)(1)(a) (requiring attention to all students) for the components of (i) through (v).

(C)(1)(b)

- The application lists several initiatives (e.g., project based learning, portfolios) that purportedly address (b)(i)-(iv). Certainly, in theory, these different curricula and frameworks may allow for this. However, again, there are so many that their connections are difficult to discern and, more importantly, may overlap in many regards. And, again, the application lacks sufficient and particular attention to (v) of the application - accommodations and high quality strategies for high needs students.

(C)(1)(c) It is questionable whether existing mechanisms are in place to provide the training and support to students, as required here, for them to manage and understand their learning (e.g., the district notes that it has considerable technology infrastructure yet parlaying into proper training, etc., is another matter). The focus on the application is on implementing numerous strategies and the regard for student absorption is almost assumed.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	14
--	-----------	-----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(C)(2)(a)(i)-(iv).

- The application should be commended for its adoption of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) and use of an innovative teacher evaluation model. The Dufour model, currently in use by the district, has particular effect in improving educators's ability to implement personalized learning environments, use data to re-engineer instruction, measure student performance, and effectively use feedback (e.g., a teacher evaluation plan that is linked in to the standards and student performance), thus their approach in this regard is effective in satisfying these subparts.

(C)(2)(b)

(i) The application notes that it uses many assessments (e.g., quarterly assessments). This can provide actionable information.

(ii) However, the discussion of the local developed assessments lacks sufficient connection (at least as explained here) to alignment with career ready standards.

(iii) The district has a number of processes that can lead to improved feedback (e.g., PLCs, an evaluation process linked to

standards and student performance).

(C)(2)(c)

(i),(ii) The district has adopted a teacher evaluation system that closely links evaluation and student performance, although the attention to its use for closing achievement gap is lacking.

(C)(2)(d) The district does note that it can transfer teachers, under the collective bargaining agreement, to positions within the district. However, the ability is there, the district does not articulate sufficiently a high-quality plan (e.g. has goals, timelines, deliverables) as how it can move its talent around the district.

In sum, the district has a number of successful programs/ideas articulated here, but also lacks some specificity. See comments for (C)(2)(d), thus making a average/above average score appropriate.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	7
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>D(1)(a) The district notes that it has/will have a number of central office committees/structures, including Board Advisory Teams, Ins. Leadership Teams, and Building Planning Teams, among others; however, the extent to which they can be considered part of a high-quality plan, as required under this sub-part, is questionable. The teams seem to have generic goals that overlap. Thus, they should not be considered part of a "high-quality" plan (which has clear goals, timelines deliverables).</p> <p>(b) While the application describes building level teams, the extent to which the team has autonomy over budgets, personnel decisions, etc is questionable. Their focus seems to be curricular in nature. To be sure this is important.</p> <p>(c) The application lists several assessments that can purportedly be used for this purpose (e.g., capstone projects) and generally satisfy this subpart.</p> <p>(d) The district references, but does not provide sufficient detail (is this available across all grades? all subjects?)</p> <p>(e) The links between the resources etc and the specific subgroups here is weak, at best. The application refers too generally to students, with sufficient differentiation.</p> <p>The application includes a number of positive attributes with respect to this requirement (e.g., use of Building Level Teams) but is too general in many regards and, therefore, deserves a low/middle score.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	1
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>As a general matter, the application describes the bureaucracy it intends to employ. However, this response misses the requirements of this subpart in important regards, a making it a very low score.</p> <p>(a) It is difficult to discern how parents, in particular, will have access to the tools, and content they may need to support implementation. The application notes, in this part, that they will be part of the process of governance. But the question of access is not fully addressed.</p> <p>(b) The link between parents and educators and technical support is lacking detail. Again, there seems to be a great amount of technical requirements involved here (e.g., e-portfolios) etc. but this providing appropriate levels of technical support, especially for parents and students, is somewhat overlooked here.</p> <p>(c) It is not all clear how the district will provide for infrastructure supports allowing parents and students to export information.</p> <p>(d) the application is severely lacking in describing, articulating, some assurances that information can be exchanged seamlessly.</p>		

Because the application overlooks a number of important required components, its score should be low.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	8
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application should score moderate because</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The district exhibits a clear committment to PLCs, which, if properly implemented, do lead to effective and continuous improvement. - The district, throughout the appliction, has embraced an innovated teacher evaluation model that links student achievement, standards, to evaluation in a continual feedback loop. - However, and importantly, the link to the project itself (and its many moving parts) between these mechanisms is not clear. In fact, it seems that the separate governance structure established for the project is not referenced sufficiently in the application. Thus, the loop back to this project -- using the data to potentially revise the project -- and the various structures proposed or in place is weak under the definition of a high-quality plan. The district is operating under the assumption that the plan(s) and programs will be successful and opportunity for revision is not apparent. 		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan should receive a moderate score because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The application provides for a number of mechanisms (perhaps too many) to engage internal stakeholders. That said, the engagement is focused inward, to a fault. - It relies heavily on posting information on its website to engage the community in general and outside stakeholders. Thus, the community must engage the district. Instead, a more proactive approach through the use of social media, etc., may have more benefit and provide for continual community updates. - The plan generically lists important external stakeholders "rotary" children's council and therefore lacks a comprehensive approach to identifying those. Moreover, a particular group may require a different type of engagement other than the presentation of quarterly reports, as called for here. - That said, the updating of the website could provide a useful means to make information available. 		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The application should receive a low score because</p> <p>(a) The rationale for selecting its targets is sufficient in that they are connected to other accountability objectives (e.g., graduate rates, proficiency in core subjects).</p> <p>(b) However, there is a disconnet between the district's target goals and its use of T-CRS (Teacher Child Rating Score) assessments. Indeed, the district seems to be suggesting that by tracking through T-CRS it can gauge its progress to these varied goals (e.g., graduation, proficiency). Yet the application suggests that the T-CRS is, in part, a measure of students' social-emotional competencies. Thus, to the extent this arrangement can provide the formative and impactful feedback -- for the particular target areas - is left in doubt.</p> <p>(c) Insufficient attention is given to the timelines and use of the T-CRS as it relates to achieving the performance goals stated, assuming that the two can be linked together.</p>		

As a whole the goals of graduation rates and proficiency rates seem achievable. However the proficiency goals of 80% for all subgroups is not as ambitious as it should be. Likewise, the FAFSA application for subgroups is not ambitious (2% each year).

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

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The district should score moderate here

- Contracting to an external evaluator (who adheres to the Guiding Principles for Evaluators) can provide the impartiality and expertise needed to evaluate the effectiveness of the plan

- However, there are so many programs and initiatives embedded in this grant that it will be difficult for any reviewer to ascertain the impacts of the different parts on the overall goals, which subtracts from the overall quality of the plan.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	7

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The budget identifies the funds

(b) The funds - largely personnel - appear in line with typical costs in education, thus they appear reasonable requests. Moreover, the number of personnel appear to provide sufficient manpower to achieve the activities suggested/proposed. However, and oddly, the budget narrative discusses heavily the purchase of Ipads. It is unclear how these relate to the thrust of the grant proposal other than the grant suggests, in this subpart, that the ipads will "effectively support implementation of the new curricula, teamwork, data analysis." It is unclear how ipads will be able to reach these goals.

(c) The grant does identify items that are one-time investments. The district provides some rationale in this subpart. However, the link between the funds expended on Engineering by Design and the IBB framework is unclear.

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
---	-----------	----------

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has set forth a number of mechanisms in which it proposes to sustain the project. If the district's estimates are correct that \$ 1.8 million is required to sustain the grant going forward after the grant period ends, then the plan has a high rate of success. The district does identify promising sources of funds, including state aid that allows for a substantial reimbursement of professional development (80% according to the applicant). Given that the ongoing needs would relate highly to PD, this is a good sign for sustaining efforts. However, the specificity in a three-year budget (post grant) is lacking from the applicant, thus warranting some reduction.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	5

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The application has a promising partnership. However, because the proposal lacks specifics (especially as it relates to desired outcomes) it should be considered a low/middle score.

- (1) The application describes its partnership with the local university. The application describes a number of services the social work school from the university provides and, importantly, addresses the issue of "toxic stress." Indeed the partners' attention to this idea should be commended.
- (2) The application lists a number of desired results that include education outcomes and family engagement.
- (3) However, the application just generally describes the means it will use to track. (a) and also how this will be used to target resources (b) or scale the model.
- (4) The application tends to list the relationships and overlooks a rich discussion of how these programs would be integrated.
- (5) The application is weak on descriptors concerning engagement. Indeed, the application tends to omit engagement with respect to parents and appears to assume that the engagement will occur by virtue of its relationships with the university and the services it provides to parents/families. Moreover, the applications further assumes that these are the services/relationships the community needs, yet it would be helpful to include a more robust discussion about why these particular needs are relevant in this community. To be sure, the "toxic stress" notion is something that may cut across any poor community.
- (6) In general, the application section here is deficient with respect to an important of a high-quality plan -- timelines and setting clear goals. Indeed, the desired results are mentioned in general, non-measurable terms (e.g., improved family engagement, improved attendance).

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does address absolute priority 1. For instance,

- (1) It has adopted Common Core Standards, addressing core area 1.
- (2) It is creating PLCs and proposes to use data to improve instruction through building level meetings, again addressing core area of teacher effectiveness.
- (3) It has adopted an innovative teacher evaluation model, including linking teacher goals to standards and student achievement, thereby attempting to increase the reach of its effective educators, as mentioned a core area.
- (4) The district is a "Focus District" under state regulations and therefore would, if successful, turnaround low performing schools.
- (5) The district has adopted the Common Core standards which, by definition, satisfy the college and career ready prong.
- (6) It has proposed a number of innovations, including IBB, that do hold promise to personalizing learning. However, to some extent it is unclear how IBB will personalize instruction for all students.
- (7) The plan proposes to increase the rates of graduation and college attendance (e.g., improving graduation by 2% annually). Thus, it has addressed the issues of improving outcomes and addressing achievement gaps.

Total	210	101
--------------	------------	------------

Race to the Top - District Technical Review Form



Application #0078NY-2 for Binghamton City School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a clear and comprehensive reform vision based on understanding the demographics of the school population with a proposed focus on 7 key focus areas that respond directly to needs of the district and students. The reform plan uses as its basis the IB program, a program that has proven success in raising critical thinking skills and team building skills. Through implementation of the Common Core State Standards assessments, prioritizing teacher effectiveness, using data, and turning around low performing schools the applicant will be focused towards college and career readiness. Further, the partnership with the local BOCES (vocational training) will support a transdisciplinary approach to the overall reform vision. The reform plan will be supported by use of data to support development in teaching and leadership. Further, the development of professional learning opportunities will support data-driven decisions and will support implementation of development for educators. The response provides a clear vision on how the CCSS will positively impact the district as part of a comprehensive plan including the use of data, educator evaluations, and cross-discipline learning. The vision also includes the important role of families and parents in the success of the reform plan. However, the plan does not comprehensively address how the students in the district will actually experience the reform plan. Little detail is provided on what the plan will look like for students and how it will translate into everyday actions in a cohesive way so as to maximize likelihood of success. Given the general strong and detailed response but general lack of detail on description of classroom experience, the score falls into the mid range.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>While the response provides a general description of the participating schools (all schools in the district). The response does not give a clear picture of breakdown students from low-income families. The response does not provide adequate details on the decision to have all district schools participate in the reform plan. Due to general lack of specificity and detail on how or why the entire district was selected to participate as well as general lack of detail in breakdown of students, the response scores in the low range.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The response indicates the applicant has crafted a high quality plan to support meaningful reform to spark change in all schools. The detailed plan includes specifics on each of the core projects, key evidence, and key personnel involved. A clear plan to roll out changes in each year of implementation is evidence the applicant has a clear vision for how the plan will result in district-wide change. For example, Year 1 will be focused on a landscape analysis of current programs and initial roll out with a steady progression to full roll out in Years 3 and beyond. This shows the applicant has considered the fact that district wide reforms do not happen overnight, but are instead fostered through a deliberate approach. The applicant also shows a thoughtful theory of action that is likely to result in outcomes for students. Given evidence that the applicant has considered how the plan will translate into district-wide change, the response scores in the high range.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	4

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The response indicates that the applicant is able to articulate ambitious and achievable goals. However, little rationale is provided on how the goals are either achievable or ambitious. For example, the response indicates that an increase of 2% in proficiency (10% for students with disabilities each year) but there is little evidence that the applicant has founded these numbers in past benchmarks, why the stated goals are ambitious nor why they are realistic. To decrease achievement gaps, the response provides a coherent rational for why decreasing the gap is important and that at a basic level, a gap exists, and as such, does not address how goals will be ambitious or realistic. The response states that percentage of students going to college will increase by 75% but again, little reasoning is provided as to how realistic this goal may be. Due to a general lack of specificity as to why goals were chosen as lofty yet realistic, this response 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>While the response details current programs and several examples of improvements in student learning outcomes, little specificity is given as to a clear track record of success based on ambitious goals. The response clearly describes details of the programs already in place but little attention is paid to answering the basic questions around which programs have been successful so as to justify building on them. While some evidence of effectiveness data is given (ratings for students under the Reading First program) but those data do not necessary reflect a clear track record of success. For example, over a four year implementation period, a 4 point percentage increase does not seem ambitious. One would think a more rigorous goal that would contribute to a clear track record of success would be more appropriate to justify implementation of a comprehensive reform plan. Therefore, it is not clear that there has been a clear track record of success in why successes notes were ambitious. It should be noted that goals for teacher effectiveness were strong as the response provides strong rationale for why there has been a clear record of success. In addition, overall, the response does not clearly show how data will be made available to all stakeholders. Given the general lack of justification for goals (for all categories except teacher effectiveness which notably was not an area specified in the selection criteria) as well as lack of detail on how performance data will be made available to the public, the answer scores in the low range.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	4
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Overall the response to this selection criterion provides ample evidence that the district has actively made an effort to make the budget available to the public and has sought feedback from stakeholders through publically funded forums. The response references specific modes of public dissemination for actual salaries of all required groups. The response provides evidence that the applicant will be transparent as far as processes, practices, and investments. As a result of a clear and comprehensive overview of evidence that supports the conclusion that the district has prioritized a high level of transparency, the score falls into the high range.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	9
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Response establishes evidence of successful conditions for implementation as given through current state policies. The response includes reference to recent legislation passed by the New York State legislature and supported by key state level stakeholders to allow for the conditions to support wide reform plans at districts within the state that specifically references the use of federal dollars to support such reform. Other notable evidence includes state Board of Regents adoption of the Common Core, state supported data systems, and a state developed educator evaluation system (ARRT). This is evidence the LEA has the successful conditions and autonomy under which the plan</p>		

can be successful and supported. Notably, the response would be strengthened further through additional details on what 'network teams' are (ie, are they state supported, how they relate directly to district autonomy). Given the response is generally strong and provides evidence that the reform plan can be successfully supported by autonomies and flexibilities current in place, the response scores in the high range.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	5
--	-----------	----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

While the response clearly addresses the collective bargaining support needed to implement the reform plan, little details are provided that clearly show that stakeholders were engaged throughout development of the proposal. The response indicates that the community was engaged throughout the development process but little evidence is given as to how the feedback was incorporated. General lack of depth and specifics in the response results in a low range score.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Applicant's response provides a detailed and thorough strategy that lays out a high quality plan that can support improved learning and teaching through focusing on student-centered learning environments but does not adequately describe how the plan will be translated for students so that they believe learning is integral to their success nor does the response provide details on a high quality plan that are external to the IB program, CCSS, Project Lead the Way, or Engineering by Design. The use of the IB program will promote education of the whole student including a focus on social and emotional supports. The response is broken down into strategies that will be employed at each age range (primary, middle, and diploma years) thus serving as evidence that learning and teaching will be a focus at all grade levels in the district. Further, the response references the Common Core, a plan that will provide assessments and curriculum in core subjects. However, the plan is light on how it will foster student understanding of how learning is integral to future success and accomplishing goals: in short, making learning relevant to students. Further, while the plan does address college and career ready standards, it does not provide evidence that the district has considered how to tie learning goals to a student's personal goals. The plan does address how technology will be used as a resource to students but it does not provide specifics on how the plan will translate into a personalized sequence of instruction. Overall, the response scores in the mid-range because it addresses some of the selection criteria but not all. The response addresses the supports parents and educators will provide students (b) and which mechanisms are in place to help train and support students. But the responses did not provide strong rationale for how students would understand how learning is tied to their personal goals or how students will be involved in deep personal experiences.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	6
--	-----------	----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The district provides strong rationale to its thinking around improving the educator workforce in the district. The educator evaluation model that links evaluation with student performance is a strong element the district has included in their reform plan. The district has executed a teaching strategy that is focused on personal learning communities but it does not provide a strong response as to how these communities have and will meet the needs of each student. Further, the response provides a weak description of how IB and CCSS curriculum will be adapted to fit individual student needs. Further, the response does not discuss how measures of student progress will be used to measure against college and career goals nor does it describe how teachers will be supported in using the PLC framework to provide differentiated instruction (the response simply states that differentiation in instruction will occur but does elaborate on how teachers will approach doing so in an effort to provide optimal learning opportunities for all students). Overall, the response lacks detail on several pieces of the selection criteria including training, systems and practices that will propel progress as well as a high quality plan that supports increasing the number of effective and highly effective teachers and

principals in all subjects, and specifically hard to staff subjects and therefore the score is in the low-range.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	7
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Through the formation of Board Advisory Teams (BATS), Instructional Leadership Teams (ILTS), and Building Planning Teams (BPTS) the applicant describes a detailed plan for how school leadership teams will be effectively structured to provide supports to participating schools. However, the response is silent on how the district central office will be structured to support an effective governance structure. Use of these school level teams will also support flexibility and autonomy at the school level and will support a de-centralized approach to implementing the reform plan including how the teams will use data to drive decision –making. The response is generally weak, though, in providing a clear plan for how students will be able to progress through mastery of (not necessary length of time spent on) a topic. Through the option for students to use on-line tools such as Advanced Academics, they will be able to master subjects and topics outside of the traditional classroom. Overall, the response lacks clarity and detail as to how the plan will provide the necessary infrastructure essential to provide personalized learning to each student and therefore scores in the mid range.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	4
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The response to this criteria does not address the required areas in a fundamental way. Supports are provided through school level teams and leading teams. The GEL steering committee will provide resources to all stakeholders and work with external partners. However, no evidence is given nor discussion provided for how the plan will ensure all stakeholders have access to resources, technical support, data, and a way by which to view interoperable data. The response neglects to address the core selection criteria requiring the applicant consider how all stakeholders will be able to access information and tools. Further, the response does not discuss how technical support will be given to all stakeholders.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	5
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>While the response discusses a four pronged approach that will foster continuous improvement and continual feedback on progress the response does not adequately address how, in practice, the plan will address the requirement that information will be available to the public. While the response does indicate that an annual review will be available on a public website, there is no discussion of how the quality of investment will be measured and shared with the public. Overall, the response provides little detail on the ‘how’ behind the district’s continuous improvement plan. While the plan states that a process will be in place, it does not provide specifics on how the process will actually function and be implemented during the grant period thus making the response largely superficial with little depth. The plan does not reflect a well thought out plan for how the district will respond to challenges. The response therefore earns a low score on this selection criteria.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The response indicates that a webpage will be the primary vehicle by which information will be shared with stakeholders. The website as described will allow a stakeholder to gain information that is targeted to their specific stakeholder group (ie, parent, student, staff member, community member). However, the response provides little detail on how the website will actually engage stakeholders. Further, no strategy is provided beyond use of the website showing a one-dimensional plan that has little chance of successfully meeting the goal of the selection criteria. Therefore, the response has earned a score in the low range.

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

5

1

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has chosen performance assessments easily available and familiar to stakeholders. While this rationale is valid, it is not a strong indicator that the applicant has considered other performance measures- this seems to be the ‘easiest’ option but may not necessarily be the best. The performance measures are reasonable and include appropriate measures tailored to age group but there is little discussion as to how each measure will provide formative information – it is implied throughout the response but not directly discussed. While the response provides a rationale for why the performance measures were chosen, but the rationale provided is not strong. Further, there is little evidence that the applicant has considered how the performance measure will provide essential feedback that will inform revisions to the plan. There is insufficient evidence supporting a conclusion that the performance measures are ambitious and achievable. Lastly, the response does not provide any discussion of how each measure will be reviewed and revised if necessary. Therefore the response scores in the low range.

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

5

1

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The response shows that the applicant has considered the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of investments. Both quantitative and qualitative measures will be used. However, the evaluations proposed are not comprehensive. For example, the applicant does not provide a clear plan for how it will evaluate each piece of the plan for efficacy. For example, while qualitative measures will be used to gage the efficacy of professional development, the response is vague on how quantitative assessments will be used to measure effectiveness. While the response states that all evaluation will adhere to USDOE standards, it is vague as **how** evaluations will do so. Generally, this response lacks clarity and detail and does not represent a high quality plan to evaluate the funded activities in a robust and comprehensive manner- therefore the response scores in the low range on this selection criteria.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	2
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The budget identifies all funds that will be used to support the reform plan. However, notably, Race to the Top-District funds are the only funds specified thus, bringing into question stakeholder financial support in the community. The budget narrative describes how the funds are reasonable and sufficient to support the plan- indeed, the proposed costs are appropriate to support the plan in that all budget items are identified to support pieces of the reform plan. While the use of funds for one-time investment vs. ongoing expenses can be inferred, neither the budget nor the narrative are specific in breaking down expenses as such. The overall response falls into the low range because the budget proposal is adequate, reasonable, and appropriate. However, more specifics are needed as to any external funds that will be used (for example, from BU) as well as around specific identification of which investments are regular and which ones are one-time expenditures. As a result the response falls into the low range.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	1

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

It appears the district has not considered how the plan will be financially sustained beyond the reform period. While the applicant does reference the partnership with BU, there is little explicit discussion of how the plan will remain in place after the grant period has ended and federal funds depleted. As a result, the score given is low.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's response provides a clear and thorough description of how the district will leverage external partnerships to support the reform plan. Institutions of higher education will partner with the district and provide supports in several ways including targeted support to district elementary schools and through general support as a Promise Zone partner. The district will achieve population desired results through piloting a professional development program in two elementary schools that will be brought to scale if effective. Further, the applicant will work to implement parent outreach and organizing tactics to support district wide change. The BU partnership will serve in helping the districts understand the needs of students and help in deciding which reform tactics are effective. The response clearly indicates that the partnership with BU in particular will support the reform plan in a truly meaningful way. However, the response could provide further details on how the desired results for subsections of population groups are ambitious yet attainable. Therefore, the response scores in the mid to high range.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The application, when taken into consideration as a whole, meets the absolute priority because it builds on the educational assurances, focuses on personalized learning, and focuses on college and career readiness. The applicant recognizes the importance of student achievement and increased educator effectiveness as well the critical role all stakeholders will play in the overall implementation of the plan. Overall the applicant addresses all factors required to meet priority 1.

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



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0078NY-3 for Binghamton City School District

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Full points are awarded because the Applicant's Global Engagement of Learners (GEL): A STEM approach to career and college readiness model clearly and comprehensively articulates a coherent reform vision based on implementing an innovative and achievable model of reform that focuses on individualizing, deepening, and accelerating student learning; builds on its work in the four core educational assurance areas, increases equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interest; and describes what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalizing learning environments.

The Applicant's reform vision, Global Engagement of Learners (GEL): A STEM approach to career and college readiness, grew out the Binghamton City School District's (BCSD) need to address the many challenges facing their ten member schools. In addition to demographic challenges, the Binghamton City School District (BCSD) faces numerous academic challenges. The Applicant's reform vision, Global Engagement of Learners (GEL): A STEM approach to career and college readiness is an ambitious initiative that is achievable and that can make a meaningful difference in the accelerating student learning and addressing the demographic and academic challenges that the district faces.

In 2012, the BCSD Board of education adopted a set of district-wide quantifiable objectives intended to monitor LEA-wide progress. As a part of an ESEA State mandated accountability compliance review the district underwent a state mandated Focused Review as part of ESEA accountability a School Improvement plan addressing seven focus areas designed to shape reform efforts district-wide and school-wide.

As part of this plan, the district identified a set of seven focus areas which will be used to shape school reform efforts both district-wide and at the individual building level. Binghamton City School District (BCSD) selected several programmatic elements of the initiative including key focus areas on which to build its reform initiative.

The primary framework for the district's reform is the International Baccalaureate program. The IB approach operationalizes the fundamental belief that all students have the capacity to develop critical thinking skills, team-working skills, and effective communication skills if we, as educators, can find ways to empower students to self-direct their learning, see real world application for themselves, and draw from their own personal base of assets and strengths to build a pathway to success.

The Applicant's vision is based on removing barriers through the Global Engagement of Learners (GEL): A STEAM approach to career and college readiness reform initiative. The initiative will focus on investments in professional development, curriculum development, technology acquisition, partnerships that extend the boundaries of school. Using the IB framework at all grades P-12, the GEL project seeks to develop a trans-disciplinary, articulated P-12 Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Math (STEAM) curriculum that supports college and career readiness for all students while Binghamton City School District Binghamton, integrating the Common Core Standards.

This approach will respond to students' academic interest via school-to-career and school-to-college-to-career pathways and responds to New York State's economic growth plans. The project will serve more than 5,800 students and 600 teachers across the district. The Applicant clearly describes how the GEL project builds on the four core educational assurance areas of RTTT.

The Applicant's goal includes implementing curricular reform in all schools; support professional growth in teachers and leaders professional through a horizontally and vertically integrated professional learning communities model of continuous improvement; provide educators with the tools, knowledge, opportunities and pedagogical strategies they need to effectively differentiate instruction, integrate real-world; applications and individualize learning.

Classroom Experiences- The Applicant's ambitious plan for classroom experiences for teachers and students is a trans disciplinary vision of reform which will require meaningful major enhancements and modifications in curriculum and the learning environment at all grade levels.

Together these reform initiatives using the IB framework at all grades P-12 as the basis for the Global Engagement of Learners (GEL): A STEM approach to career and college readiness model provide strong evidence supporting the Applicant's probability of successfully implementing a trans disciplinary, well articulated P-12 Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Math (STEAM) curriculum that supports college and career readiness for all students in the 10 participating schools in Binghamton City School District. .

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

10

10

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Process for selecting schools- The Binghamton City School District (BCSD) serves an ethnically and socio-economically diverse population of about 5,700 students in a network of 10 public schools. All of the schools in the district house students low-income families, who are high-need students with participating educators (as defined in this notice). The rationale for selecting all ten schools in the district to participate is to increase the probability of successfully implementing the proposed district-wide reform (Global Engagement of Learners (GEL): A STEAM approach to career and college readiness), which will be vertically aligned in every school from the seven elementary schools, to the two middle schools, and the one high school that comprise the district. Teachers at all level will receive appropriate training and support to ensure high quality teaching and learning.

The Applicant's approach to implementation is innovative and focused; appropriately targets participating students and teachers; and appears feasible for supporting high-quality LEA-level and school-level implementation of the planned Global Engagement of Learners (GEL): A STEAM approach to career and college readiness reform model.

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

10

10

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The Applicant reports that n 2012/13, the district underwent a state mandated ?Focused Review? as part of ESEA accountability compliance. The results of the review were then used as the foundation for a mandated =School Improvement? plan. As part of this plan, the district identified a set of seven focus areas which will be used to shape school reform efforts both district-wide and at the individual building level.

The focus areas include:

Focus 1: Teaching and Learning: To ensure all students have equal access to rigorous, high quality curriculum that is aligned to the Common Core Standards and delivered through challenging instruction.

Focus 2: Alternative Education Programs: To ensure students placed in alternative programs make adequate yearly progress (including BOCES programs, Twilight program, etc.)

Focus 3: Highly Effective Teachers and Leaders: To ensure continuous improvement of administrators and teachers through performance evaluation.

Focus 4: Parent/Community Engagement & Ownership: To create and implement communication methods that ensure families and the community are genuine partners.

Focus 5: School Climate and Safety: To ensure all students experience a safe and positive school climate that welcomes and actively engages all families.

The Applicant's plan is to scale up focus areas 1,3,4,and 5 scale the proposal up to support district-wide change using the International Baccalaureate program as a framework for reform. The Applicant describes the IB approach as a process for the building student capacity to develop critical thinking skills, team-working skills, and effective communication skills.

Strong examples of scale-up initiatives cited that demonstrate why is this approach is likely to be successful in helping the Applicant reach its outcome goals include providing the district with the resources to develop and introduce:

- a district-wide P-12 STEAM program of study that focuses on college and career readiness;
- professional development for educators and leaders that focus on integrated and effective
- strategies for implementing Common Core standards and STEAM content;
- content depth and real-world, authentic application of that knowledge for students;
- data systems that are accessible and instructional for students, parent and educators;
- International Baccalaureate (IB) and Advanced Placement (AP) courses and expansion of BCSD
- Pathways in Technology Early College High School program (P-TECH);
- relevant Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs that support high demand school-to-career
- opportunities, including expansion of the existing Project Lead the Way programming, and the addition of IB
- Career Credential option

Full points are awarded because the Applicant presents a comprehensive and high quality plan including detailed descriptions of achievable goals, innovative strategies, appropriate activities, supporting evidence, key personnel and timelines describing how the reform proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform to support district-wide change beyond the participating schools and will help the applicant reach its outcome goals. The Applicant's model for reform, the Global Engagement of Learners (GEL): A STEAM approach to career and college readiness clearly demonstrates how the Applicant's reform may appropriately improve student learning outcomes for all students served.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)**10****8****(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:**

Performance on summative assessments (proficiency status and growth)-The Applicant describes the district's performance on required State 3-8 assessments and Regents examinations and college preparedness assessments; including the PSAT Growth Program for all 10th and 11th grade students reflect below average student performance (50% of BCSD students in grade 3-5 are below the state median in ELA and 51% are below the state median in Mathematics). When appropriately executed, the Applicant's ambitious and achievable goals based on the Applicant's reform initiative (Global Engagement of Learners (GEL): A STEAM approach to career and college readiness) could significantly improve student performance on summative assessments by two percentage points each year. Strong examples of strategies to improve performance on summative assessments include:

- At the elementary level train teachers to use tiered intervention services as well as the application of literacy and mathematics skills to relevant topics.
- Students in grades K-8 will be assessed at the beginning of the year to identify their reading and mathematics skills using local assessments. Appropriate interventions will be applied. These students will also participate in benchmark and end of year assessments to demonstrate the years' worth of growth in reading and mathematics.
- Incorporate more hands on learning experiences in STEAM as well as career exploration for students so that teaching and learning are tied to real world experiences
- Increase awareness of the connections for high needs students to develop a deeper understanding and learning so that they have a better chance of passing the five New York State Regents examinations required for graduation at a higher rate. The goal is to increase the percentage of students with disabilities passing each of the exams and graduating will by 10% per year.

The Applicant's ambitious goals for successful student outcomes are likely to succeed utilizing their reform initiative (i.e.. The Global Engagement of Learners (GEL): A STEAM approach to career and college readiness) appear to be feasible approaches toward improving student performance on summative assessments by two percentage points each year.

Decreasing the Achievement Gap- The Applicant's presents feasible strategies for decreasing achievement gaps but does not adequately explain how implementing them are likely to improve student outcomes. Strong examples of ambitious and achievable strategies include closing achievement gaps by:

- utilizing student growth measures on assessments and an evaluation system that set targets for all elementary level teachers to see a year's worth of growth for all students in reading and mathematics through tiered intervention services as well as the application of literacy and mathematics skills to relevant topics.
- providing appropriate interventions early in a child's education so that targeted students receive social and behavior program modifications before at-risk problems escalate.
- providing professional development and increased use of the Rtl process will help to identify students' needs and ensure that appropriate interventions are in place for tier two and three students
- Increasing rigorous coursework for high school students such as AP and IB courses, offering Fast Forward college in the classroom courses to ensure that graduates meet the graduation competencies and are prepared for the transition to college and careers
- tracking student progress and implementing interventions to ensure access and equity for all students

Graduation Rates- Although the Applicant states that they plan to utilize hands on application of literacy and mathematics through IB framework to engage all students; to increase attendance by one percentage point Binghamton City School District Binghamton year; and keep students in school throughout grades K-8, the Applicant provides sparse and insufficient details explaining how these strategies will significantly impact graduation rates and how improved student learning will occur as a result.

College Enrollment- The Applicant describes a variety of ambitious and reasonable strategies to increase student enrollment in college. Strong examples of how these are likely to improve student outcome include:

- Utilizing the Pathways to Technology: Early College High School district grant to give students the opportunity to take classes on a college campus that allows students to see success in college level work.
- Supporting students in selecting and successfully completing rigorous advanced course such as taking college level coursework through AP, IB, and college in the high school or as part of the Early College High School.
- Providing a variety of options that support college level coursework allowing some students to attain 2-year degrees by the time they graduate.
- Providing instant admission days for local Community Colleges at the Greater Binghamton College Day event a
- Sponsor financial aid nights where students will have the opportunity to work directly with counselors to complete

their FASA application. FAFSA data will be collected – an activity which is currently not in place.

The Applicant reasonably expects that implementing these college enrollment strategies will increase the percentage of students going on to college from 50% to 75% or greater, thus improving overall student outcome.

Although the Applicant presents clear and convincing plans and strategies on performance on summative assessments, decreasing achievement gaps, and college enrollment and post-secondary degree attainment, the supporting narrative is sparse for graduation rates and **vaguely addresses the extent to which the applicant’s vision is likely to result in improved student learning and performance and increased equity as demonstrated by ambitious yet achievable annual goals. Full points are not awarded for this reason.**

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	11

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Applicant comprehensively describes a clear record of success in the past four year in advancing student learning and achievement and in increasing equity in learning and teaching.

Strong examples of district-wide reform in a low-achieving schools include the following which is evidence that the district as a whole has a strong track record of success in this area:

- Binghamton High School Regents Academy: The BCHS Regents Academy is an intensive, “smaller learning communities” model which offers at-risk students a broad array of academic and pro-social supports. In order for students to qualify for the Binghamton High School Regents Academy (RA), students must have failed at least three of five courses during their previous year. The program is self-contained, with its own principal and teaching staff, and the cost per student is slightly greater than for the regular high school, but it takes place during the normal school day and year and similar programs are feasible for most public school districts. During its first year, RA students not only performed far better than a comparison group that experienced the normal high school routine in a randomized control design, but they performed on a par with the average high school student. In its first year of operation, of 117 9th and 10th graders who qualified for the RA by failing three or more courses during the previous year, 56 were randomly chosen to enter the program and the others were tracked as they experienced the normal routine at Binghamton’s single high school (BHS). The outcome variables included quarterly grades in each core subject and the grades Binghamton City School District Binghamton, NY 44 for all state-mandated Regents exams taken by the students at the end of the year, which include Algebra, Living Environment, Comprehensive English, and Global Studies. The first two were taken by all 9th grade students and by the 10th graders who had failed the exams during the previous year. The second two were taken by 10th graders only. Class grades are not strictly comparable because the RA students and comparison group experienced different curricula and the grading standards might have been different. Regent’s exam grades therefore provide a more rigorous basis of comparison and are provided for the Binghamton High school as a whole in addition to the RA students and the comparison group. Although these students represent the most at-risk students within the community of Binghamton, the Applicant describes how the Binghamton High School Regents Academy is an ambitious and significant reform that has a history of success in its persistently lowest-achieving schools for improving student learning outcomes, close the achievement gap, and a strong track record of success in increasing the likelihood of increasing graduation and college enrollment rates.
- The Reading First: BCSD was awarded a Reading First grant to support quality instruction in reading in 2006. The Reading First project initiative was implemented in compliance with the collective bargaining agreements in effect at that time. All schools in the Binghamton City School District adopted a new core reading program. The results of implementing full day, year round programming, beginning for many of the children as 3 year olds, resulting in statistically significant improvement in 12 classrooms. Each classroom demonstrated environments that supported language and literacy learning. The percentage of Binghamton ERF students who scored 85 or more on the spring PPVT tests was similarly high (93% of our 3-year olds and 94% of 4-year olds). The percentage of students who achieved a four-point or larger fall-to-spring increase in PPVT scores averaged about 58%, which is comparable to the rate of 62% for all students in federally funded ERF program during 2004-2007 years. However there were larger increases on the PPVT among several student sub-populations; 78% ELL students, 70% of Black students, 67% of Hispanic students and 66% male students demonstrating a 4 point or greater gain on the PPVT. Evidence of Effectiveness: Three years prior to instituting Reading First, the district’s classification rate for students with

disabilities varied between 13.9% to 13.7%. Since the program's implementation and the district's sustained efforts, the classification rate has declined 1.6%, from 13.7% to 12.1%. The Applicant includes detailed descriptions, using clearly displayed charts and raw student data which provide convincing evidence of the Applicant's ability to improve student learning outcomes and close achievement gaps, including raising student achievement, and increasing the likelihood of increasing high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates.

These examples clearly demonstrate Applicant's clear record of success in the past four years in advancing student learning and achievement and increasing equity in learning and teaching in its persistently lowest-achieving schools.

Applicant does not provide a response to part (c) {Make student performance data (as defined in this notice) available to students, educators (as defined in this notice), and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services.} of this selection criteria. For this reason points in the medium range are awarded.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Full points are awarded because the Applicant provides convincing evidence of a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments, including by making public, by school, actual school-level expenditures for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration. Information provided by the applicant and demonstrates a high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments because the four areas required in the selection criteria are evident in the following strong examples:

- Detailed line-item proposed and adopted budgets that show personnel salaries and non- personnel expenditures are available for review by the public every year upon request.
- The New York State Education Department also publishes a "Fiscal Supplement" for each district in the state which details the district's expenditures per student, per teacher, including personnel salaries and non-personnel expenditures. Similarly, performance data on all state-wide assessments is published by district, by school, by grade and by sub-group for all core curricular areas is published annually by the State Education Department and is made available on state- managed websites.
- The New York state Education Department, in cooperation with the governor's office, has indicated that parents will be granted access to teacher evaluation ratings by contacting the school administration directly.
- Employees are represented by a collective bargaining unit. Position openings and their related salaries are posted publicly. The district shares performance data school-wide and with the public through regular publication of a series of "Data-Dash Boards". State laws governing cooperative and competitive bidding are observed.
- In the Binghamton area, a local Gannett daily newspaper also maintains a data-base of salary data for all public employees, including school districts. This data-base is updated annually in cooperation with area schools including BCSD and is searchable by employee name and/or title. Additionally, the district launched a new Web-site, armed with social media tools and is in the process of planning for their effective use.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	5
--	-----------	----------

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

In May 2010, the New York State Legislature passed legislation, supported by Governor Andrew Cuomo and the Board of Regents, which laid the foundation for broad-based education reform, including participation in RTT programming. The Applicant submitted a Memorandum of Understanding confirming their support for, and their intent to participate fully in, the state's RTT plan.

In addition to passing legislation related to RTT in New York, the state's education leaders have enacted numerous other initiatives that will help ensure successful RTT implementation which the Applicant will also comply to ensure successful conditions to implement the personalized learning environment. Highlights include:

- The NYS Board of Regents endorsed participation in the federally funded 24-state Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC); the state continues to maintain an active and involved role as one of PARCC's governing board members.
- The Board of Regents in July 2010 adopted the Common Core Standards for English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics, as well as the literacy standards in history/social studies, science and technical subjects.
- The New York state assessments for core high school subjects (Regents exams) will be fully aligned with Common Core Standards.
- Network teams have been created to directly support school districts. These three-person teams consist of experts

- in curriculum, data and instruction.
- The NYSED is in the process of developing a statewide longitudinal data system to effectively manage, use and analyze education data to support instruction.
- New York designed and rolled out the Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR) program, an evaluation system for teachers and principals. This evaluation system uses multiple measures of success, including student achievement and classroom observations.

Points in the medium range are awarded because the Applicant provided a signed Memorandum of Understanding confirming their intended full participation in the state's RTT plan which includes compliance to implement successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicant's proposal. However, there is insufficient evidence related to autonomy to implement personalized learning environments or the connection between the State's Race to the Top grant and autonomy.

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

15

3

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The Applicant describes some meaningful stakeholder participation in the development of the project. For example, a project development committee was formed in the summer of 2012, supporting the district's previous RTTT-D submission, which included the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, the Director of Secondary Math/Science Education, the High School Principal, the Director of Career and Technical Education and the Director of Humanities. Data from risk assessment surveys, employee feedback surveys, academic performance data and behavioral/incident data was examined. Dialog with local higher education entities, specifically SUNY Cortland and Broome Community College has been ongoing and these discussions have Binghamton City School District Binghamton, NY 51.

Although the Applicant describes how the initiative was developed through a process of collective visioning and consensus building including the Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, the Director of Secondary Math/Science Education, the High School Principal, the Director of Career and Technical Education and the Director of Humanities, the Applicant provides no letters of support (MOUs) from key stakeholders. Also, the Applicant does not provide a clear description of how students, families, and teachers in participating schools were engaged in the development of the proposal and, as appropriate, how the proposal was revised based on their engagement and feedback. For these reasons the Applicant is awarded points in the low range.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	7

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The Applicant clearly describes a high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) 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 plan is based on the district implementation of several fundamental shifts in instruction and assessment.

The backbone for the new model is the International Baccalaureate program. The IB continuum consists of four, vertically aligned programs; the Primary Years program (K-5 in BCSD); the Middle Years program (grades 6-8) and the IB and IB Career Credential (a CTE option) at the high school level.

The Applicant extensively and clearly described each component of the proposal and the plans include the Applicant's 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 college- and career-ready graduation requirements and accelerate his or her learning through support of his or her needs.

Strong examples include:

- The student electronic portfolio will be used to personalize learning for students;
- the CTE curriculum will integrate learning across four key areas: English language arts, mathematics,

- science/technology and arts/humanities, coupled with workplace learning;
- The extended day program will provide high needs students enrolled at any level in BCSD access to up to 40 hours of academic support;
- The extended year program will provide additional traditional tutoring, a cohort of 100 students each year will experience – once in 9th grade, again in 11 grades, and then in grade 13 - a week-long (5 days x 6 hours/day) summer institute at BCC based on a locally developed and piloted summer institute model called the Go Green Institute.
- The Workplace Connection-Beginning in the middle school years, students will regularly work with industry professionals through online mentoring, face-to-face meetings, and workplace visits, and PBL based on workplace standards outside the school.
- The Higher Education connection which allows high school teachers and college faculty also need opportunities for collaboration
- Technology upgrade and the Electronic Portfolio which would provide students with access to technology to personalize learning
- AIS and Supplemental Education through the BCSD proposal with their experts in the area of math and ELA to act as AIS teachers and provide academic support for students in the afterschool or pull –out setting.
- Using Technology to Enrich and Extend Learning – The Binghamton area exhibits one of the highest student/computer ratios in NYS and one of the most robust LAN/WAN infrastructures as well. In taking advantage of that capacity, we will use a Web-based learning management system called E-School View to facilitate digital communication for all partners and all stakeholders, including students and parents.

Although the Applicant describes exhaustive list of sound and focused strategies for implementing their plan, however, insufficient details describing how the Applicant plans to frequently update individual student data that can be used to determine progress toward mastery of college- and career-ready standards; nor does the Applicant include clear information documenting how students are support by parents and educators. For these reasons, points in the medium range are awarded.

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

20

15

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment

The Applicant describes an ambitious 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 plan includes activities for 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 (as defined in this notice) and college- and career-ready graduation requirements and accelerate his or her learning through support of his or her needs.

Strong examples include:

- Induction and Mentoring- All new teaching and administrative staff participate in a two-week new staff orientation program that includes essential elements of navigating the district as an employee, as well as setting the foundation for the expectations of teaching, learning and leadership.
- Teacher Evaluation: In addition to the mentoring component for teachers and administrators deemed as ineffective or developing under the new APPR, targeted professional development to support quality teacher and principal improvement plans are key to instructional reform. The goal to improve professional practice through effective use of the adopted teacher practice rubric. Therefore, the Applicant has targeted an increase of 2 points in the average score attained by all staff annually after year 1.
- Teacher Professional Development and Growth: The BCSD uses a professional learning community format to update essential leanings based on Common Core Learning Standards and action planning to meet aligned district and building targets.
- The Professional Learning Community BCSD schools are all actively engaged in the PLC model and process and have been for the past several years, having engaged repeatedly the services of Drs. Richard and Rebecca DuFour, among the nation’s foremost authorities in this domain

Together these examples provide credible evidence of the Applicant's success for improving learning and teaching by personalizing the learning environment in order to provide all students the support to graduate college- and career-ready.

Teacher Training, systems, and practices to continuously improve school progress toward the goals of increasing student performance and closing achievement gaps: The Applicant clearly describes an achievable plan for teacher

development and growth. Strong examples include:

- training for teachers in the use of technology tools
- training for teachers as PD and PLC facilitators, mentors and coaches
- a 36 month plan for training teachers in curriculum and assessment
- participation in PLCs to update essential leanings based on Common Core Learning Standards and action planning to meet aligned district and building targets
- building level PLC's (10) will provide a structured leadership forum wherein highly effective teachers and administrators can collaborate 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
- 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 frequently measure student progress toward meeting college- and career-ready standards
- use data to inform both the acceleration of student progress and the improvement of the individual and collective practice of educators
- improve teachers' and principals' practice and effectiveness by using feedback provided by the LEA's teacher and principal evaluation systems including frequent feedback on individual and collective effectiveness, as well as by providing recommendations, supports, and interventions as needed for improvement.

Teacher Evaluation- In addition to the mentoring component for teachers and administrators deemed as ineffective or developing under the new APPR, targeted professional development to support quality teacher and principal improvement plans is key to instructional reform. This support will be focused on five areas of practice reflected in the practice rubrics as noted below. The primary goal of our teacher evaluation system is to promote student learning and improve teaching and professional practice. To that end, it is the Applicant's goal to improve professional practice through effective use of their adopted teacher practice rubric. The Applicant has targeted an increase of 2 points in the average score attained by all staff annually after year 1. The Annual Professional Performance Review Plan encourages professional growth and development through a process that is based on current research and best practices, and is aligned with New York State's Teaching Standards. It assures a common language and common expectations among all teachers and evaluators. It is intentionally linked with the district's professional development plan to ensure teacher-driven professional development and support.

All participating school leaders and school leadership teams- The Applicant's model for school leadership teams is the professional learning community (PLCs). The Applicant describes how all schools have been actively engaged in the PLC model and process for the past few years utilizing the services work of national experts such as The DuFour model of PLC described in: Professional Learning Communities at Work: Best Practices for Enhancing Student Achievement. Using the PLC model, teachers, data coaches and administrators work collaboratively with the GEL project staff to implement the following:

- Review of student performance data on a monthly basis as a key means implementing Data-Driven Instruction (DDI) decision making processes
- A PLC specific to this RTTT project will be formed in each of the district's 10 school, consisting of the principal, two teachers at each grade level, the CIO, the program evaluator and other staff as deemed necessary.
- District formative and summative student assessments data is analyzed and disaggregated down to the unique teacher/student ID level. SLO data is also available and handled in similar fashion. A formalized frequent assessments practice at all grade levels and in all core curricular areas occurs every 10 weeks. It is from these assessments, along with regular curriculum embedded assessments that quarterly marking period grades are derived.
- Individual teachers at BCSD are all trained in differentiated instruction and use these more frequent, localized assessments to help shape curriculum and instruction in their own classroom and for each learner as indicated by their progress.

Full points are not awarded because the Applicant provides insufficient information on a high- quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals (as defined in this notice), including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects (such as mathematics and science), and specialty areas (such as special education).

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	11
--	-----------	-----------

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

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

The LEA central office is organized to provide support and services to all participating schools through a shared decision making process. The shared decision making framework selected by the Applicant is the PLC. The Applicant states that the mandate to use a shared decision making models is in accordance with NYS Education Department Commissioner's regulation 100.11, BCSD requiring that LEAs regularly engage in a Shared Decision Making process. The Applicant clearly describes how each site in the project will select a district Steering Committee which will provide guidance for the selection, implementation and general oversight of the project direction.

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

The Applicant describes a feasible process for providing school leadership teams in participating schools with sufficient flexibility and autonomy to control such factors as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and non-educators, and school-level budgets. The Applicant clearly describes how the LEA decision making process is collaborative and includes district leaders who participate in implementing the proposed project but do not hold sole decision making authority over it.

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

The Applicant clearly describes reasonable strategies that the district uses to give students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple ways.

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

Points awarded in the medium range are awarded because the Applicant did not fully explain their plan for giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways and for giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

a) Ensuring that all participating students (as defined), parents, educators (as defined), and other stakeholders (as appropriate and relevant to student learning), regardless of income, have access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation of the applicant's proposal

Examples of Applicant's strategies for providing access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support the implementation of the applicant's proposal include the following:

- Board Advisory Teams (BATS)-The purpose of the BATs is to provide recommendations to the Boards of Education based upon valid reliable research, considerable thought and due diligence directed toward constantly improving student outcomes.
- The Instructional Leadership Teams are major players in facilitating the ultimate goal of a quality education: to graduate students who can take ownership of their own learning. There is a team devoted to each content area. Each team meets as needed to examine, map, and align curricular and other practices that impact student outcomes. Their work is conducted using the guideposts of National (ESEA) and NYS Common Core Standards and the BOE Benchmarks.
- Building Planning Teams (BPTs) will exist in each of the elementary schools, at the middle school, and at the high school. They will meet regularly to identify and resolve issues having to do with improving the educational performance of the students.

b) Ensuring that students, parents, educators, and other stakeholders (as appropriate and relevant to student learning) have appropriate levels of technical support, which may be provided through a range of strategies (e.g..., peer support, online support, or local support);

The Applicant convincingly describes how the involvement of parents in district and school planning and decision-making comply with state and federal requirements, as well as the regulations for parent involvement in special education, Title I, and other programs will be implemented in the LEA. In addition, the Applicant details how school district SDM plans will enhance parent participation in the decision-making process by going beyond the mandates by making parents active participants of district and school teams, curriculum and continuing education committees and other shared decision-making teams.

Also, the Applicant clearly describes how coaching and support personnel will work directly with parents, service providers and students to collectively ensure that students regularly arrive at school ready to learn. The Applicant clearly describes how representation from parent and student groups will be incorporated into the design of the governing body and all content level PLC and building level teams. The Applicant assures that enrollment in the Parent Engagement program, like enrollment in any other RTI program, is based on performance and not on income, race, or any other sub-group definition.

(c) Using information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format (as defined in this notice) and to use the data in other electronic learning systems (e.g..., electronic tutors, tools that make recommendations for additional learning supports or software that securely stores personal records)

The Applicant states that the district has taken several focused and executable steps to ensure that data is made available to stakeholders and is used to inform decision making and planning activities.

Student Assessments

The Applicant clearly describes how data used in many district level DDI efforts and can be disaggregated down to the unique teacher/student ID level, including SLO data. The Applicant details how the district utilizes frequent and structured assessment practices at all grade levels and in all core curricular areas every 10 weeks. It from these assessments, along with regular curriculum embedded assessments that quarterly marking period grades are derived. The Applicant describes how district teachers are all trained in differentiated instruction and use these more frequent, localized assessments to help shape curriculum and instruction in their own classroom and for each learner as indicated by their progress.

d) Ensuring that LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems (as defined) (e.g..., systems that include human resources data, student information data, budget data, and instructional improvement system data).

The Applicant describes the district's robust technology system which utilizes third-party software systems to manage academic and non-academic data for all students. The Applicant states that the district employs a Chief Information Officer and data teams in keeping with state and federal requirements. Information managers in districts work closely with the Regional Information Center at Broome –Tioga BOCES, one of 13 state sanctioned data and network management providers in NY state, to archive data, produce customized reports, dashboards and predictive models and facilitate state/federal mandated reporting through existing data portals. The Applicant plans to explore web-based content management systems and learning management systems which will facilitate interoperability through single-sign-on protocols. In keeping with NY State's RTTT agreement with USDOE, the Applicant states that district leaders are working closely with the area RTTT Network Teams to meet the state's data and data and interoperability objectives. Combined these initiatives provide reasonable support of the Applicant's goal of ensuring that LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems.

Although the Applicant listed a variety of strategies, it is unclear how the strategies listed specifically provide access to necessary content, tools, and other learning resources both in and out of school to support . Points in the high range are awarded.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

To appropriately address this selection criterion, the Applicant extensively and clearly describes how the GEL Project will be facilitated through the use of the Professional Learning Community (PLC) as the primary organizational, training, and facilitation structure; and a governance structure and function using the APPR process.

How the Professional Learning Community (PLC) Model Provides a High Quality Plan for Implementing a Rigorous Continuous Improvement Process

The Applicant states that the LEA has been actively engaged in the PLC model and process for the past several years, and has utilized the services of Drs. Richard and Rebecca DuFour, among the nation's foremost authorities in this domain. The Applicant documents strengths of the proposed PLC model for their RTI-D proposal by citing appropriate research.

The Applicant's ambitious and achievable plan is for the PLC structure to facilitate constructive conversation in three spheres of influence: Literacy, Math and Science and Trans-disciplinary learning, which is based on the nationally recognized DuFour model of PLCs (Richard and Rebecca DuFour, 2009).. The basis for the PLCs is a belief in teacher leadership and involvement in school improvement efforts. Through the PLC model knowledge is situated in the day-to-day experiences of teachers and is best understood through critical reflection with others who share the same experiences (Haar, 2003; Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2006). The PLC model actively engages teachers and increases their professional knowledge and enhance student learning (Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2006). The following are key components of the Applicant's proposed PLC model:

Characteristics of the Applicant's PLC Model

- Implementing shared values and vision-Teachers and administrators will share a vision focused on student learning and a commitment to improvement (Reichstetter, 2006).
- Creating collaborative cultures- Through collaboration, professionals achieve more than they could alone. Teachers will benefit from the resources that each brings to the PLC (Newman, 1994).
- Collaboration will provide a mechanism for sharing responsibility for student learning and a means to work together toward a common purpose (Reichstetter, 2006; Stoll et al., 2006).
- There will be a focus on collaboration (e.g.. opportunities for teachers to engage in ongoing collegial opportunities where they talk about teaching, receive frequent feedback on teaching, design classes together, teach each other, etc.) because collaboration has been found in successful schools and is missing in unsuccessful schools (Little, 1989, 2003).

How The Applicant's PLCs focus on examining outcomes to improve student learning

- PLCs will promote results-oriented thinking that is focused on continuous improvement and student learning that extends beyond a team getting together to look at data.
- In the proposed PLCs, teachers will respond to data that require mutual accountability and changing classroom practices.
- Data will help motivate teachers to see what is happening and what they need to do collectively (White & McIntosh, 2007).

How The Applicant's PLCs Promote Supportive and Shared Leadership

- Administrators are committed to sharing decision making with teachers and providing opportunities for them to serve as leaders
- Leadership will be shared and distributed among formal and informal leaders (Phillips, 2003; Reichstetter, 2006).
- The purposes and goals of the PLCs will grow from among the participants, based on their values, beliefs, and individual and shared experiences (Thompson, Gregg, & Niska, 2004).
- Teacher leadership capacity will sustain PLCs. Sharing power and authority with teachers through decision making and shared leadership increases leadership capacity and builds a belief in the school's collective ability to affect student teaching (Olivier & Hipp, 2006).

How the Applicant's PLCs Will Promote Shared Personal Practice

- Establish professional learning in which teachers work and learn together as they continually evaluate the effectiveness of their practices and the needs, interests, and skills of their students (McREL, 2003).
- Teachers will share experiences, observe each other, and discuss teaching, share practices and use collective inquiry to help sustain improvement by strengthening connections among teachers, stimulating discussion about professional practice, and helping teachers build on one another's expertise (McREL, 2003).
- Through continuous inquiry and reflective dialog teachers will discover solutions and address student needs (Hord, 1997; Stoll et al., 2006).
- The PLC structure will meet every ten weeks to review progress toward the state performance measures and make recommendations to the Project Steering Committee, which facilitate the adjustment of service levels and content focus as indicated by data.

The Applicant's logic model clearly depicts how the continuous improvement cycle works. The cycle begins with the New York State core curriculum and common core standards, from which essential learning needs, are determined. The learning needs of students are the basis of personalized classroom instruction. Through aligned, frequent assessments, teachers gather feedback which allows them to differentiate instruction. Common summative assessments are given to determine student mastery and appropriate action plans are developed. The process is one of continuous improvement that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant.

The APPR Process

The Applicant clearly describes how the APPR process involves a structured and criteria based on use of observation, data analysis, reflection and action-research. To assure the successful implementation of the process, staff has been actively engaged in collaboratively developing student learning objectives, learning common core standards and revamping current, or building new, curriculum to align with NYSED Common Core Curriculum Units. The Applicant plans to continue training evaluators to support the APPR process, which will facilitate continuous improvement through regular review of performance as measured by the approved Teacher Performance rubric and the NYS Teaching Standards. Structured, formal teacher improvement plans will be developed as necessary and all teachers will be provided with the supports that they need to succeed. In New York State, both student assessments and teacher evaluations are published annually at the aggregate level by the NYSED and can be obtained individually at the teacher or student specific level by parents.

Fiscal Management and Efficiency

The Applicant describes how the Steering Committee will conduct an annual review of the financial operation of the project including a per capita expenditures report. The Steering committee and Project Director will work with the district's finance team to develop a cost/benefit index for the proposed project for the purpose of comparative analysis and potential national model development. These data will be available on the project website and will be compared to historical regular operating budget expenditures of the district and presented to the board of education annually.

Combined, the strategies outlined by the Applicant for this selection criterion constitute a high quality plan for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process that provides timely and regular feedback on progress toward project goals and opportunities for ongoing corrections and improvements during and after the term of the grant. Full points are not awarded because the Applicant did not adequately describe a high quality plan for how they will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments if funded by Race to the Top – District, such as investments in professional development, technology, and staff.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Full points are awarded because the Applicant presents a coherent plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. The PLC, SDM and governance structure/function mechanisms are designed to seek input, share information and engage a cross-section of stakeholders in the decision making, planning, monitoring and revision processes. Strong examples that clearly include the following:

- Using the Web and the E-Zine as part of its commitment to transparency and engagement
- The project director will work with the district CIO to develop a set of webpages, integrated into the district's existing website, to communicate with the public at large regarding progress and pitfalls.
- Aggregate performance data will be made available at this site, along with evaluation reports, meeting agendas, program related resources and relevant policy documents/decisions.
- The website will consist of four portals of entry delineated as parents, students, staff and Community members.
- Stakeholders may obtain access both to publicly available information such as that listed above, or less publicly available information such as personal time and accounting or student information management systems, both made

available via web-links with the districts existing third party database systems

- The Project Director will also publish a monthly electronic newsletter presenting highlights of the project to all parents in the district and to subscribers who sign up via the web portal.
- Members of the Steering Committee will present reports regarding project highlights and milestones to the board on quarterly basis, and to PTO/PTA organizations and community groups (rotary, children’s council, etc.) as appropriate.
- Parent Café’s will provide a vital, two-way communications path between project leadership and engaged parents.

All of these components of the Applicant’s Web and the E-zine system demonstrate a high quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. The plans appear feasible, achievable, and likely to succeed because they clearly focus on continuous improvement.

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

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

(a) Its rationale for selecting that measure

The Applicant provided a clear rationale for selecting their performance measures and appropriately selected the required total of approximately 12 to 14 performance measures. The Applicant clearly describes how they will use the results of regularly administered statewide assessments as performance measures for this project. These measures were chosen because they are readily available and already familiar to all stakeholders. Examples include a longitudinal archive of data that is already available for planning and evaluation processes. Also the NYS Regents Reform Plan and the NYS ESEA Waiver set long-term aspirations based on state-wide assessment data. Since this project is designed to synergize with the State-wide reform effort, NYS ESEA Waiver targets have been incorporated into performance measures wherever possible. Those targets, set for the 2015/16 school year, include:

- *90% graduation rates for all student sub-groups
- *80% proficiency rates in core curriculum areas for all sub-groups
- *A halving of gaps in performance between the highest and lowest achieving sub-groups
- *That all students will score 80% or better on the Math Regents at the high school level; 75% or better on the ELA Regents.

(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

The Applicant comprehensively describes how they will use the assessment based performance measures identified in the accompanying charts provided in this application to track progress of this effort and to provide rigorous, timely, and formative information tailored to its plan for implementing the GEL project. The Applicant also details plans to utilize the *Teacher-Child Rating Scale* (T-CRS) (Hightower & Perkins, P.E. et al, 2010) as a validated teacher-rated measure of students’ social-emotional problem behaviors and competencies. It consists of 32 items, assessing four empirically-derived subscales including:

1. Task Orientation
2. Behavior Control (includes frustration tolerance, acting out and shy-withdrawn)
3. Assertiveness (formerly ?Assertive Social Skills?)
4. Peer Social Skills

Each of these subscales contains 8 items: four positively and four negatively worded items. All items are measured on a 5-point Likert scale according to how much the teacher agrees each item describes the child. Strong examples of the benefits include:

Correlation with student achievement: The T-CRS results correlate strongly to student achievement. In school district at Pre-K, these correlations are used in resource allocation, professional development and other areas of policy-formulation.

Ease of administration: The T-CRS is easy to administer. Approximately four to six week familiarity with the student is all that is needed by the teacher. An online system is used for administration, which means the results are readily retrievable. A teacher can complete an entire classroom in 20 – 30 minutes from a computer; at home, school or elsewhere.

Validity and Reliability metrics: The T-CRS possesses strong indices of reliability and predictive validity. Normative Tables are provided for *urban, suburban, and rural; male and female*. Note that BCSD pupils have always been included in the norming sampling. On the national norming sample the T-CRS alpha coefficients of internal consistency range from .87

to .94 with a median of .94. Studies correlating the T-CRS with the Walker-McConnell and Achenbach's scales suggest strong convergent and divergent concurrent and construct validity (Hightower, A.D & Perkins, P.E. et al, 2010). Students who scored below the 15 percentile (approximately 1 standard deviation) in any TCRS subscale were considered to be at risk in that particular area. Two or more subscales are typically flagged as having social-emotional difficulties.

In addition to the Teacher-Child Rating Scale instrument, attendance data is used as the social/emotional indicator in this proposal because the research clearly suggests that pro-school, pro-social protective behaviors such as regular attendance are directly linked to student success.

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

Full points are not awarded because the Applicant did not provide a sufficient response on how they plan to review and improve the measure over time if it is insufficient to gage implementation progress.

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

5

5

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The Applicant's plans include contracting with an external evaluator for their proposed GEL project. Proposed evaluation activities will include collaboration with stakeholders to assure that the investigation is culturally competent and that it will produce strategies for program improvement without impeding day-to-day operations of the program. The Applicant clearly details the focused proposed project activities including the following:

- determine the extent to which the application's stated goals, objectives and benchmarks are accomplished or achieved
- provide ongoing technical assistance to the various project staff regarding the use of data and collection instruments
- provide a synthesis and analysis of qualitative and quantitative data to assess the fidelity to implementation activities (including barriers) as outlined in this proposal
- provide synthesis and analysis of quantitative data including disaggregated data by subgroups to evaluate student and teacher outcomes
- facilitate program improvement dialog based on available data and evaluative feedback, including interim and final reports and meetings with all stakeholders

The Applicant assures that USDOE required pre-post statistical analysis will be provide and in addition the Applicant's ambitious goal is to provide a thorough analysis of additional data from local assessments, portfolios and teacher observations. A key component of the Applicant's plan is to provide on-going student progress monitoring data, specifically chosen to relate to the annual outcome measures outlined in the proposal's narrative. A reasonable expectation is for these assessments to be administered and reviewed on an on-going basis by classroom teachers, coaches and other staff educators.

The details how the Project Director will appropriately provide the PLC teams, IB Team and Steering Committee with a quarterly analysis that will present utilization, student performance and timeline data in quantifiable terms and will assess these data against benchmarks and against progress toward performance/outcome measures.

The Applicant assures that their proposed plan will conform to all anticipated evaluation protocols and methodology that is empirically sound, ethical and responsive to the logistics of the consortium. Also the Applicant plans include stakeholder participation with evaluators in developing and approving the evaluation questions, tools and protocols, in order to ensure that the investigation is culturally competent, feasible and will produce strategies for improvement. The Applicant intends to share findings from evaluation efforts regularly with building teams, the Steering Committee, the PLCs, and other stakeholders through an established timeline to facilitate modifications and improvements.

The Applicant clearly describes focused qualitative and quantitative measures designed to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities. Strong examples include:

Proposed Qualitative measures

1. Interviews with staff and key stakeholders for perceptions of: implementation; their own growth; changes in instructional practices; classroom environments; parent knowledge and engagement and impact on their students;
2. Structured Observations and systematic review of program generated documents (e.g., meeting minutes, attendance sheets, unit/lesson plans, professional development evaluations.) for evidence of implementation and

match between activities and outcomes;

3. A systematic content analysis of teacher logs and student progress monitoring documentation (summative, formative, local, state assessments) along with findings from classroom observations and coach and teacher interviews to look for evidence of differentiated instruction correlated to critical measures of writing/math comprehension;
4. Surveys with staff and parents to illuminate: level of awareness and practice of literacy/math skill development activities; awareness of their connection to school success and their level of engagement with schooling, and satisfaction with the project activities.

Proposed Quantitative measures

Quantitative measures will use standard statistical methods to test for significant growth in participants and differences between interventions as measured by the assessments described in the proposal. Specifically, paired t-tests will be used to evaluate whether or not there are significant improvements in mean scores between the pre and post- tests each year. Independent sample t-tests and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) will be used to compare quantitative measures among student subgroups (race, SWD, economic status). All statistical testing will be conducted at a 5% level of significance. The Evaluations and project staff will cooperate fully with the US DOE evaluation protocol and will share findings across the field as appropriate.

Full points are awarded because the Applicant provides a high quality and coherent plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top District funded activities. The Applicant thoroughly outlines both qualitative and quantitative measures to be used, appropriately identifies internal and external resources, and clearly describes expectations of staff, stakeholders, the project evaluator, and the project director in the successful implementation of the plan.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

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

(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) Identifies all funds that will support the project (e.g., Race to the Top – District grant; external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds)

The Applicant identifies all funds that will support the GEL project through Race to the Top-District grant. The Applicant did not list external foundation support, LEA, State or other Federal funds.

(b) Is reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant’s proposal

The budget appears reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the Applicant’s proposal. The Applicant describes the proposal as a district-wide school reform effort based on implementing new Common Core teaching and learning standards and curriculum using the International Baccalaureate framework. The Applicant’s initiative consists of four key projects including infrastructure development; elementary STEAM curriculum development; middle school STEAM curriculum development and high school level college and career readiness. STEAM is an acronym that stands for science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) with an A added for Arts (including fine arts and humanities) Research suggests that adding an A to STEM makes the math/science content come alive for students that may not respond favorably to a traditional diet of math and science education. In addition to these four projects, the Applicant plans to invest in professional development to support this major systemic reform effort. Professional development will include training, reflection, review and revision. Consequently, very substantial amounts of money have been allocated for teacher professional development, curriculum development and licensure in each of the projects two through four. Daytime PD requires substitute teachers, while afterschool or summer sessions require stipends for staff.

(i) A description of all of the funds that the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal, including total revenue from these sources

The Applicant details how funds that will be used for the project will come from the RTT-D grant allocation. These funds will be used to support four projects. Project #1 (Infrastructure) consists of capacity building for the district as a whole. Major costs in this element include a Project Director, project support staff, teacher mentors, AIS teachers, college students acting as tutors and several social workers employed as Parent Engagement Specialists. This staffs are considered separately from the other three projects because they serve all students at all grade levels, rather than specifically serving only those in a sub-set of the general population which is the case in projects two through four. Also included in Project #1 is an external evaluator to aid the district in meeting USDOE requirements and continuously using data appropriately to guide, monitor, and assess progress – measure success and identify challenges along the way.

Consequently, Project #1 provides four key reform requirements including leadership, capacity, technology and data-driven decision making.

Project #2 will focus on implementing the International Baccalaureate Primary Years Program (IB-PYP) in each of the district's seven elementary schools. In addition to the IB framework, the Applicant plans to implement an evidence-based curriculum originally adopted by the state of Maryland called Engineering by Design (EbD). EbD sets the state for inquiry-based learning by providing students with a sequence of authentic learning experiences which have real world application and set the stage for a more focused STEM careers pathway in the middle school.

Project #3 will focus on the implementation of IB at the middle school level. The Applicant has taken preliminary steps to initiate an IB-MYP (middle years program) pilot over the past three years; however, the district was unable to maintain the pilot because of limited funding. The Applicant asserts that fully funding the IB-MYP would provide a significant link to the successful high school IB program.

Project #4 will allow the district to add a Career and Technical Education (CTE) component to its IB High School. The IB Career Credential is designed to provide students with a CTE pathway which will lead directly to the world of work, yield a credential or certificate in a specific field, or seamlessly matriculate into a two or four year college experience.

The combination off the IB-CC program with the district's Pathways to Technology, Early College High School Program? (PTECH) will allow CTE oriented students to begin earning college credits via a partnership with nearby Broome Community College as early as grade nine and graduate with as many as 60 college credits (and A.S. or A.A.S. degree) five or six years later, having been dually credentialed with a college degree and an IB-Career Credential-Endorsed Diploma.

Full points are awarded because the Applicant convincingly describes a rationale for budget expenditures and comprehensively addresses the requirements of the selection criteria in the narrative and is supported by accompanying budget tables.

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

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The Applicant describes a two-part plan they will use to sustain the project goals. Part one of the plan is to offset the \$1.8 million annual costs for professional development by an 80% recapture of the district's State education aid if the professional development is offered to multiple districts in a shared environment. SIG funding will also help offset ongoing professional development costs. Off- setting the cost of professional development and partnering with other LEAs after the term of the grant are reasonable approaches to sustainability. However, this plan does not describe support from State and local government leaders; and a description of how the Applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and how they will use this data to inform future investments.

Part two of the Applicant's sustainability plan is to utilize Title one funding to support afterschool and AIS activities associated with this grant. Approximately \$800,000 will be absorbed into the regular operating budget as of 2018. The majority of this increase will be offset by state foundation aid while approximately \$400,000 annually will need to be secured from non-tax based revenue such as foundation grants, other state/federal grants and private businesses. BCSD currently manages between \$4 and \$6 million in grant funds annually. However, this plan does not adequately describe how the Applicant will evaluate the effectiveness of past investments and how they will use this data to inform future investments.

The Applicant does not describe how the they will evaluate improvements in productivity and outcomes to inform a post-grant budget, and does not clearly describe an estimated budget for the three years after the term of the grant that includes budget assumptions, potential sources, and uses of funds. For these reasons points in the average range are awarded.

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8

Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

(1) Provide a description of the coherent and sustainable partnership to support the plan described in Absolute

Priority 1 that it has formed with public or private organizations, such as public health, before-school, after-school, and social service providers; integrated student service providers; businesses, philanthropies, civic groups, and other community-based organizations; early learning programs; and postsecondary institutions

The Applicant clearly describes a coherent and sustainable partnership through the Promise Zone Partners, including district support from Broome County Mental Health, Broome Tioga, Binghamton University who have assisted in the building of a county-wide network of community schools that help initiate implement, and evaluate innovative programming to benefit students, families, school professionals and the community. Working collaboratively with Promise Zone partners, Binghamton University is enhancing its partnership commitment to the community schools beyond offering internships and research opportunities. Community schools will be a key focus of the Applicant's initiative that will include academic courses and expanded field work, service learning, internships to complement current social work, nursing, education and public administration research, teaching, service and internships around community schools.

The Binghamton University Center for Family, School, and Community Partnerships (out of the College of Community and Public Affairs' Department of Social Work) will provide professional development for trauma informed culturally proficient practices and bully prevention programming. The Binghamton University Department of Social Work will provide school based social work services to district students and lead the family engagement work with marginalized families. Binghamton University has been working in partnership with the Applicant for the past decade with grants and interns involved in school-linked and school-based services. The Applicant has been a primary partner due to high needs and inadequate resources.

In 2008, the Stewart W. and Willma C. Hoyt Foundation supported Binghamton University departments/schools with an award to establish, implement, and evaluate school-based inter-professional teams of social work, nursing, and education students serving high needs students at three BCSD elementary schools. From 2009 to 2013, in collaboration with Broome-Tioga BOCES (lead) and Lourdes Youth Services, Binghamton University received support through the federal (DOE, HHS & DOJ) Safe Schools/Healthy Students initiative for 10 Broome County districts, with BCSD representing the urban core. In 2010 the project, known locally as SHARE (Safe Healthy Attitudes Require Education), received OJJDP support to expand youth mentoring. SHARE services, particularly family engagement and MSW internships, continue under Promise Zone funding to support the development of community schools. The Promise Zone recognition was due in large part to the success of the SHARE Project in program innovation, service delivery, and in the ability to develop effective partnerships with a wide range of community providers, leaders, and stakeholders.

The Applicant's clearly provides a comprehensive descriptions of their coherent and sustainable partnerships to support the plan described in Absolute Priority 1. The Applicant's partnerships are formed with a plethora of public and private organizations with whom they work collaboratively to provide seamless programs and services to support the Applicant's plan.

(2) Identify not more than 10 population-level desired results for students in the LEA or consortium of LEAs that align with and support the applicant's broader Race to the Top – District proposal.

Student level outcomes including educational results and family and community supports:

- **Improved school climate and classroom engagement:** Assess using school VADIR data, including data regarding suspensions; all school survey data about climate at baseline and each year thereafter; yearly youth survey and focus groups with youth.
- **Improved attendance:** Assess using whole school data on attendance and tardiness since attendance is a prerequisite for learning.
- **Improved test scores:** Assess through state testing results and all-school grade reports.
- **Improved utilization of community resources for social-emotional and mental health concerns:** Assess through number of referrals made and followed through on, students and family members served, and self-report of adequacy of service.
- **Improved work environment and effective teaching practices:** Assess by its implementation and integration of continuous performance improvement practices, including productive use of Annual Professional Performance Review (APPR), and other goals as delineated by BCSD administrators and teachers at the pilot schools.
- **Improved family engagement and progress toward shared governance:** Assess comparing data on participation in parent-teacher conferences; surveying teachers and parents about their perceptions of quality and quantity of parent involvement and relationships with school; examining development and effectiveness of parent-teacher school management committees through all-school survey of effectiveness.

The Applicant provides reasonable explanations and achievable strategies that describe population-level desired results for students in the LEA that align with and support the applicant's broader Race to the Top – District proposal.

(3) The Binghamton University Center for Family, School, and Community Partnership will provide faculty and graduate student intern support to:

(a) Track the selected indicators that measure each result at the aggregate level for all children in the school participating in the pilot project, and at the student level for those students who receive individual and/or small group supports.

(b) Work with the Applicant's administrators to use the data to target its resources to focus on two high needs elementary schools for year one. The two schools chosen have poverty rates of 85% or higher and about half the students in each school are students of color.

(c) Continuous program improvement methods will inform ongoing development and inform next phases of the project to move the trauma informed culturally responsive approaches to other schools in the district. It is anticipated that full implementation in a school will take two to three years, with schools becoming increasingly autonomous in their ability to integrate the approaches as time goes on. During the first year, intensive services, including professional development training, MSW intern support, and parent outreach will be provided to the two pilot schools. The second year, these services will continue, and a third school will receive professional development training. In the third year, as the pilot schools become stabilized in the new approach, the intensive services will reduce in the pilot schools to be directed at the third school, and a fourth school will begin training. Additional schools will be added sooner if resources, including funding, are secured. In this manner, as teachers, school social workers, guidance counselors, and administrators become proficient in the approach. The new methods will be integrated into existing PBIS and bully prevention initiatives that are ongoing in each school building and become self-sustaining.

(d) Data on student outcomes and school climate will be collected at regular intervals and used to inform ongoing program development to ensure that results are improving over time.

(4) Describe how the partnership would, within participating schools (as defined in this notice), integrate education and other services (e.g., services that address social-emotional, and behavioral needs, acculturation for immigrants and refugees) for participating (as defined in this notice)

The trauma informed culturally responsive approaches are designed to improve the ability of teachers and other school personnel to respond to the social-emotional needs of all students to improve classroom engagement and student learning outcomes. MSW interns will spend part of their time in classrooms working with students with higher mental health needs, and be available to the teacher and teacher aids for consultation on classroom management or student behavioral issues.

(5) Describe how the partnership and LEA or consortium would build the capacity of staff in participating schools (as defined in this notice) by providing them with tools and supports to –

(a) Assess the needs and assets of participating students (as defined in this notice) that are aligned with the partnership's goals for improving the education and family and community supports (as defined in this notice) identified by the partnership

The Applicant clearly details how the district will work collaboratively with Binghamton University to assess the needs and assets of all students in the school building receiving intensified programming, and of those students receiving individual or small group services. Examples include;

- Student climate and classroom engagement assessed through small group discussions with students in grades 4 and 5
- Student climate and classroom engagement assessed through classroom observations in grades k.
- Teacher assessment will include pre and post assessments as well as observations to determine their skills in classroom management and focused lesson planning.
- Parent perspectives will be assessed through community outreach, and their active involvement in school activities will be encouraged to work toward the goal of shared governance.

By implementing these feasible strategies, the Applicant's achievable goal is to improve student attendance and test scores by year two of the project in the pilot school.

(b) Identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community that are aligned with those goals for improving the education and family and community supports.

The Applicant's identification and inventory of needs and assets of the school and community are based on a 2012 Binghamton University survey conducted part of the federally funded, regional Safe School/Healthy Students project. The Applicant describes significant findings indicating that the mental health needs for many of the targeted students. For example, in district elementary and middle schools with the highest rates of poverty, approximately one third of 5th graders

reported that they had felt sad, and similar numbers stated they felt helpless; over a third reported that they had problems too big to solve; and about a quarter of the children reported that they had hurt themselves on purpose. Almost half reported that they felt nervous or anxious about their school work and more than a third stated they felt nervous or anxious when they are in class. Based on these findings the Applicant plans to utilize the expertise and support services of the Binghamton University schools of education and nursing. The Applicant also describes support for the alignment of project goals for improving the education and family and community supports through partnerships with a variety of community organizations that work collaboratively with the Applicant. These organizations include: Broome Community College Center for Civic Engagement and EOP programs; BU Center for Civic Engagement, Multicultural Resource Center, and EOP; Broome County Gang Prevention; Binghamton Youth Bureau; the Urban League, the Family & Children's Society, and community members who volunteer their time.

The information provided clearly shows how the Applicant will identify and inventory the needs and assets of the school and community that are aligned with those goals for improving the education and family and community supports.

(c) Create a decision-making process and infrastructure to select, implement, and evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating students and support improved results.

The Applicant details a decision-making process that will include the following multiple steps and phases: data collected at various points. The following is a general description of the process.

1. Identify school personnel from two pilot schools.
2. Conduct focus groups and collect data to assess needs and introduce trauma informed culturally responsive perspectives and the Sanctuary Model (Bloom, 1995; 1997).
3. Conduct parent focus groups to capture their perspectives, strengths and concerns which will be integrated into the program design.
4. Conduct additional focus groups and/or individual interviews with school personnel to and administer questionnaires from which data will be collected to clarify professional development needs that inform training design.
5. Collect baseline data from teacher questionnaires on school climate and student engagement areas targeted by the training to assess their impressions.
6. Binghamton University faculty will lead professional development and collect data through a pre- and post-evaluation of the presentation and the anonymous questionnaire for teachers.
7. On-going professional development focusing on perspectives and skills related to trauma informed culturally responsive practices and the Sanctuary Model.
8. Training participants will share information and feedback from trainings with colleagues.

Although the activities and strategies the Applicant describes are reasonable, the Applicant does not sufficiently describe how these steps create a decision-making process. Also the Applicant provides insufficient information explaining how the district plans to evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating students and support improved results.

(6) Identify its annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population-level and describe desired results for students.

The Applicant clearly identifies its annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures for the proposed population-level and reasonably describes desired results for students.

Develop and use logic models: Binghamton University and the Applicant will develop a program logic model within the first 3 months, to articulate the program's theory of change and assist with monitoring progress toward expected outcomes.

Provide quantitative analysis of student data: Binghamton University will conduct annual statistical analysis of all student data related to key objectives and indicators as provided in the chart at the end of this narrative section, including: school attendance, discipline/behavioral incidents, T-CRS surveys, and participation rates, NYS math and reading/language arts assessments and report card grades. Statistical analysis will incorporate descriptive approaches and multivariate, inferential methods and standard statistical methods testing for significance and use school generated electronic data. BU will distill and present this information in regular reports to BCSD and parent partners in a clear fashion to enhance its use for program improvement and to demonstrate progress.

Provide qualitative analysis: Qualitative methods will include structured program observations and point-of-service reviews along with annual student, parent, teacher and staff surveys, and focus groups with students and parents.

Statistical and qualitative analysis will document program satisfaction, progress with expected changes in knowledge, skills, behavior and engagement with schooling and the overall impact of selected interventions/services

1. Baseline data will be collected in the first six weeks of the school year by having teachers, aides, and other school personnel complete a short anonymous questionnaire. Focus groups with school personnel and parents will also be conducted as part of the baseline data collection process throughout the first half of the school year.
2. Mid-point data will be collected approximately half way through the school year by having a sample of teachers complete the short anonymous questionnaire used at pretest to assess their impressions of school climate and student engagement.
3. Posttest data will be collected at the end of the school year in multiple ways: by having a sample of teachers complete the short anonymous questionnaire used at pre- and mid test to assess their impressions of school climate and student engagement; through a formal focus group with participants in the training; and through group meetings and/or individual interviews with other school personnel not directly involved in the trainings to assess their awareness and impressions of the project, this data will be collected through note taking and a short questionnaire.
4. A report summarizing the process, findings, and recommendations for next steps will be provided to the school and district administration at the conclusion of the year. A summary of this will be shared with parent partners, who will be included in the planning for program development.

Full points are not awarded for the competitive Preference Priority because the Applicant provides insufficient responses to the following selection criteria:**(c) Create a decision-making process and infrastructure to select, implement, and evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating students and support improved results.** - Although the activities and strategies the Applicant describes are reasonable, the Applicant does not sufficiently describe how these steps create a decision-making process. Also the Applicant provides insufficient information explaining how the district plans to evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating students and support improved results.

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

Based on the evidence provided the Applicant provides a clear and coherent reform vision that are supported by a high quality plan that includes ambitious and achievable goals, innovative and feasible strategies and activities, sound deliverables, reasonable timelines, and a clear delineation of duties and responsibilities. The Applicant's ambitious reform vision is Global Engagement of Learners (GEL): A STEAM approach to career and college readiness. The primary framework for the district's reform is the International Baccalaureate program. The IB approach operationalizes the fundamental belief that all students have the capacity to develop critical thinking skills, team-working skills, and effective communication skills if we, as educators, can find ways to empower students to self-direct their learning, see real world application for themselves, and draw from their own personal base of assets and strengths to build a pathway to success.

A key indicator of the livelihood of successful implementation is that the Applicant's vision is based on removing barriers through the Global Engagement of Learners (GEL): A STEAM approach to career and college readiness reform initiative. The initiative will focus on investments in professional development, curriculum development, technology acquisition, partnerships that extend the boundaries of school. Using the IB framework at all grades P-12, the GEL project seeks to develop a trans-disciplinary, articulated P-12 Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Math (STEAM) curriculum that supports college and career readiness for all students while Binghamton City School District Binghamton, integrating the Common Core Standards.

This comprehensive approach will respond appropriately to students' academic interest via school-to-career and school-to-college-to-career pathways and responds to New York State's economic growth plans. The project will serve more than 5,800 students and 600 teachers across the district. The Applicant clearly describes how the GEL project builds on the four core educational assurance areas of RTTT as follows:

- 1.) Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy; BCSD has adopted the Common Core Curriculum and Standards in all core academic areas and at all grade levels.
- 2.) Building data systems that measure student growth and success and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction. This plan will focus on the use data to inform instruction.

- 3.) Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed.
- 4.) Turning around the nation's lowest-achieving schools.

Total	210	150
--------------	------------	------------