



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0176AL-1 for Birmingham City Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district described in the application for RRTD Grant funding (PLEDGET2) describes how they will build upon its work within the four core educational assurance areas, but is incomplete. For example: They provide vague information regarding teacher, principal, and superintendent evaluation systems; The district describes the college-and career-ready standards or how they will determine that their standards compare to the established college and career ready graduation requirements. The district is unclear on its plan to build or support a robust data system with the RTTD funds. There is no mention of how the district will protect personal information and comply with FERPA regulations.</p> <p>The consortium inadequately describes what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments from both the teacher and the student perspectives.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant is promoting a convenient sample of population of all middle schools students served in the county of Birmingham Schools. According to the application all schools meet the competitions eligibility requirements.</p> <p>The applicant provides a list of schools that will participate in grant activities along with the total number of participating students' demographics. According to the application, all students are high-need.</p> <p>The applicant does not provide the adequate information in order to ensure that they have a clear approach to implementing its reform proposal. The applicant provides details that are vague and lacks supporting evidence to support a high-quality level of implementation that is required through RTTD grants.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	4
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant does not provide a high-quality plan describing how the district's proposal will be scaled up and translated into meaningful reform that can be scaled up or translated into meaningful reform for other schools within the district.</p> <p>The applicant does include its plan for extended student access for technology beyond school hours, but this does not address the requirement as presented in the grant instructions as to what constitutes a high quality plan. The applicant provides the details fo the PledgeT2 project that will allow middle school students to strive towards college and career readiness by increasing the role fo technology in the classroom and givin each 6th grader a moble device. However, they do not include specific measurable and targeted key goals for the project. The applicant provides activities that will be used in the plan such as extended day, but does not provide information on how it is linked to the goals and outcomes. The applicant does not provide a project timeline or deliverables and there is no mention of who will be responsible for the implementation of the project. Overall this plan does not meet the requirements of a high quality plan.</p>		
(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	5
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided appropriate data to the extent that they have feasible performance goals across grade levels included in the grant. However, the application contains some discrepancies in the baseline numbers. Without</p>		

explanation, a valid judgment regarding the realistic nature of the goals is not able to be determined.

The application does not discuss college enrollment numbers and targets, however, according to the application, “the project focuses on improving academic achievement and increasing the graduation rate”.

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	6
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided a clear set of examples in which to support their record of success; However, the outcomes of these initiatives were ambiguous in nature. For example, they note that advanced placement courses have had larger enrollments, but they do not discuss the numbers or the number of “successful” students.</p> <p>The applicant does not discuss how it will or how it does make student performance data available to students, educators, and parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, and services.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides an assurance statement for the transparency for processes, practices, and investments to all stakeholders. However, the information provided is inadequate in meeting the requirements as set out by the grant proposal on how it will improve upon current practices to insure that it meets the requirements for the section. While the applicant provides information on how it meets the minimum requirements for reporting, it does not address the need for a high level of transparency at the school levels or the district level. While some of this information is made public through the other means, the applicant is not specific to the how they provide personnel salaries for instructional staff versus non instructional staff.</p>		
(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)	10	4
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides a strategic plan, but it does not demonstrate evidence of successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under state legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the advancement of technology provided in the plan. The applicant addresses performance measures in this section along with an outline for a strategic plan. The performance measures do align to the strategic plan, but the application does not address if the strategic plan allows for successful conditions and sufficient autonomy under state legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the plan.</p>		
(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	5
<p>(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides unclear documentation as to what processes or procedures are already in place or what will be put in place after the development of the grant.</p> <p>The applicant does not provide documentation that they have at least 70 percent of teachers participating under agreement with the grant proposal.</p> <p>There are no documentations of letters of support from key stakeholders in the community or from the school stakeholders.</p>		

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	6
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

The applicant lacks specific details on how they will implement their plan in order to be considered a high-quality plan. For example, they state that “students’ personalized learning helps direct the learning process and helps builds students interest and motivate them to be activity involved in their learning”, but does not provide any details on how they will ensure that all students understand this or will accomplish this. The will offer voluntary summer sessions, but it is unclear what they will do to bring students in and what will happen in the turnout is low.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	8
--	-----------	----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has provided a plan that supports participating educators engage in training and participates in professional teams through the PLEDGE-T2 Academy.

The application does not specifically address the support for effective implementation of personalized learning environments and strategies to meet the academic needs of all students.

The application provides a plan to create a way for teachers to have access to video and other forms of professional development at their leisure.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	0

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not address any of the requirements in this section.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

While the applicant provides exhaustive information regarding the infrastructure of technology within the district, it does not address the key requirements found in this section.

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

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

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has contradictory information found in this section. They have added a “control group” to compare the effectiveness of RRT-D funding. This has not been mentioned in the plan prior and according to the plan, all middle schools will be included, it is unclear what middle schools will play this role.

The applicant does not provide clear and precise evidence to support a high-quality plan for implementing rigorous continuous improvement process that will provide regular feedback on the success of the plan.

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

(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not provide clear and precise evidence to support a high-quality plan for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. Without appropriate information, this plan is considered incomplete. In order to be considered a high quality plan, the applicant should provide key goals for the implementation of the plan, activities and rationale for the activities related to communication and engagement, timelines that will provide a sense of timely feedback and communication among the stakeholders, and the parties who will be involved in soliciting and providing ongoing communication and engagement with all stakeholders. For example: The plan does say community meetings, such as the Superintendent's Community Forum, curriculum caravans, and parent nights at each school are designed to

provide data and information that is relevant to the performance and growth of both the district and school levels, but does not provide a high-quality plan which includes timelines, responsible parties, and overall credibility of the plan.

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

5

1

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant listed performance measures in an earlier section, but they did not include the sufficient rationale for selecting the measure, how the measure will provide rigorous, timely, and formative leading information, or how it will review the measure over time.

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

5

0

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not adequately discuss how this requirement in the proposal.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	5
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant provides a budget outline that describes how funds will be used to support the project. There will be no other funds to support the projects implementation. The applicant provides a description of the funds identifies one-time investments over investments that require added cost associate with the. The applicant's descriptions of long-term sustainability is limited and contradictory as they state that they are not allowed to hire permanent positions with grant money, yet they will need the additional technology help to sustain the personalized learning environments past the grant years.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	1
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant provides a budget outline that describes how funds will be used to support the project. There will be no other funds to support the projects implementation. The applicant provides a description of the funds identifies one-time investments over investments that require added cost associate with the. The applicant's descriptions of long-term sustainability is limited and contradictory as they state that they are not allowed to hire permanent positions with grant money, yet they will need the additional technology help to sustain the personalized learning environments past the grant years.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: This application does not include a competitive preference priority plan.		

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:		

The applicant does not meet the required documentation for Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments.

The applicant does not adequately address how it will meet all of requirements of the Core Educational Assurance Areas. The applicant does not adequately address the evaluations of teachers, superintendents, and administrators that are required by the 2014-15 school year. The applicant provides some details regarding their intent to build a robust data system, but lacks the essential components of how it will provide timely feedback and be assessable to all state holders at all times. The applicant does not provide ensure statements that records will also be protected under FERPA.

Total	210	63
--------------	------------	-----------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0176AL-2 for Birmingham City Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

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

(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(A)-Vision

Birmingham City Schools (BCS), in its RTTD proposal, seeks to transform its middle schools into Personalized Learning Environments for Developing Generations of Excellence Through Technology (PLEDGE-T2) sites with the support of a Race to the Top district grant. The project represents a comprehensive reform effort involving 5,700 students, 400 teachers and administrators, and all of the district’s 18 middle schools. BCS is an urban district serving the largest city in Alabama. The district has 24,800 students in 49 schools: 21 elementary schools, eight middle schools, ten K-8 schools, seven high schools and one alternative school. It is the fourth-largest district in the state, managing 65 sites in a 120-square-mile area. Birmingham has a population of more than 212,000 and is the core of a metropolitan region with a population of 1.1 million. The district is predominantly African-American, with enrollment of 94 percent African-American students, 1 percent white students, 4 percent Hispanic. The district also has 1,276 English Language Learners.

The PLEDGE- T2 project had as its vision to “build capacity in our teaching ranks as well as more fully engage students. It will allow us to increase rigor by providing curriculum across a variety of platforms, both traditional and digital. By equipping successive classes of sixth-graders with digital devices for a personalized learning environment, we will also be preparing our students for the state requirement of taking at least one class online during high school. Our plan will increase rigor and student achievement while readying our students to become global digital citizens.”

Project PLEDGE-T2 was characterized as the theory of action and will be described in a later section.

(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision

The proposal earned medium points. Information was missing or very difficult to find because the proposal writers did not follow the organizational structure of the RTTD application. When the information was found, it often was very sparse. The proposal often appeared to respond to a technology-rich learning experience and not a personal learning environment required in the RTTD application. The following are specifics that illustrate the medium points.

(a) Builds on its work in four core educational assurance areas (as defined in this notice);

Birmingham City Schools (BCS) did not organize its proposal to respond to the RTTD expectation that it describe its work in four core educational assurance areas (as defined in this notice). Primarily through use of the search tool “Find”, the following information was found in other sections

The proposal had some information on “adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy except to state that Alabama’s College and Career Ready Standards combine Common Core State Standards and chosen/ existing and rigorous Alabama Course of Study Standards. The Mathematics College and Career Ready Standards were fully implemented in the 2012-2013 school year. The English Language Arts (ELA) College and Career Ready Standards are being fully implemented during the 2013-2014 school year.”

The proposal stated that through Project PLEDGE -T2, “BCS will increase learner access to informal and formal (standards and assessments) spaces rich in content to enable all middle schools students to create personal learning plans that guide the development and testing of their college and career readiness. BCS will support increased learner access with its Learning Platform and Project Cloud.

In Section (A)(2), the proposal noted that the introductory phase of a summer student workshop “will help us ensure that students will develop knowledge of important concepts and a full understanding of the benefits of using technology appropriately. Their first classroom experiences will involve teachers and students learning collaboratively with activities that support College and Career Ready Standards.”

There was minimal discussion of building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction. The term does appear in their theory of action graphic but there was no further elaboration about what it was now or would be in the near future. Learning Platform and Project Cloud were named but not described.

The description of project PLEDGE -T2 had the following explanation:

“**Assess:** Learners using formative and summative data. BCS will assess student and teacher, principal and superintendent performance using formative and summative assessment supported by its robust Educational Data Management System. It effectively manages the ever-growing amount of data by cleansing, integrating, identifying and analyzing it, giving all stakeholders – students, administrators, teachers and parents – the right information to help achieve higher educational success. In fact, we will equip the student with assessments for learning skills that enables each student to develop rubrics and goals to populate a personalized learning plan.

Turning around lowest-achieving schools

The only reference to turning around lowest-achieving schools was found in the Project PLEDGE-T2 graphic with the following content. “**Adapt:** remove time as the constant and replace it with learning BCS will field a Learning Platform that supports synchronous and asynchronous learning, enabling all middle school students to actively engage with materials on their own terms and timetable. High-need students will be provided highly supportive interactions with teachers, other students and the content to ensure success in blended learning.”

There was limited information about recruiting, developing, rewarding and retaining effective teachers and principals especially where they are needed most but it was scattered and did not address many of the intents of the RTTD program. Again using “Find”, the reviewer was unable to find information about recruiting and retaining teachers. The developing of effective teachers is discussed in later sections.

BCS does have an objective to “Recruit, employ, induct and retain a highly effective core of teachers and administrators and ensure that they have there sources needed to support high achievement for all students. There was no discussion beyond indicating that possible measures might include:

- Identify and implement incentives and employee-recognition programs
- Incorporate student achievement/outcomes in analysis of overall effectiveness

The Project PLEDGE-T2 graphic had the following content. **Alter:** the relationship between student, teacher and content. BCS will provide learners (students, and teachers) training in project pedagogy and blended learning to meet student personal learning plan goals and objectives. Project pedagogy will drive personalization of learning and will substantially alter the relationship between student and teacher and content in ways that accelerate and deepen each student’s learning, production of knowledge and global competitiveness.

(b) Articulates a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests

The BCS proposal did not have a direct response to this expectation. It did articulate the following objectives:

- Focus on school and college readiness by expanding pre-K programs
- Set high expectations for all students and focus on closing the achievement gap between BCS and the state.
- Ensure student achievement is the highest funding priority.
- Provide rigorous curriculum that prepares students for global society by emphasizing College and Career Ready Standards
- Explore and implement innovative curriculum and programming that adds to the diverse portfolio of options for schools across the system

(c) Describes what the classroom experience will be like for students and teachers participating in personalized learning environments.

Proposal writers stated that Project PLEDGE-T2 was the theory of action used to organize what the RTTD program in their district would be. The following is quoted from the BCS graphic conceptualizing how the BCS would structure their personalized learning environments.

“Access: informal and formal content BCS will increase learner access to informal and formal (standards and assessments) spaces rich in content to enable all middle schools students to create personal learning plans that guide the development and testing of their college and career readiness. BCS will support increased learner access with its Learning Platform and Project Cloud.

Alter the relationship between student, teacher and content. BCS will provide learners (students, and teachers) training in project pedagogy and blended learning to meet student personal learning plan goals and objectives. Project pedagogy will drive personalization of learning and will substantially alter the relationship between student and teacher and content in ways that accelerate and deepen each student’s learning, production of knowledge and global competitiveness.

Adapt:remove time as the constant and replace it with learning. BCS will field a Learning Platform that supports synchronous and asynchronous learning, enabling all middle school students to actively engage with materials on their own terms and timetable. High-need students will be provided highly supportive interactions with teachers, other students and the content to ensure success in blended learning.

Assess: Learners using formative and summative data BCS will assess student and teacher, principal and superintendent performance using formative and summative assessment supported by its robust Educational Data Management System. It effectively manages the ever-growing amount of data by cleansing, integrating, identifying and analyzing it, giving all stakeholders – students, administrators, teachers and parents – the right information to help achieve higher educational success. In fact, we will equip the student with assessments for learning skills that enables each student to develop rubrics and goals to populate a personalized learning plan.”

No other descriptions were given for what the classroom experience would be for students and teachers.

(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)	10	6
--	-----------	----------

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section earned medium points because the requested provided was very minimal and .sketchy

(a) A description of the process that the applicant used or will use to select schools to participate. The process must ensure that the participating schools (as defined in this notice) collectively meet the competition’s eligibility requirements;

BCS has determined that it will involve all students in all middle schools in the school district. That comprehensive effort will involve 5,700 students, 400 teachers and administrators, and all of the district’s 18 middle schools. BCS is a diverse district with a high level of poverty – 89 percent of students qualify for free or reduced-price lunch. The district is predominantly African-American, with enrollment of 94 percent African-American students, 1 percent white students , 4 percent Hispanic students and 1 percentage other. The district also has 1,276 English Language Learners. That number of students and the poverty rate collectively meet the competition’s eligibility requirements;

(b) A list of the schools that will participate in grant activities.

The list of schools was included in the proposal and that list has the required information.

(c) The total number of participating students (as defined in this notice), participating students (as defined in this notice) from low income families, participating students (as defined in this notice) who are high-need students (as defined in this notice), and participating educators (as defined in this notice). If participating schools (as defined in this notice) have yet to be selected, the applicant may provide approximate numbers

CBS proposal meet the low-income requirements noted in the RTTD application. Eighty-nine percent of students qualify for free or reduced-price lunch.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

BCS earned low points for its section on LEA-wide reform & change. The plan in this section and in fact in the entire proposal described development of technology-rich learning environment instead of personalized learning education. This is evident by how much proposal text was devoted to just technology purchase logistics and how little was given to teacher professional development. There was no evidence that the proposal writers were familiar with personalized learning literature and little mention of successful locations to emulate. Worse yet the proposal descriptions defined technology-rich learning experiences instead of well-designed personalized learning environment.

- The PLEDGE -T2 project will be phased in at the sixth-grade level over four successive years.
- In the 2014-2015 school year, all sixth graders will be given a mobile device to accelerate learning across multiple platforms. These devices may be laptops, tablets or smartphones. (For budget purposes, we have calculated the leasing costs of a hybrid laptop-tablet now coming

onto the market.)

- These mobile devices will have a capacity for algorithms, curriculum management, wireless access and real-time data analytics to help teachers personalize the learning experience for each student.
- We estimate that we will need to lease 1,850 mobile devices in the first year (this figure includes devices for teachers as well as students).
- In the second year, we will again provide mobile devices to incoming sixth graders while continuing to provide them to the first group as they enter seventh grade. We estimate that we will need to lease 3,800 mobile devices in the second year.
- In the third year, we will again provide mobile devices to all incoming sixth-graders, while continuing to provide them to the seventh- and eighth-graders as well.
- This phased approach will allow us to prepare our middle school students for digital learning in high school.

This was in contrast to attention to teacher professional development.

“Teachers will participate in a summer Personalized Learning Experience (PLE) to support teaching and learning through mobile devices. The summer program will extend teachers’ learning and focus on big ideas within and across specific curriculums. Activities in the summer program will require active learning and creative thinking to stretch learners’ minds as they engage in a rich variety of programs using multiple intelligences.”

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

10

6

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

This subsection earned medium points primarily because the vision was very minimal and the proposal did not provide explicit goals.. Explanation was not given why there appeared to be such a drop in SY 2012-2013 from scores in SY 2011-2012. Except for the students with learning disabilities gap projection, the other seemed ambitious yet achievable.

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

Data showed major decreases in proficiency in SY 2012-2013 from scores in SY 2011-2012. Many of the drops were in the 5% to 20 percent range. The projection then showed increases of an average 3 percent each of the years of the RTTD program. In some cases the increases would not return scores back to what they were in SY 2011-20112.

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

BCS is 94% African American and the other groups were too small to make statistical comparison. Students with learning disabilities have a gap of about 20% and improvements for this population are projected to decrease 3% a year. This projection if understood correctly seemed overly ambitious.

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

The proposal showed an increase of approximately 2.5 percent each year of the project. These projections seemed ambitious yet achievable.

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:

BCS earned low points for this section. The proposal did not provide any information required in the RTTD application. Specifically it did not respond to the following information requests:

(a) Improve student learning outcomes and close achievement gaps (as defined in this notice), including by raising student achievement, high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice), and college enrollment (as defined in this notice) rates

Points were given for improvements in graduation rates, IB participation and advanced placement. However most of the critical and required information was not provided on improving student learning outcomes and closing achievement gaps. There just was not sufficient data provided that demonstrated RTTD required improvement.

(b) Achieve ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) or in its low-performing schools (as defined in this notice)

No information

(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.

No Information

Instead of talking about the information requested above, the BCS proposal response was to highlight information about two previous BCS programs concerned with XO laptops and an NSF grant.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
---	----------	----------

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

BSC proposal earned medium points for this section. BCS indicated that it provided high level of transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments, including by making public information about the four required categories of school-level expenditures from State and local funds. It did so by:

- Finance Department makes public each year a budget report and overview detailing all personnel and non-personnel expenditures.
- Presentation is given in a public meeting to our elected Board of Education and also made available online.
- District posts all personnel salaries online in a searchable document and in print.
- All salary schedules are on our district webpage for viewing.
- BCS responds to all reasonable public records requests promptly.

It did not indicate that the available reports were by actual school-level for regular K-12 instruction, instructional support, pupil support, and school administration. It also did not indicate that they had conducted special meetings for non-English speakers or use school-based community meetings to share this information.

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

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The BCS proposal provided the following brief response.

"Currently, Alabama does not restrict school districts' ability to customize students' learning. Alabama Accountability Plan(Plan 2020) is a proactive, customized approach to defining accountability for our state."

The proposal received medium points because the proposal showed that the LEA had sufficient autonomy. It did not earn high points because it did not elaborate on specific successful conditions that the autonomy covered. It also did not provide sufficient information about specific State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements that encouraged creation of personalized learning environments.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (15 points)	15	2
--	-----------	----------

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

This section earned low points for its description of how students, families, teachers, and principals in participating schools (as defined in this notice) were engaged in the development of the proposal and, as appropriate, how the proposal was revised based on their engagement. There is minimal information on how the proposal was developed and two factors emerged. They were:

- The design principles were informed by the New Urban High School Project (NUHS), an initiative of the U.S... Department of Education's Office of Vocational and Adult Education, 1996-1999.
- School administrators had shared and received information about personalized learning in their regular meetings with stakeholders. However there did not appear to be any student or parent meetings focused on the RTTD proposal.

There was no evidence that BCS provided the required teacher involvement specifically (i) For LEAs with collective bargaining representation, evidence of direct engagement and support for the proposals from teachers in participating schools; or

(ii) For LEAs without collective bargaining representation, at a minimum, evidence that at least 70 percent of teachers from participating schools support the proposal.

In fact there was no evidence of any teacher participation in the development of the proposal.

(b) There were no letters of support from such key stakeholders as parents and parent organizations, student organizations, early learning programs, tribes, the business community, civil rights organizations, advocacy groups, local civic and community-based organizations, and institutions of higher education. Two letters were sent by the superintendent to the state superintendent and the mayor but there was not evidence of responses.

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

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

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section earned low points. It did not have a high-quality plan. It did not provide explanations for its statements they used to echo the expectation. In many cases, the only proposal response to an RTTD criteria was to put a subject such as “PLEDGE - T2, student, teacher and the verb “will” to the expectation without additional detail or elaboration. There were some original responses. In short, the proposal had no descriptive content and read as a series of pledge statements rather than a proposal of work. The following are some examples from subsection (a)(i), (ii) and (iii) that use “will” were minimal or little explanation of implementation specific and evaluative expectations.

- Our Parental Involvement Program will work with the PLEDGE - T2 Instructional Technology Leaders to offer meaningful and engaging workshops for parents to assist middle school students to achieve at higher levels
- Students will have a clear understanding of the district’s goals and guidelines in using technology
- Students will develop knowledge of important concepts and benefits of using technology appropriately.
- Teachers will participate in a summer Personalized Learning Experience (PLE) to support teaching and learning. The summer program will extend teachers learning and focus on big ideas.
- Teachers will be energized and fascinated with multiple ideas within and across curriculum.
- Activities from the summer program will require active learning and creative thinking to stretch learners’ minds and engage in a rich variety of multiple intelligences work.
- Students and teachers will use their technological devices to support learning, access information, create materials to support the learning experiences.
- Students and teachers will use their technological devices to support learning, access information, create materials to support the learning experiences.

Even those with more detail were not developed as a plan. The following are two examples of those responses.

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

“Birmingham City Schools is a district that is economically diverse in that most of our students qualify for free or reduced-price lunch. Other subgroups include a large number of ELL students and special education students. To help all students succeed, it is imperative that we incorporate support from all stakeholders in our district, including parents, students, and communities. These varied learners will provide opportunities and responsibilities for teachers and students to respect one another’s diversity. Teachers have the responsibility to provide high-quality education for all learners.”

and

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

“With the implementation of College and Career Ready Standards the expectations are high for all students. It is our goal that all students graduate from high school and attend college or enter the workforce. The standards allow for pre-assessment, individualized instruction with ongoing support and immediate feedback. Students’ goals will progress over time, building their ability to think critically, work through challenges and become active problem-solvers.”

Subset B had similar patterns but with more “will” statements. Some examples for the various subsets are:

- Students will have access to the core curriculum and be fully engaged in 21st -century technology, allowing them to identify and set personal goals.
- Students and teachers will use their technological devices to support learning, access information, create materials to support the learning experiences. All devices will have web access approved by the district.
- The PLEDGE – T2 Project will allow students to gain information through multiple learning styles. Individualized goals will support

students' progress through daily activities such as teacher interaction, video gaming, webinars, or group activities.

- Handheld devices will allow students to have access to web-quest, instructional software, digital images, etc. which will be provided to students in grades six through eight in all 18 middle schools.
- Students will access and monitor their individualized learning progress on a daily basis. In addition, teachers will be able to provide immediate feedback and assessment results to personalized teaching and learning. Students will the opportunity to decide on activities that enhance mastery and interest.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	4
--	-----------	----------

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section earned low points because most of the required components of this section were missing from the proposal. This section did not follow the format of the application and it was necessary to link what little information was available to RTTD requirements when possible.

The BCS proposal did not have 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. Subsections A and D were not addressed in a significant or appropriate manner. Some requirements in subsections B and C were addressed very superficially in ten bulleted statements of one or two sentences. The proposal had no information on how it would provide participating school leaders and school leadership teams the training, policies, tools, data, and resources that enable them to structure an effective learning environment. The proposal also did not have information on how it would provide a high-quality plan for increasing the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals.

Those statements could not be called a high quality plan. They did not “include an approach to implementing instructional strategies for all participating students (as defined in this notice) 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 (as defined in this notice) and accelerate his or her learning through support of his or her needs.”

The proposal did earn some points because it had some paragraphs dealing with a design for delivering instruction based on a hospital ship train the trainers model and using the trainees to teach other teachers. The description did provide a meaningful process for assisting all teachers.

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	0

(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

No points were given to this section because no information on a high-quality plan to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator, and level of the education system with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed was provided. The BCS proposal did not provide information about:

- (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);
- (b) Providing school leadership teams (as defined in this notice) in participating schools (as defined in this notice) with sufficient flexibility and autonomy over factors such as school schedules and calendars, school personnel decisions and staffing models, roles and responsibilities for educators and noneducators, and school-level budgets;
- (c) Giving students the opportunity to progress and earn credit based on demonstrated mastery, not the amount of time spent on a topic;
- (d) Giving students the opportunity to demonstrate mastery of standards at multiple times and in multiple comparable ways; and
- (e) Providing learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners.

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

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

This section of the proposal earned low points because applicant did not have a high-quality plan (as defined in this notice) to support project implementation through comprehensive policies and infrastructure that provide every student, educator (as defined in this notice), and level of the education system (classroom, school, and LEA) with the support and resources they need, when and where they are needed. The proposal responded to only one of the four subcomponents. Response was found for only subsection (a).

- a. Ensuring that all participating students (as defined in this notice), parents, educators (as defined in this notice), 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;

In other sections, proposal writers have noted many times that if the project is funded it will operate with one mobile device for each student and teacher. In section (A)(2) the proposal stated “We estimate that we will need to lease 1,850 mobile devices in the first year (this figure includes devices for teachers as well as students). In the second year, we will again provide mobile devices to incoming sixth graders while continuing to provide them to the first group as they enter seventh grade. We estimate that we will need to lease 3,800 mobile devices in the second year. In the third year, we will again provide mobile devices to all incoming sixth-graders, while continuing to provide them to the seventh- and eighth-graders as well.” In another section, the proposal stated that each teacher would have a mobile device.

The proposal did not address technology solutions for parents. It did not address in a substantive manner the content that would be available to students. A more substantive description of the digital professional development content for teachers was provided in another section. The proposal had a detailed description of the technology infrastructure.

The proposal did not provide information for the following RTTD requirements:

- (b) Ensuring that students, parents, educators (as defined in this notice), 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);
- (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); and
- (d) Ensuring that LEAs and schools use interoperable data systems (as defined in this notice) (e.g..., systems that include human resources data, student information data, budget data, and instructional improvement system data).

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	2

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:

This section earned low points because it did not provide 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. The evaluation plan did not address how the applicant will monitor, measure, and publicly share information on the quality of its investments funded by Race to the Top – District, such as investments in professional development, technology, and staff.

The BCS evaluation plan was minimal and earned low points. It consisted of two paragraphs.

“The evaluation will appropriately utilize methods such as a carefully matched comparison group design, consisting of both cross-sectional comparisons with non-treatment cohorts in other grades, using a sample of students who are statistically similar in profile to the students participating in the program, and a longitudinal analysis of the treatment cohort on factors related to comfort and familiarity with the learning technologies being provided.”

The second paragraph provided the following two design components:

- All students participating in the PLEDGE-T2 program will be paired with a statically matched cohort from other grades that are not participating.
- High quality implementation data to be collected will include baseline student data from the district on the participants’ rate of passing courses as well as their subsequent performance on standardized exams.

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	0
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>No points were awarded because the BCS proposal did not provide any information associated with a clear and high-quality approach to continuously improve its plans.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Medium points were awarded this section because the proposal provided information on ambitious performance measures. It did not earn high points because it did not provide overall or by subgroup with annual targets for required and applicant-proposed performance measures. The proposal did not provide information about how they determined those goals or how they would achieve the ambitious goals especially given limited interventions.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Low points were awarded this section because the proposal provided no information on a high-quality plan to rigorously evaluate the effectiveness of Race to the Top – District funded activities, such as professional development and activities that employ technology. Throughout the proposal little attention was given to the evaluation aspects.</p>		

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	4
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The BCS proposal earned medium points for the applicant’s budget, including the budget narrative and tables for the following reasons.</p> <p>(a)The budget did not show District grant; external foundation support; LEA, State, and other Federal funds that will support the budget. Instead it identified only RTTD funds that are being requested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. It was impossible to determine whether the budget was reasonable and sufficient to support the development and implementation of the applicant’s proposal. So much of the proposal narrative was missing for so many of the required elements that the reviewer does not have a meaningful and complete understanding of what the BCS proposal entailed and what the budget implications would be. b. The details of the budget that were shared were reasonable and sufficient but unfortunately the budgets provided were limited to contracts for personnel, their travel expenses and equipment needs. They also listed stipends that would be paid for their participation in professional development activities and for extra responsibilities. <p>The budget did not clearly provide a thoughtful rationale for investments and priorities. It did indicate what funds were designated for position contracts explaining that people could not be hired as permanent personnel. The budget did provide a brief rationale for why the positions were needed. It also provided rationale for conference travel and fees explaining what they expected to learn.</p> <p>In the budgets that were provided, there were notations as to which were one-time costs. There was no discussion of what costs would be maintained after the grant ended.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The proposal earned zero points for this section because the applicant did not provide a high-quality plan for sustainability of the project’s goals after the term of the grant. In fact, there was no discussion in the proposal about anything associated with sustainability of the project’s goals. The proposal did indicate that “Board policy prohibits hiring permanent personnel using grant funds. Therefore, no permanent personnel will be hired.”</p>		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: No points were awarded because the proposal did not provide any information on a "Competitive Preference Priority."		

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: <u>Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments.</u> The applicant did not coherently and comprehensively address the major expectations of RTTD. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The proposal did not build on the core educational assurance areas (as defined in this notice) to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards. While it did respond to the standards and assessment expectation, it minimally or not all address the other three core educational assurance areas. b. The proposal did not coherently and comprehensively address how it would increase student achievement and deepen student personalized learning by meeting the academic needs of each student. At best it provided a minimal picture of how it would increase use of technology. But BCS did not deal with personalized learning probably because the proposal gave no evidence that they had researched the topic sufficiently. c. The proposal did not provide information that it had decrease achievement gaps across student groups. In fact the proposal did not provide information about its work or success with lowest-achieving schools. <p>The proposal was so incomplete and missing so much required information, that the proposal must be designated as “not met” for the “Absolute Priority.”</p>		

Total	210	50
--------------	------------	-----------



Race to the Top - District

Technical Review Form

Application #0176AL-3 for Birmingham City Schools

A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	5
(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant presents a reform vision which builds on their prior work of Adopting and modifying the Common Core State Standards in ELA and Math and investing in laptop technology for elementary schools. The applicant confuses increasing student access to technology with increasing Personalized Learning Environments. Subsequently, the proposed vision describes a method to increase student technology access, yet fails to demonstrate how that access will ensure Personalized Learning. Without more detail outlining how the district-wide educational reform will turnaround the lowest		

performing schools. is difficult to determine how the district-wide educational reform will effect student achievement or close the existing achievement gap. This is a critical goal of the applicants plan, therefore needs much more detail.

(A)(2) Applicant’s approach to implementation (10 points)	10	3
--	-----------	----------

(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant’s narrative describes a vague rationale for choosing all middle schools (with year 1 implementation starting in 6th grade) as one that will extend the reform vision began in the Elementary Tech. Project. In Table A2 "Column A" does include individual schools numbers the total number of participating educators. The noticeable lack of complete information is an indication of the lack of emphasis on educator buy-in. By not fully articulating the process used to choose participant schools and missing data, the applicant does not present a coherent approach to implementation of the proposal. Thus, failing to provide a clear representation of how students will be educationally impacted by the proposed changes nor the individual school educators who will participate.

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

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a narrative with a vague plan to expand the proposed reform to high school as the participating students move from the middle school setting to the high school. However, the applicant fails to provide a clear coherent high quality plan for scaling up the proposed reform. Specifically, there is no timeline, persons responsible, or deliverables.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	3
--	-----------	----------

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant does not provide a clear explanation of how the the annual goals were set or why subgroup data were not reported in the table. Additionally, the narrative that is provided does not articulate how the applicant's vision will result in improved student learning and performance, it does explain how increased educational equity will be demonstrated. The applicant does provide annual goals for increased student performance however, the subgroup data was not reported making it difficult to evaluate the rigor of projected subgroup goals as the goals are (in some cases) higher than overall performance goals for individual grade levels and subjects.

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	6

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has a broad general description of anecdotal success in increasing equity in learning evidenced by the 2008 XO laptop computer for elementary schools in BCS which the University of Alabama at Birmingham positively reported the following: increased usage of laptops for research, higher grades on projects, and peer collaboration increased. The applicant identified these positive outcomes as the basis for the current proposal. The narrative provides evidence of other grants that were awarded to BCS, namely the National Science Foundation and Urban System Program to increase number and percentage of students who were prepared to pursue science, mathematics, or technology majors upon college enrollment. The final USP grant evaluation showed that 62% of graduates were prepared to pursue corresponding majors upon enrollment in college (up from 34% in 1994). Finally, the Comprehensive Partnership for Mathematics and Science grant, the Career Academies initiative, and IB program were all found to have positive outcomes. Unfortunately, the applicant falls short of providing more raw data or charts or address how the persistently lowest achieving schools are reformed. Nor does the narrative discuss how student performance data is made available to parents in ways that inform and improve participation, instruction, or services.

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

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant currently post detailed budgets and financial information on their website yearly. A presentation is given at a public meeting to the elected Board of Education and made available online. Additionally, the district posts all personnel salaries in a searchable document and in print. The applicant responds to all reasonable public records request promptly.

The applicant's response meets the requirements for the selection criteria.

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

10

3

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant copied the narrative from the vision statement which contains one sentence (E) that directly addresses the attribute criteria. Namely, the applicant responds thusly under "Climate and Culture", "Sufficient autonomy under State legal, statutory, and regulatory requirements to implement the personalized learning environments described in the applicants proposal." There is not sufficient depth in this statement to evaluate the applicant's autonomy to implement the reform proposal. Generally, the applicant's response evidences the thought that was put creating successful conditions to implement the reform proposal outlined in the BCS Strategic Plan, not the current reform proposal.

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

15

5

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant made efforts to engage some stakeholders' support in the form of stakeholder engagement sessions designed to reach all segments of the community. The applicant established an email account for school personnel to submit questions and offer support. The applicant does not give a complete picture of overall educational staff support for the application as there is no mention in the narrative (or accompanying documentation of support) describing how educators were engaged and support the proposal. Nor does the applicant provide any evidence that parents, students, or the community at large were engaged in or buy into the proposal possess at all. Finally, there is no evidence that the applicant plans to further engage these groups of stakeholders. The applicant does provide two letters of support, one from the mayor of Birmingham and one from the Superintendent of Education.

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

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	4
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant's narrative restates the individual attribute criteria but falls short of articulating what the current proposal will "do" or "create" to accomplish the reform vision. There is a rationale for the proposed activities with a vague sense of a time frame, and overall deliverable of producing 21st Century capable graduates, however there is no clear articulation for many of the listed attributes. Namely, there is no discussion detailing how students will master critical academic content and develop necessary traits, nor of the variety of high-quality instructional approaches, or how students will have access to individual student data and only a general nod to students with disabilities being accommodated or mechanisms that are in place to provide training and support to students. These attributes are essential components of implementation of a rigorous and student centered reform that require more details and thought.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	4
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:		
<p>The applicant's narrative has evidence of planning to engage educators in the training necessary to support their capacity to improve student's achievement through PLEDGE-T Academy. Which would be a group of 50 teachers and leaders who will train their 50 middle school colleagues to implement and scale up the reform proposal. There is a noticeable lack of specific details concerning how these groups will be trained before they undertake the huge task of ensuring all middle school educators have the necessary understanding and training to fully implement the proposal. The narrative does detail use of web-mediated individualized coaching and other sources of PD however there is not discernable timeline. Additionally, there is little discussion of providing feedback to principals about their effectiveness nor of teacher effectiveness. These critical components of the proposal have not been given sufficient in depth thought which result in the educational staff not having the tools or support needed to ensure massive systematic change.</p>		

D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

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

(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, and rules (15 points)	15	0
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's narrative lumps all of the attributes under D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure into one brief response which provides details about the LEA's Technology systems, practices, policies, and the availability of Tech rather than address the individual subdivided criteria requested. This narrative does not address the applicant's practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	3
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>LEA Policy and Infrastructure into one brief response which provides details about the LEA's Technology systems, practices, policies, and the availability of Tech. The applicant indicates that there will be data systems and instructional improvement systems to support personalized learning as envisioned by the applicant. However, there is not evidence of a High Quality Plan to support project implementation through the comprehensive policies or infrastructure. The narrative notes that technology is available to all students in BCS (in classrooms, computer labs, and media centers). Additionally, there is wireless access and the system is filtered to provide protection for students. The applicant fails to outline how parents, students, or educators will receive appropriate levels of technical support nor how the LEA and schools will incorporate interoperable data systems.</p>		

E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	2
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's narrative lumps all of the attributes under E. Continuous Improvement into one extremely brief response which provides a general idea of the applicant's plan. The response outlines a general concept of how the evaluation system might engage the Improvement Process in that there is discussion of an evaluation that will "Utilize Methods such as a carefully matched comparison group design, using a sample of students who are statistically similar in profile to the participating students." Additionally, the applicant fails to include the critical components of a High Quality Plan for implementing a rigorous continuous improvement process (ie., a timeline for regular feedback on progress, key goals, deliverables, nor persons responsible). The response is inadequate in articulating how the applicant will implement rigorous continuous improvement.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	0
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's narrative lumps all of the attributes under E. Continuous Improvement into one extremely brief response which provides a general idea of the applicant's plan. The response as well as the entire proposal is inadequate in articulating how the applicant will implement ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant's narrative lumps all of the attributes under E. Continuous Improvement into one extremely brief response which provides a general idea of the applicant's plan. The applicant does list Performance Measures in another section however there is no discussion of the applicants rationale for choosing the Performance Measures, nor how the measures will provide rigorous, timely, formative leading information tailored to the proposed plan. The response is inadequate in that the applicant addresses the Performance Measures criteria, briefly, in Section A of the proposal, but only to list them with no targets by subgroup or explanation of how they will be used to gage progress. These are critical components which would drive continuous improvement.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	0

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's narrative lumps all of the attributes under E. Continuous Improvement into one extremely brief response which provides a general idea of the applicant's plan. The response as well as the entire proposal is inadequate in articulating how the applicant will evaluate effectiveness of investment.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	3
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: The applicant provides a budget that describes the use of the Race To The Top-District funds being requested. There is no description of any other funds that the applicant will use to support the implementation of the proposal. The applicant did identify the one time expense for travel that they are requesting. The response is brief in the description and not sufficient to clearly provide a thoughtful rationale for investment and priorities.		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	0
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: The applicant did not respond to the criteria in the Sustainability of the project goals attribute. There is no plan in the entire proposal for sustaining the proposed project goals.		

Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	0
Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments: The applicant did not respond to the Competitive Preference Priority Attribute. There is no narrative which address the coherent/sustainable partnership to support the plan nor are any population-level desired results, nor a description for how the partnership would track the selected indicators. Finally, the applicant did not describe how the partnership would integrate education and other services.		

Absolute Priority 1: Personalized Learning Environments

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1		Not Met
Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments: The applicant has a broad generalized plan that builds on the BCS' Strategic Plan of action as opposed to the Race to the Top- District four core educational assurances areas (as defined in the notice). The current proposal centers around creating a pathway for providing 1:1 handheld technology for middle school students, however the details of the proposal are vague and ambiguous in providing rationale for the activities. The narrative is repetitive and does not respond to the required criteria in many attributes. The critical component of High Quality Plans to implement system wide change is noticeably not present. Finally, the applicant briefly addresses creating personalized learning environments by providing 1:1 technology for middle school students, but does not correlate authentic Personalized Learning Environments.		

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

