

**ARRA Race to the Top Fund
USED Final Notice:
RTTT Priorities, Requirements, Definitions and Selection Criteria**

**SUMMARY ANALYSIS AND "BLUEPRINT" FOR STATE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
NOVEMBER 17, 2009**

Introduction

President Obama and U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan on November 12, 2009, released the Final Notice of Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Criteria (Final Notice)¹ for the \$4 billion Race to the Top Fund (RTTT), enacted by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). The Final Notice will be published in the *Federal Register* on November 18. States are encouraged to submit a notice of intent to apply for Phase 1 grants by December 8, with Phase 1 applications due January 19, 2010, and with Phase 1 awards to be made in April 2010. Phase 2 applications will be due June 1, 2010, with awards to be made in September 2010.

RTTT represents a major ARRA leverage point for education reform by providing competitive grants to states to reward and support education reform in the four priority policy areas identified in the ARRA's State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF): promoting college- and career-ready standards and aligned, improved assessments; enhancing teacher effectiveness and promoting the equitable distribution of effective teachers for low-income and minority children; strengthening data systems that foster fuller collection, sharing, and use of data; and supporting turn around of the lowest achieving schools. RTTT awards are for a period of up to four years.

To assist interested states in preparing their applications, we have attached a "blueprint" tool in graphic form that itemizes in one place the full suite of requirements, selection criteria, evidence, and performance indicators contained in the Final Notice and related documents and how to respond to them. In addition, we recommend that states keep other key points in mind in preparing their applications:

- **Coherence.** Given the scope of the requirements and criteria, it is particularly important that applicants address the elements and evidence for each area, but applicants also should consider how to tie their application together through an overarching vision in a way that demonstrates coherence and alignment of the state's reform efforts across reform areas and that frames the balance of the application. As revised in final form, both the RTTT absolute priority for comprehensive reform and a new selection criterion on "State Success Factors" call for states to spell out a comprehensive, coherent, and aligned approach to education reform.
- **Scope of plans.** Unlike typical federal education grant programs, the plans that states submit and the criteria by which they will be judged apply not simply to how a state proposes to use the RTTT grant funds if selected, but rather to statewide goals, policies, and programs to effect significant education reform, irrespective of the funding source. States should focus on their broad reform agenda and how RTTT will help to accelerate it.
- **Integration of funding under other programs, including other ARRA programs.** Applicant states need to consider how to leverage and integrate other funding sources, including their grant proposals for other federal grant programs with complementary or overlapping purposes, several of which are receiving significant funding under the ARRA. These include School Improvement Grants, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems grants, Teacher Incentive Fund grants, and grants under Title I, ESEA. States should also consider whether there are any

¹ The U.S. Department of Education (USED) also released a notice inviting applications, an application form, an executive summary document, and a preamble and summary of changes document. The Final Notice and these other documents are available at <http://www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/index.html>.

opportunities to leverage use of State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) grants by local educational agencies to implement the RTTT plan at the local level. In their application, states should address how the requested RTTT funding will build on and complement these other sources of funds.²

- **Focus on process.** The selection criteria place a heavy emphasis on stakeholder buy-in to the state's plan, in particular the commitment of local educational agencies (LEAs) in the state. That means that in preparing their applications, states need to focus on the process of building stakeholder support, as well as on the substance of the plan.
- **Simultaneous SFSF applications.** As noted above, states must have their Phase I and Phase II applications under the SFSF approved prior to receiving a RTTT grant. Requirements for Phase II SFSF grants were just published on November 12, 2009. The requirements for these grants involve significant data and education reform commitments. It appears that states will have to simultaneously prepare their Phase II SFSF applications and RTTT applications. (*See* EducationCounsel Summary Analysis and Blueprint for SFSF, November 13, 2009)
- **Implications for local-state-federal relationships.** Participation in the RTTT will have significant implications for agency relationships, including the relationship between the state and LEAs in partnering on state reform efforts, and the establishment of a partnership relationship between the state and USED to promote and oversee education reform, with significant federal oversight (including the possibility of a formal partnership or cooperative agreement between USED and funded states).
- **Waivers.** Developing a bold reform proposal may prompt the state to consider seeking waivers of requirements (e.g., relating to assessments or accountability requirements) in the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) that may constrain innovative options that the state would like to pursue. If requirements in the NCLB impede the state's reform efforts, the state should consider filing a waiver request with its application to give itself the flexibility to carry out its plan.

Overall Approach of the Final Notice

The Final Notice focuses on funding state applicants that take a comprehensive approach to all four reform areas (or "assurances") and that are able to demonstrate, *in each of these areas*, both significant progress to date and ambitious, achievable plans for further progress using RTTT and other funds. The notice prescribes very detailed elements that will be expected by USED to address each of the reform areas and other general criteria. In particular, the proposed criteria include for each reform area both "State Reform Conditions" criteria, which relate to what progress the state already has made or whether the conditions exist for reform, and "Reform Plan" criteria, which relate to the state's plan to move forward in the area, including whether the state has ambitious and achievable annual performance goals for each area. Also, USED, in Appendix A to the Final Notice, prescribes specific evidence that states will be expected to provide to address many of the criteria.

Appendix A also includes USED-mandated annual performance measures, with a requirement that the state provide baseline data for these measures with the application, for many of the specific "Reform Plan" criteria. Applicants need to provide in their applications specific annual targets for the USED-mandated performance measures. Funded states will be required to report annually on the performance measures and other conditions for the conduct of the project, with draw-down of funds subject to progress against the annual targets and compliance with project requirements.

Separate Competition for Common State Assessments

The Final Notice does not address requirements and criteria for a \$350 million set-aside for a separate RTTT Common Assessment competition for awards to consortia of states related to the development of assessments aligned to the common core of standards. USED has announced a separate process to obtain input for that competition, including several regional hearings and an opportunity for written comments, and will separately announce final requirements and criteria for that competition. Evidence required in Appendix A of the Final Notice – regarding State

² The RTTT application form indicates that states should include an appendix to their budgets which describes how other federal, state, and local funds will be leveraged to further support RTTT education reform plans.

Reform Conditions criteria for assessments – relates to state participation in a consortium of states that applies for the assessment award. Also, in light of the separate assessments competition, the Final Notice prohibits use of grant funds awarded under this notice for statewide summative assessments.

Competitive Process

As a competitive grant program, RTTT will not allocate funds by formula to all the states. Rather, states that meet eligibility and application requirements and the "absolute priority" established in the Final Notice will submit applications for qualitative review by USED officials and peer reviewers under selection criteria established in the law and the notice (and a competitive priority established in the notice). As noted above, applications may be filed and grant awards will be made in two phases. The notice does not address whether some percentage of the available funds will be held back for phase 2. This likely will happen, but may depend on the quality of applications submitted in phase 1. A state that applies in phase 1 and is not selected for funding may reapply in phase 2, and will have the benefit of feedback from USED and its peer reviewers to its phase 1 application in preparing a phase 2 application. The application notice indicates that finalists in each phase will be invited to send a team of up to 5 state leaders who will be involved in implementing the plan (which may not include consultants) to Washington, D.C., to present the proposal to reviewers. The notice also indicates that significant steps will be taken to promote transparency and learning from the competition, including providing reviewers' scores and comments on its application to each applicant and posting on USED's website all applications and their scores (as well as a transcript and/or video of each finalist's presentation of its proposal).

The notice inviting applications for the RTTT gives *non-binding*, state-by-state guidance on the ranges of awards that states may expect if they are selected for funding, based on the population of children ages 5-17.³

Weighting of the Selection Criteria

The Final Notice assigns competitive points to the selection criteria and competitive priority, totaling 500 points. Among the overall criteria, the heaviest weight is given to the criterion on "Great Teachers and Leaders" (138 points) and a new cross-cutting criterion on "State Success Factors" (125 points), with much lesser points assigned to "General Selection Criteria" (55 points) and "Turning Around the Lowest Performing Schools." (50 points). (The competitive priority for STEM-related projects counts for 15 points.)

However, the aggregate points assigned to each overall selection criterion is less instructive than the assignment of selection points among sub-criteria, where the greatest weights are given to the strength, scope, and numbers of local educational agency commitments to the state plan (45+15=60 points); commitment to the adoption of the common standards (40 points); the strength of teacher evaluation systems (recognized by the notice to be principally a local responsibility) and their use of student achievement data (58 points); identification of the persistently lowest achieving schools and support for LEAs in using the four prescribed intervention models for these schools (5+35=40 points); and ensuring conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative, autonomous public schools (40 points).

³ The ranges include:

- Category 1: \$350-700 million: California, Texas, New York, Florida
- Category 2: \$200-400 million: Illinois, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Georgia, Michigan, North Carolina, New Jersey
- Category 3: \$150-200 million: Virginia, Arizona, Indiana, Washington, Tennessee, Massachusetts, Missouri, Maryland, Wisconsin
- Category 4: \$60-175 million: Minnesota, Colorado, Alabama, Louisiana, South Carolina, Puerto Rico, Kentucky, Oklahoma, Oregon, Connecticut, Utah, Mississippi, Iowa, Arkansas, Kansas, Nevada
- Category 5: \$20-75 million: New Mexico, Nebraska, Idaho, West Virginia, New Hampshire, Maine, Hawaii, Rhode Island, Montana, Delaware, South Dakota, Alaska, North Dakota, Vermont, Wyoming, District of Columbia

Overall, the weights are relatively balanced between State Reform Conditions criteria (~40%) and criteria relating to the quality of the state's reform plan (~60%). To enhance their competitive chances, states need to place close attention to – and consider focusing their time and resources in light of – the relative weights among the criteria (which are reflected fully below in the blueprint tool), including directions to the peer reviewers in a Scoring Rubric contained in Appendix B of the Final Notice, also listed in the blueprint tool below. At the same time, states would be well-advised not to ignore areas with limited points. Doing so could raise issues as to whether the state complies with the absolute priority for comprehensive reform and also affect the application's rating under the new criterion on State Success Factors.

Changes from the Proposed Notice

The Final Notice was developed with the benefit of substantial public input in response to a notice of proposed priorities, requirements, definitions, and criteria published in the *Federal Register* July 29, 2009. The Final Notice does not change the fundamental approach focusing on comprehensive reform or the absolute and competitive priorities published in the proposed notice. Also, the Final Notice retains the key eligibility requirements relating to USED approval for funding under the SFSF (revising it to require approval for Phase I and Phase II SFSF funding prior to receiving a RTTT grant) and to the absence of laws (clarified to apply to state-level laws) that bar linking or use of student achievement data for teacher and principal evaluations (and requiring a statement from the State Attorney General verifying that fact and supporting the accuracy of application statements regarding state law). However, there are many significant changes in the Final Notice, which are summarized in some detail in USED's "Preamble and Major Changes" document. Apart from the addition of competitive points for the selection criteria, as described above, notable changes include —

- **State Reform Agenda and LEA Commitment.** A new overall criterion has been added that examines the quality of the state's comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that clearly articulates the state's goals for reform in the four ARRA assurance areas and establishes a clear and credible path to these goals, including demonstrating stakeholder support. The most heavily weighted part of this criterion relates to the commitment of LEAs to the plan, as evidenced through MOUs between the state and its LEAs, and the extent to which participation of LEAs will have a broad statewide impact. The Final Notice adds considerable detail and emphasis on the participation of LEAs, including requiring an agreement with each participating LEA (and providing a model LEA MOU in Appendix D) that includes a preliminary scope of work for the participating LEA (and requiring a final scope of work to be submitted by each participating LEA 90 days after a state receives an award); providing for multiple local officials to sign the MOU, including representatives of the school board and teachers' union; and providing in the Appendix B scoring rubric that if the rating of two applications is equal, the strength of LEAs' commitment to the plan will be used as a tie-breaker.
- **Common Standards Deadline.** The deadline for adoption of common standards has been moved back to August 2, 2010, with latitude for states to adopt later in 2010.
- **Invitational Priority for Preschool Programs.** A new invitational priority for innovation to improve early learning outcomes by enhancing the quality of preschool programs has been added.
- **Local Use of Data.** The final selection criteria place additional emphasis on the use of data to inform professional development and a culture of continuous improvement in schools and local educational agencies, weighting that equally to the strength of state longitudinal data systems.
- **Teacher and Principal Effectiveness.** Criteria related to teacher and principal effectiveness emphasize the design – and use in decisions regarding development, compensation, retention, or removal, etc. of teachers and principals – of rigorous, fair, and transparent evaluation systems for teachers and principals and emphasize that evaluation needs to be assessed based on multiple measures, not simply student test scores; that student growth, not raw achievement scores, are a significant evaluation consideration; and that evaluation systems for teachers and principals need to be developed with teacher and principal involvement.
- **Lowest Achieving Schools and Prescribed Intervention Models.** The criterion on turning around the lowest achieving schools has been revised to refer to "persistently lowest achieving schools," which are defined to include not only the lowest 5% of (or 5) Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the state, but also the lowest 5% of (or 5) secondary schools in the state that are eligible for but do not receive Title I funds, as well as high schools that are eligible for Title I funds and that have a graduation rate below 60% for a

number of years. (this may have the effect of bringing within this definition a higher percentage of secondary schools than elementary schools). In addition, USED has prescribed that only four intervention models may be used for these schools -- the turn-around model, restart model, school closure model, and transformation model – and has adopted common definitions of these models (set out in Appendix C of the Final Notice) for RTTT, SFSF, and School Improvement Grants. The definitions of these models are quite prescriptive, including, for the turn-around and transformation models, requirements for replacing school staff; strategies to change the school environment; teaching and learning aligned to standards; increased learning time (defined in the notice); and community/family-oriented services/engagement (The engagement of community partners in providing services for at risk students beyond the capacity of schools also has been added to the invitational priorities relating to P-20 Alignment and School-level conditions for reform.)

- **Charter Schools.** The notice revises and moves sub-criteria on charter schools from the criterion on turning around the persistently lowest achieving schools to the general criteria section, with the intent to avoid an implication that charter schools are a preferred solution for persistently underachieving schools. However, charter schools as a reform strategy continue to be heavily weighted in the evaluation criteria.

Blueprint on RTTT State Application and Planning

The blueprint tool below summarizes in one place the requirements, selection criteria, scoring rubrics, evidence, and performance measures contained in the Final Notice and related documents as an aid to states in planning and preparing their applications.

	Core Points	Peer Reviewer Guidance for Priorities
Priorities		
<input type="checkbox"/> Absolute. <i>States must...</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Address all four ARRA reform areas and State Success Factors Criteria. - Demonstrate sufficient LEA participation and commitment to successfully implement and achieve the goals in its plans - Describe how the state and LEAs will use RTTT and other funds to increase student achievement, decrease achievement gaps, and increase rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers. 	<input type="checkbox"/> The absolute priority cuts across the entire application and should not be addressed separately. It is assessed, after the proposal has been fully reviewed and evaluated, to ensure that the application has met the priority. If an application has not met the priority, it will be eliminated from the competition.
<input type="checkbox"/> Competitive. <i>States will receive credit for...</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Emphasis on STEM (15 pts, all or nothing) To meet this priority, the State's application must have a high quality plan to address the need to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - offer a rigorous course of study in STEM; - cooperate with industry experts, museums, universities, research centers, or other STEM-capable community partners to prepare and assist teachers in integrating STEM content across grades and disciplines, in promoting effective and relevant instruction, and in offering applied learning opportunities for students; and - prepare more students for advanced study and careers in STEM, including by addressing the needs of underrepresented groups and of women and girls in STEM. 	<input type="checkbox"/> The competitive priority will be evaluated in the context of the State's entire application. Therefore, a State that is responding to this priority should address it throughout the application, as appropriate, and provide a summary of its approach to addressing the priority. The reviewers will assess the priority as part of their review of a State's application and determine whether it has been met.
<input type="checkbox"/> Invitational. <i>States are invited to address...</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Innovations for Improved Early Learning Outcomes. The Sec. is particularly interested in applications in which the state has plans that -- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - include practices, strategies, or programs to improve educational outcomes for high-need students by enhancing the quality of preschool programs; 	<input type="checkbox"/> Invitational priorities are addressed in their own separate sections. <input type="checkbox"/> No points are awarded for invitational priorities.

- improve school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive);
- improve the transition between preschool and kindergarten.

- **Expansion and Adaptation of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems.** The Sec. is particularly interested in applications in which the State plans to:
 - integrate data from special education, ELL, early childhood, at-risk and dropout prevention, school climate, and culture programs as well as information on student mobility, human resources, school finance, student health, postsecondary education and other relevant areas; and
 - propose state collaboration to adapt one state's statewide data system so that it may be used, in whole or in part, by one or more other States, rather than having each State build or continue building such systems independently.

- **P-20 Coordination, Vertical and Horizontal Alignment.** The Sec. is particularly interested in applications that include:
 - plans for how early childhood programs, K-12 schools, postsecondary institutions, workforce development organizations and other State agencies and community partners will coordinate to improve all parts of the education system and create a more seamless preschool through graduate school route for students;
 - vertical alignment across P-20 is particularly critical at each point where transition occurs to ensure that students exiting one level are prepared for success without remediation at the next.;
 - horizontal alignment, that is coordination of services across schools, state agencies, and community partners is also important in ensuring that high need students have access to the broad array of opportunities and services they need and that are beyond the capacity of a school itself to provide.

- **School Level Conditions for Reform, Innovation, and Learning.** The Sec. is particularly interested in applications in which the State's participating LEAs seek to create the conditions for reform and innovation as well as the conditions for learning by providing schools with flexibility and autonomy in such areas as –
 - selecting staff;
 - implementing new structures/formats for the school day/year that result in increased learning time;
 - awarding credit to students based on student performance instead of instructional time;
 - providing comprehensive services to high-need students (*e.g.* mentors and other caring adults, though local partnerships with community-based organizations, non-profit organizations, and other providers)
 - creating school climates and cultures that remove obstacles to, and actively support student engagement and achievement; and
 - implementing strategies to effectively engage families and communities in supporting the

	academic success of their students.	
Requirements		
<input type="checkbox"/> Eligibility. <i>To be eligible for a grant...</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> State SFSF phase 1 and 2 applications must be approved prior to being awarded a RTTT grant. <input type="checkbox"/> At the time the state submits its application, it may not have any legal, statutory, or regulatory barriers at the state level to linking student, teacher, and principal data for the purpose of evaluation.	The Department will determine eligibility under these requirements before making a grant award. The certification of the State Attorney General must address the data barrier requirement. The applicant may provide explanatory information, if necessary.
<input type="checkbox"/> Application. <i>State applications must...</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Be signed by the governor, chief and state board president. <input type="checkbox"/> Describe progress made over the past several years in the four reform areas. <input type="checkbox"/> Describe how funds will be used to improve student achievement, improve graduation rates, and close achievement gaps; describe state's record of improving student progress overall and by subgroup; and give priority to high need LEAs. <input type="checkbox"/> Provide information on status of meeting each "state reform conditions criterion," and required evidence. <input type="checkbox"/> Provide detailed plans for each "reform plan criterion," including key goals; activities undertaken and rationale; implementation timeline and parties responsible for implementation; and information requested in the performance measures and supporting evidence, where applicable. <input type="checkbox"/> Submit certification from the state Attorney General supporting state statements and conclusions of law, and that state does not have any legal barriers to linking student and educator data. <input type="checkbox"/> Provide specific data and follow specific guidelines when addressing issues related to assessments required under ESEA or subgroups in the selection criteria, according to specified requirements.	The Governor must also sign the assurances in Section IV.
<input type="checkbox"/> Other. <i>Funded states must...</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Annually report progress on goals, timelines, budgets and actual performance vs. annual targets for performance measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Participate in a series of national evaluations by IES. The state may conduct its own evaluation, and may propose to use RTTT funds, but this is not a requirement. <input type="checkbox"/> Participating LEAs must complete final scopes of work within 90 days of receipt of RTTT award. <input type="checkbox"/> Make freely available all outputs (materials, tools, process, systems) related to program by posting the output on any website identified by USED. <input type="checkbox"/> Participate in all technical assistance activities conducted by USED. <input type="checkbox"/> States cannot use funds to pay for statewide summative assessments. <input type="checkbox"/> States <i>may</i> need to enter into a written cooperative or performance agreement with USED.	

Criteria

A. State Success Factors (SSF) - 125 possible points (25% of total)

SSF Criterion (A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEAs' participation in it - 65 Possible Points

<i>The extent to which...</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Specific Peer Reviewer Guidance/Performance Measures</i>
(i) The State has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that clearly articulates its goals for implementing reforms in the four education areas described in the ARRA and improving student outcomes statewide, establishes a clear and credible path to achieving	<input type="checkbox"/> None specified.	<input type="checkbox"/> General Guidance Only <input type="checkbox"/> No Performance Measures Required

Criteria		
<p>these goals, and is consistent with the specific reform plans that the State has proposed throughout its application; (5 pts)</p>		
<p>(ii) The participating LEAs are strongly committed to the State's plans and to effective implementation of reform in the four education areas, as evidenced by Memoranda of Understanding or other binding agreements between the State and its participating LEAs that include -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Terms and conditions that reflect a strong commitment by the participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to the State's plans; b. Scope-of-work descriptions that require participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to implement all or significant portions of the State's RTTT plans; and c. Signatures from as many as possible of the LEA superintendent, the president of the local school board (or equivalent, if applicable), and the local teachers' union leader (if applicable) demonstrating the extent of leadership support within participating LEAs; (45 pts) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> An example of the State's standard Participating LEA MOU, and description of variations used, if any. <input type="checkbox"/> The completed summary table indicating which specific portions of the State's plan each LEA is committed to implementing, and relevant summary statistics <input type="checkbox"/> The completed summary table indicating which LEA leadership signatures have been obtained <input type="checkbox"/> The completed detailed table, by LEA, that includes the information requested in the criterion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The MOU, provided in Appendix D to the Notice, is an example of a strong MOU.
<p>(iii) The LEAs that are participating in the State's RTTT plans will translate into broad statewide impact, allowing the State to reach its ambitious yet achievable goals, overall and by student subgroup, for -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. increasing student achievement in (at a minimum) reading/language arts and mathematics, as reported by the NAEP and the assessments required under the ESEA; b. decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, as reported by the NAEP and the assessments required under the ESEA; c. increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice); and d. increasing college enrollment (as defined in this notice) and increasing the number of students who complete at least a year's worth of college credit that is applicable to a degree 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The completed summary table indicating the numbers and percentages of participating LEAs, schools, K-12 students, and students in poverty <input type="checkbox"/> Tables and graphs that show the State's goals, overall and by subgroup, requested in the criterion, together with the supporting narrative. In addition, describe what the goals would look like were the State not to receive an award under this program. <input type="checkbox"/> The completed detailed table, by LEA, that includes the information requested in the criterion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> General Guidance Only

Criteria		
within two years of enrollment in an institution of higher education. (15 pts)		
SSF Criterion (A)(2) Building Strong Statewide Capacity to Implement, Scale Up and Sustain Proposed Plans - 30 possible points		
<i>The extent to which-</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Specific Peer Reviewer Guidance/Performance Measures</i>
<p>(i) The State ensures that it has the capacity required to implement its proposed plans by -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. providing strong leadership and dedicated teams to implement the statewide education reform plans the State has proposed; b. supporting participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) in successfully implementing the education reform plans the State has proposed, through such activities as identifying promising practices, evaluating these practices' effectiveness, ceasing ineffective practices, widely disseminating and replicating the effective practices statewide, holding participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) accountable for progress and performance, and intervening where necessary; c. providing effective and efficient operations and processes for implementing its RTTT grant in such areas as grant administration and oversight, budget reporting and monitoring, performance measure tracking and reporting, and fund disbursement; d. using the funds for this grant, as described in the State's budget and accompanying budget narrative, to accomplish the State's plans and meet its targets, including where feasible, by coordinating, reallocating, or repurposing education funds from other Federal, State, and local sources so that they align with the State's RTTT goals; e. using the fiscal, political, and human capital resources of the State to continue, after the period of funding has ended, those reforms funded under the grant for which there is evidence of success. (20 Points) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The State's budget, as completed in Section XI of the application. The narrative that accompanies and explains the budget and how it connects to the State's plan, as completed in Section XI of the application. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> General Guidance Only <input type="checkbox"/> No Performance Measure Required
<p>(ii) Use support from a broad group of stakeholders to better implement its plans, as evidenced by the strength of statements or actions of support</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A summary in the narrative of the statements or actions and inclusion of key statements or actions in the Appendix. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> General Guidance Only <input type="checkbox"/> No Performance Measures Required

Criteria		
from – a. the State's teachers and principals, which include the State's teachers' unions or statewide teacher associations; and b. other critical stakeholders, such as the State's legislative leadership; charter school authorizers and State charter school membership associations (if applicable); other State and local leaders (<i>e.g.</i> , business, community, civil rights, and education association leaders); Tribal schools; parent, student, and community organizations (<i>e.g.</i> , parent-teacher associations, nonprofit organizations, local education foundations, and community-based organizations); and institutions of higher education. (10 points)		
SSF Criterion (A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps - 30 possible points		
<i>The extent to which the State demonstrates ability to...</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Specific Peer Reviewer Guidance/Performance Measures</i>
(i) Make progress over the past several years in each of the four education reform areas, and used its ARRA and other Federal and State funding to pursue such reforms; (5 points)		<input type="checkbox"/> General Guidance Only <input type="checkbox"/> No Performance Measure Required
(ii) Improve student outcomes overall and by student subgroup since at least 2003, and explain the connections between the data and the actions that have contributed to – a. Increasing student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA; b. Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA; and c. Increasing high school graduation rates. (25 Points)	<input type="checkbox"/> NAEP and ESEA results since at least 2003. Include in the Appendix all the data requested in the criterion as a resource for peer reviewers for each year in which a test was given or data was collected. Note that this data will be used for reference only and can be in raw format. In the narrative, provide the analysis of this data and any tables or graphs that best support the narrative.	<input type="checkbox"/> General Guidance Only <input type="checkbox"/> No Performance Measure Required
B. Standards and Assessments - 70 possible points (14% of total points)		
SA Criterion (B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards - 40 possible points		
<i>The State has demonstrated its commitment to adopting a common set of high-quality standards, evidenced by-</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Specific Peer Reviewer Guidance/Performance Measures</i>

Criteria		
<p>(i) The State's participation in a consortium of States that -</p> <p>a. Is working toward jointly developing and adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) that are supported by evidence that they are internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation; and</p> <p>b. Includes a significant number of States; (20 pts)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A copy of the Memorandum of Agreement, executed by the State, showing that it is part of a standards consortium. <input type="checkbox"/> A copy of the final standards or, if the standards are not yet final, a copy of the draft standards and <input type="checkbox"/> Anticipated date for completing the standards. <input type="checkbox"/> Documentation that the standards are or will be internationally benchmarked and that, when well-implemented, will help to ensure that students are prepared for college and careers. <input type="checkbox"/> The number of States participating in the standards consortium and the list of these States. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> General Guidance Only <input type="checkbox"/> "High" points for a significant number of States are earned if the consortium includes a majority of the States in the country. <input type="checkbox"/> "Medium" or "low" points are earned if the consortium includes one-half of the States in the country or less. <input type="checkbox"/> No Performance Measure Required
<p>(ii)</p> <p>a. For Phase 1 applications, the State's high-quality plan demonstrating its commitment to and progress toward adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) by August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 specified by the State, and to implementing the standards thereafter in a well-planned way; or</p> <p>b. For Phase 2 applications, the State's adoption of a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) by August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 specified by the State in a high-quality plan toward which the State has made significant progress, and its commitment to implementing the standards thereafter in a well-planned way. (20 pts)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> For Phase I applicants: A description of the legal process in the State for adopting standards, and the State's plan, current progress, and timeframe for adoption. <input type="checkbox"/> For Phase 2 applicants: Evidence that the State has adopted the standards. Or, if the State has not yet adopted the standards, a description of the legal process in the State for adopting standards and the State's plan, current progress, and timeframe for adoption. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> "High" points are earned for: Phase 1 applicants' commitment to and progress toward adoption by August 2, 2010; and Phase 2 applicants' adoption by August 2, 2010. <input type="checkbox"/> No "Medium" points are assigned for this criterion. <input type="checkbox"/> "Low" points are earned for a high-quality plan to adopt by a later specified date in 2010. <input type="checkbox"/> No points are earned for a plan that is not high-quality or for a plan to adopt later than 2010. <input type="checkbox"/> No Performance Measure Required <input type="checkbox"/> Phase 2 applicants may amend their application by submitting evidence of adopting common standards after June 1, but before August 2.
SA Criterion (B)(2) Developing and implementing high quality assessments - 10 possible points		
<i>The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to improving the quality of its assessments, evidenced by the State's participation in a consortium of States that -</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Specific Peer Reviewer Guidance/Performance Measures</i>
<p>(i) Is working toward jointly developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) aligned with the consortium's common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice); and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A copy of the MOU, executed by the State, showing that it is part of a consortium that intends to develop high-quality assessments aligned with the consortium's common set of K-12 standards; or documentation that the State's consortium has applied, or intends to apply, for a grant through the separate RTTT Assessment Program ; or other evidence of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> General Guidance Only <input type="checkbox"/> No Performance Measure Required

Criteria		
	the State's plan to develop and adopt common, high-quality assessments	
(ii) Includes a significant number of States.	<input type="checkbox"/> The number of States participating in the assessment consortium and the list of these States.	<input type="checkbox"/> "High" points for a significant number of States are earned if the consortium includes a majority of the States in the country. <input type="checkbox"/> "Medium" or "low" points are earned if the consortium includes one-half of the States in the country or less. <input type="checkbox"/> No Performance Measure Required
SA Criterion (B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments- 20 possible points		
<i>The extent to which...</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Specific Peer Reviewer Guidance/Performance Measures</i>
The State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs, has a high-quality plan for supporting a statewide transition to and implementation of internationally benchmarked K-12 standards that build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation, and high-quality assessments tied to these standards. State or LEA activities might, for example, include: developing a rollout plan for the standards together with all of their supporting components; in cooperation with the State's institutions of higher education, aligning high school exit criteria and college entrance requirements with the new standards and assessments; developing or acquiring, disseminating, and implementing high-quality instructional materials and assessments (including, for example, formative and interim assessments (both as defined in this notice)); developing or acquiring and delivering high-quality professional development to support the transition to new standards and assessments; and engaging in other strategies that translate the standards and information from assessments into classroom practice for all students, including high-need students (as defined in this notice).	<input type="checkbox"/> Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.	<input type="checkbox"/> General Guidance Only <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Measure Optional
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction - 47 possible points (9% of total points)		
Data Criterion (C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system - 24 possible points		
<i>The extent to which-</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Specific Peer Reviewer Guidance/Performance Measures</i>
the State has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements	<input type="checkbox"/> Documentation for each of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice) that is included in the State's statewide longitudinal data system.	<input type="checkbox"/> Applicants earn two (2) points for every element the State has, out of 12 elements possible. <input type="checkbox"/> No Performance Measures Required
Data Criterion (C)(2) Accessing and using State data: - 5 Possible Points		

Criteria		
<i>The extent to which-</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Specific Peer Reviewer Guidance/Performance Measures</i>
The State has a high-quality plan to ensure that data from the State's statewide longitudinal data system are accessible to, and used to inform and engage, as appropriate, key stakeholders (<i>e.g.</i> , parents, students, teachers, principals, LEA leaders, community members, unions, researchers, and policymakers); and that the data support decision-makers in the continuous improvement of efforts in such areas as policy, instruction, operations, management, resource allocation, and overall effectiveness.	<input type="checkbox"/> Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.	<input type="checkbox"/> General Guidance Only <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Measures Optional
Data Criterion (C)(3) Using data to improve instruction: - 18 Possible Points		
<i>The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs, has a high-quality plan to -</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Specific Peer Reviewer Guidance/Performance Measures</i>
(i) Increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decision-making, and overall effectiveness;	<input type="checkbox"/> Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.	<input type="checkbox"/> General Guidance Only <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Measures Optional
(ii) Support participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) and schools that are using instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) in providing effective professional development to teachers, principals, and administrators on how to use these systems and the resulting data to support continuous instructional improvement; and	<input type="checkbox"/> Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.	<input type="checkbox"/> General Guidance Only <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Measures Optional
(iii) Make the data from instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice), together with statewide longitudinal data system data, available and accessible to researchers so that they have detailed information with which to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional materials, strategies, and approaches for educating different types of students (<i>e.g.</i> , students with disabilities, English language learners, students whose achievement is well below or above grade level).	<input type="checkbox"/> Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.	<input type="checkbox"/> General Guidance Only <input type="checkbox"/> Performance Measures Optional
D. Great Teachers and Leaders - 138 possible points (28% of total points)		
TL Criterion (D)(1) – Providing High Quality Pathways for Aspiring Teachers and Principals – 21 possible points		
<i>The extent which the state has -</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Specific Peer Reviewer Guidance/Performance Measures</i>
(i) Legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions that allow alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) for teachers and principals, particularly routes that allow for providers in addition to institutions of	<input type="checkbox"/> A description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents, including information on the elements of the State's alternative routes (as described in the alternative routes to	<input type="checkbox"/> The criterion must be judged for both teachers and principals. <input type="checkbox"/> "High" points are earned by States that have alternative routes that (a) permit providers who operate independently of institutions of higher

Criteria		
higher education;	certification definition in this notice).	education (IHEs), and (b) include at least 4 of the 5 elements listed in the definition of alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> "Medium" points are earned by States that have alternative routes that (a) permit providers who operate independently of IHEs, and (b) include at least 2 of the 5 elements listed in the definition of alternative routes to certification. <input type="checkbox"/> Successful applicants that receive RTTT grant awards will need to comply with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), including 34 CFR Part 99, as well as State and local requirements regarding privacy. <input type="checkbox"/> "Low" points are earned by States that have alternative routes that (a) do not permit providers who operate independently of IHEs, OR (b) include only 1 of the 5 elements listed in the definition of alternative routes to certification. <input type="checkbox"/> No Performance Measures Required
(ii) Alternative routes to certification that are in use; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> A list of the alternative certification programs operating in the State under the State's alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice), and for each: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The elements of the program (as described in the alternative routes to certification definition in this notice). - The number of teachers and principals that successfully completed each program in the previous academic year. - The total number of teachers and principals certified statewide in the previous academic year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> No Performance Measures Required
(iii) A process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> No Performance Measures Required
TL Criterion (D)(2) – Improving Teachers and Principal effectiveness based on performance – 58 possible points		
<i>The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs –</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Specific Peer Reviewer Guidance/Performance Measures</i>
(i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; (5 pts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Criteria must be judged for both teachers and principals. <input type="checkbox"/> General goals to be provided at time of application, including baseline data and annual targets regarding percentage of participating LEAs that measure student growth (as defined in this notice).

Criteria		
		<input type="checkbox"/> General data to be provided at time of application, including baseline data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Total number of participating LEAs. - Total number of principals in participating LEAs. - Total number of teachers in participating LEAs.
(ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; (15 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/> Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.	<input type="checkbox"/> General goals to be provided at time of application, including baseline data and annual targets regarding the percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for teachers and percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for principals. <input type="checkbox"/> Data to be requested of grantees in the future: Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems.
(iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools; and (10 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/> Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.	<input type="checkbox"/> No performance measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Data to be requested of grantees in the future: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year. - Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.
(iv) Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development; b. compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities; c. whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and d. removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures. (28 pts) 	<input type="checkbox"/> Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.	<input type="checkbox"/> Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems that are used to inform: (1) developing teachers and principals and (2) compensating teachers, (3) promoting teachers and principals (4) retaining effective teachers and principals (5) granting tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals (6) removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals. <input type="checkbox"/> Data to be requested of grantees in the future: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data to be requested of grantees in the future:(D)(2)(iv)(b) Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform compensation decisions in the prior academic year. - Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better and were retained in the prior academic year. - Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were eligible for tenure in the prior academic year. - Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform tenure decisions in the prior academic year.

Criteria		
		- Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs who were removed for being ineffective in the prior academic year.
TL Criterion (D)(3) – Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals – 25 possible points		
<i>The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to -</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Specific Peer Reviewer Guidance/Performance Measures</i>
<p>(i) Ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and principals by developing a plan, informed by reviews of prior actions and data, to ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools (both as defined in this notice) have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) and are not served by ineffective teachers and principals at higher rates than other students; and (15 pts)</p> <p>Plans for (i) and (ii) may include, but are not limited to, the implementation of incentives and strategies in such areas as recruitment, compensation, teaching and learning environments, professional development, and human resources practices and processes.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Definitions of high-minority and low-minority schools as defined by the State for the purposes of the State's Teacher Equity Plan.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> General goals to be provided at time of application, including baseline data and annual targets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice). - Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice). - Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective. - Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective. - Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice). - Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice). - Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective. - Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective. <p><input type="checkbox"/> General data to be provided at time of application, including baseline data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Total number of schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice). - Total number of schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice). - Total number of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-

Criteria		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> minority, or both (as defined in this notice). - Total number of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice). - Total number of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice). - Total number of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice). <input type="checkbox"/> Data to be requested of grantees in the future: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as highly effective (as defined in this notice) in the prior academic year. - Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year. - Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as highly effective (as defined in this notice) in the prior academic year. - Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.
<p>(ii) Increase the number and percentage of effective teachers (as defined in this notice) teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas including mathematics, science, and special education; teaching in language instruction educational programs (as defined under Title III of the ESEA); and teaching in other areas as identified by the State or LEA. (10 pts)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> General goals to be provided at time of application, including baseline data and annual targets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Percentage of mathematics teachers who were evaluated as effective or better. - Percentage of science teachers who were evaluated as effective or better. - Percentage of special education teachers who were evaluated as effective or better. - Percentage of teachers in language instruction educational programs who were evaluated as effective or better. <input type="checkbox"/> General data to be provided at time of application, including baseline data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Total number of mathematics teachers. - Total number of science teachers. - Total number of special education teachers. - Total number of teachers in language instruction educational

Criteria		
		<p>programs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Data to be requested of grantees in the future: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of mathematics teachers in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year. - Number of science teachers in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year. - Number of special education teachers in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year. - Number of teachers in language instruction educational programs in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.
TL Criterion (D)(4) –Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs – 14 possible points		
<i>The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Specific Peer Reviewer Guidance/Performance Measures</i>
<p>(i) Link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in this notice) data to the students' teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State; and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Criteria must be judged for both teachers and leaders. <input type="checkbox"/> General goals to be provided at time of application, including baseline data and annual targets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Percentage of teacher preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates' students. - Percentage of principal preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates' students. <input type="checkbox"/> General data to be provided at time of application, including baseline data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Total number of teacher credentialing programs in the State. - Total number of principal credentialing programs in the State. - Total number of teachers in the State. - Total number of principals in the State. <input type="checkbox"/> Data to be requested of grantees in the future: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of teacher credentialing programs in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported. - Number of teachers prepared by each credentialing program in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported. - Number of principal credentialing programs in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.

Criteria		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Number of principals prepared by each credentialing program in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported. - Number of teachers in the State whose data are aggregated to produce publicly available reports on the State’s credentialing programs. - Number of principals in the State whose data are aggregated to produce publicly available reports on the State’s credentialing programs.
(ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice).	<input type="checkbox"/> Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.	<input type="checkbox"/> See above. <input type="checkbox"/> Performance measures optional.
TL Criterion (D)(5) –Providing effective support to teachers and principals – 20 possible points		
<i>The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs, has a high-quality plan for its participating LEAs -</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Specific Peer Reviewer Guidance/Performance Measures</i>
(i) Provide effective, data-informed professional development, coaching, induction, and common planning and collaboration time to teachers and principals that are, where appropriate, ongoing and job-embedded. Such support might focus on, for example, gathering, analyzing, and using data; designing instructional strategies for improvement; differentiating instruction; creating school environments supportive of data-informed decisions; designing instruction to meet the specific needs of high-need students (as defined in this notice); and aligning systems and removing barriers to effective implementation of practices designed to improve student learning outcomes; and	<input type="checkbox"/> Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.	<input type="checkbox"/> Performance measures optional
(ii) Measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness	<input type="checkbox"/> Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.	<input type="checkbox"/> Performance measures optional
E. Turning Around the Lowest Achieving Schools – 50 possible points (10 percent of total)		
SI Criterion (E)(1)Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs – 10 possible points		

Criteria		
<i>The extent to which -</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Specific Peer Reviewer Guidance/Performance Measures</i>
The State has the legal, statutory, or regulatory authority to intervene directly in the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and in LEAs that are in improvement or corrective action status.	<input type="checkbox"/> A description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.	<input type="checkbox"/> 10 points are earned by States that can intervene directly in both schools and LEAs. <input type="checkbox"/> 5 points are earned by States that can intervene directly in either schools or LEAs, but not both. <input type="checkbox"/> 0 points are earned by States that cannot intervene in either schools or LEAs. <input type="checkbox"/> No performance measures required.
SI Criterion (E)(2) Turning Around the Lowest Achieving Schools – 40 possible points		
<i>The extent to which -</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Specific Peer Reviewer Guidance/Performance Measures</i>
(i) Identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and, at its discretion, any non-Title I eligible secondary schools that would be considered persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) if they were eligible to receive Title I funds; (5 pts)	<input type="checkbox"/> The State's historic performance on school turnaround, as evidenced by the total number of persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) that States or LEAs attempted to turn around in the last five years, the approach used, and the results and lessons learned to date.	<input type="checkbox"/> General Guidance Only <input type="checkbox"/> The number of schools for which one of the four school intervention models (described in Appendix C) will be initiated each year.
(ii) Support its LEAs in turning around these schools by implementing one of the four school intervention models (as described in Appendix C): turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model (provided that an LEA with more than nine persistently lowest-achieving schools may not use the transformation model for more than 50 percent of its schools). (35 pts)		
F. General – 55 possible points (11% of total)		
General Criterion (F)(1) Making education funding a priority – 10 possible points		
<i>The extent to which -</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Specific Peer Reviewer Guidance/Performance Measures</i>
(i) The percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2009 was greater than or equal to the percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2008; and	<input type="checkbox"/> Financial data to show whether and to what extent expenditures, as a percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice), increased, decreased, or remained the same.	<input type="checkbox"/> "High" points are earned if the percentage of the total revenues available to the State that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education increased from FY2008 to FY2009. <input type="checkbox"/> "Medium" points are earned if the percentage of the total revenues available to the State that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education were substantially unchanged from FY2008 to FY2009 <input type="checkbox"/> "Low" points are earned if the percentage of the total revenues available to the State that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public

Criteria		
		higher education decreased from FY2008 to FY2009.
(ii) The State's policies lead to equitable funding (a) between high-need LEAs (as defined in this notice) and other LEAs, and (b) within LEAs, between high-poverty schools (as defined in this notice) and other schools.	<input type="checkbox"/> Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.	<input type="checkbox"/> No performance measures required.
General Criterion (F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools - 40 possible points		
<i>The extent to which -</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Specific Peer Reviewer Guidance/Performance Measures</i>
(i) The State has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State, measured (as set forth in Appendix B) by the percentage of total schools in the State that are allowed to be charter schools or otherwise restrict student enrollment in charter schools.	<input type="checkbox"/> A description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents. <input type="checkbox"/> The number of charter schools allowed under State law and the percentage this represents of the total number of schools in the State <input type="checkbox"/> The number and types of charter schools currently operating in the State.	<input type="checkbox"/> "High" points are earned if the State either has no cap on the number of charter schools, or it has a "high" cap (defined as a cap such that, if it were filled, $\geq 10\%$ of the total schools in the State would be charter schools); and the State does not have restrictions, such as those referenced in the "note to reviewers" below, that would be considered even mildly inhibiting. <input type="checkbox"/> "Medium" points are earned if the State has a "medium" cap on the number of charter schools (defined as a cap such that, if it were filled, $\geq 5\%$ and $< 10\%$ of the total schools in the State would be charter schools); or the charter school law has sufficient flexibility to allow for an increase in the number of charter schools as if it were a medium or higher cap (<i>e.g.</i> by allowing for the creation of multiple campuses under the same charter); and the State does not have restrictions, such as those referenced in the "note to reviewers" below, that would be considered moderately or severely inhibiting. <input type="checkbox"/> "Low" points are earned if the State has a "low" cap on the number of charter schools (defined as a cap such that, if it were filled, $< 5\%$ of the total schools in the State would be charter schools) OR if the State has restrictions, such as those referenced in the "note to reviewers" below, that would be considered severely inhibiting. <input type="checkbox"/> No points are earned if the State has no charter school law. <input type="checkbox"/> Note to reviewers: Charter school laws are so complex that it is hard to write rules to capture each possible obstacle to charter school growth; therefore, this rubric is meant to guide reviewers, not to bind them. For example, if a State limits the number of charter schools by limiting the share of statewide or district-level funding that can go to charter schools, rather than by explicitly limiting the number of charter schools, reviewers should convert the funding restriction into an approximately equivalent

Criteria		
		limit on the number of schools and fit that into the guidelines here. As reviewers assess the inhibitions on charter schools, they should look for restrictions such as: disallowing certain types of charter schools (<i>e.g.</i> , startups or conversions); restricting charter schools to operate in certain geographic areas; and limiting the number, percent, or demographics of students that may enroll in charter schools. Some States have "smart caps" designed to restrict growth to high-performing charter schools; this is not a problem unless it effectively restricts any new (<i>i.e.</i> , unproven) charter schools from starting.
(ii) The State has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools; in particular, whether authorizers require that student achievement (as defined in this notice) be one significant factor, among others, in authorization or renewal; encourage charter schools that serve student populations that are similar to local district student populations, especially relative to high-need students (as defined in this notice); and have closed or not renewed ineffective charter schools.	<input type="checkbox"/> A description of the State's approach to charter school accountability and authorization, and a description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents. <input type="checkbox"/> For each of the last five years: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The number of charter school applications made in the State. - The number of charter school applications approved. - The number of charter school applications denied and reasons for the denials (academic, financial, low enrollment, other). - The number of charter schools closed (including charter schools that were not reauthorized to operate). - The reasons for the closures or non-renewals (academic, financial, low enrollment, other). 	
(iii) The State's charter schools receive (as set forth in Appendix B) equitable funding compared to traditional public schools, and a commensurate share of local, State, and Federal revenues.	<input type="checkbox"/> A description of the State's applicable statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents <input type="checkbox"/> A description of the State's approach to charter school funding, the amount of funding passed through to charter schools per student, and how those amounts compare with traditional public school per-student funding allocations.	<input type="checkbox"/> "High" points are earned if the per-pupil funding to charter school students is $\geq 90\%$ of that which is provided to traditional public school students. <input type="checkbox"/> "Medium" points are earned if the per-pupil funding to charter school students is 80-89% of that which is provided to traditional public school students. <input type="checkbox"/> "Low" points are earned if the per-pupil funding to charter school students is $\leq 79\%$ of that which is provided to traditional public school students, or the State does not have a charter school law. <input type="checkbox"/> No points are earned if the State has no charter school law.
(iv) The State provides charter schools with funding for facilities (for leasing facilities, purchasing facilities, or making tenant improvements), assistance with facilities acquisition, access to public facilities, the ability to share in bonds and mill levies, or other supports; and the extent to which the State does not impose any facility-related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than those applied to traditional public schools.	<input type="checkbox"/> A description of the State's applicable statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents. <input type="checkbox"/> A description of the statewide facilities supports provided to charter schools, if any.	

Criteria		
(v) The State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools (as defined in this notice) other than charter schools.	<input type="checkbox"/> A description of how the State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools (as defined in this notice) other than charter schools.	<input type="checkbox"/> No performance measures required.
General Criterion (F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions - 5 possible points		
<i>The extent to which -</i>	<i>Evidence</i>	<i>Specific Peer Reviewer Guidance/Performance Measures</i>
The State, in addition to information provided under other State Reform Conditions Criteria, has created, through law, regulation, or policy, other conditions favorable to education reform or innovation that have increased student achievement or graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps, or resulted in other important outcomes.	<input type="checkbox"/> A description of the State's other applicable key education laws, statutes, regulations, or relevant legal documents.	<input type="checkbox"/> No performance measures required.

EducationCounsel provides education strategy, policy, advocacy, and legal support to state and national education leaders across the country. Our goal is to help transform education policies to help dramatically improve student achievement and close achievement gaps. This summary and analysis is provided for policy planning purposes, and does not constitute specific legal advice. If you have questions about USED's ARRA RTTT notice, or other ARRA issues, please contact **Scott Palmer**, Managing Partner, at scott.palmer@educationcounsel.com or (202) 545-2916; **Reg Leichy**, Partner, at reg.leichy@educationcounsel.com or (202) 545-2918; or **Steve Winnick**, Senior Counsel, at steve.winnick@educationcounsel.com or (202) 545-2913. www.EducationCounsel.com