

APPENDIX B. SCORING RUBRIC

Corrected based on the January 2010 correction notices published in the Federal Register. These notices are available at <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetotbetop/legislation.html>.

I. Introduction

To help ensure inter-reviewer reliability and transparency for State Race to the Top applicants, the U.S. Department of Education has created and is publishing a rubric for scoring State applications. The pages that follow detail the rubric and allocation of point values that reviewers will be using. Race to the Top grants will be awarded on a competitive basis to States in two phases. The rubric will be used by reviewers in each phase to ensure consistency across and within review panels.

The rubric allocates points to each criterion and, in selected cases, to sub-criteria as well. In all, the Race to the Top scoring rubric includes 19 criteria and one competitive priority that collectively add up to 500 points. Several of these criteria account for a large number of points; others account for a comparatively small portion of a State's score.

It is important to emphasize that over half the points that reviewers may award to States are based on States' accomplishments prior to applying—their successes in increasing student achievement, decreasing the achievement gaps, increasing graduation rates, enlisting strong statewide support and commitment to their proposed plans, and creating legal conditions conducive to education reform and innovation. Finally, it bears underscoring that reviewers will be assessing multiple aspects of States' Race to the Top applications. States that fail to earn points or earn a low number of points on one criterion, can still win a Race to the Top award by presenting strong applications and histories of accomplishments on other criteria.

Notwithstanding the guidance being provided to reviewers, reviewers will still be required to make many thoughtful judgments about the quality of States' applications. Beyond judging a State's commitment to the four reform areas specified in the ARRA, reviewers will be assessing, based on the criteria, the comprehensiveness and feasibility of States' applications and plans. Reviewers will be asked to evaluate, for example, if States have set ambitious but achievable annual targets in their applications. Reviewers will need to make informed judgments about States' goals, the activities the State has chosen to undertake and the rationales for such activities, and the timeline and credibility of State plans.

Applicants address the absolute and competitive priorities throughout their applications. The absolute priority must be met in order for an applicant to receive funding. Applications that address the competitive priority comprehensively will earn extra points under that priority. Invitational priorities are extensions to the core reform areas; applicants are invited to address these, but are not granted additional points for doing so.

In this appendix there is information about the point values for each criterion and priority, guidance on scoring, and the rubric that will be provided to reviewers.

II. Points Overview

The chart below shows the maximum number of points that may be assigned to each criterion.

Selection Criteria	Points	Percent
A. State Success Factors	125	25%
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEAs' participation in it	65	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	
(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	
B. Standards and Assessments	70	14%
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	
(ii) Adopting standards	20	
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction	47	9%
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	
D. Great Teachers and Leaders	138	28%
Eligibility Requirement (b)	eligibility	
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	
E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools	50	10%
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	
F. General	55	11%
Eligibility Requirement (a)	eligibility	
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	3%
TOTAL	500	100%
Subtotal: Accomplishments	260	52%
Subtotal: Plans	240	48%

III. About Scoring

About State Reform Conditions Criteria: The goal for State Reform Conditions Criteria is to ensure that, wherever possible, reviewers are provided with criterion-specific guidance that is clear and specific, making the decisions as “objective” as possible. (See application requirement (d) for the guidance provided to States concerning responding to State Reform Conditions Criteria in their applications.)

About Reform Plan Criteria: For Reform Plan Criteria, reviewers will be given general guidance on how to evaluate the information that each State submits; this guidance will be consistent with application requirement (e). Reviewers will allot points based on the quality of the State’s plan and, where specified in the text of the criterion, whether the State has set ambitious yet achievable annual targets for that plan. In making these judgments, reviewers will consider the extent to which the State has:

- *A high-quality plan.* In determining the quality of a State’s plan for a given Reform Plan Criterion, reviewers will evaluate the key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the parties responsible for implementing the activities, and the credibility of the plan (as judged, in part, by the information submitted as supporting evidence). States are required to submit this information for each Reform Plan Criterion that the State addresses. States may also submit additional information that they believe will be helpful to peer reviewers.
- *Ambitious yet achievable annual targets* (only for those criteria that specify this). In determining whether a State has ambitious yet achievable annual targets for a given Reform Plan Criterion, reviewers will examine the State’s targets in the context of the State’s plan and the evidence submitted (if any) in support of the plan. There is no specific target that reviewers will be looking for here; nor will higher targets necessarily be rewarded above lower ones. Rather, reviewers will reward States for developing targets that – in light of the State’s plan – are “ambitious yet achievable.”

Note that the evidence that States submit may be relevant both to judging whether the State has a high-quality plan and whether its annual targets are ambitious yet achievable.

About Assigning Points: For each criterion, reviewers will assign points to an application. In general, the Department has specified total point values at the criterion level and in some instances, at the sub-criterion level. In the cases where the point totals have not been allocated to sub-criteria, each sub-criterion is weighted equally.

The reviewers will use the general ranges below as a guide when awarding points.

Maximum Point Value	Quality of Applicant’s Response		
	Low	Medium	High
45	0 – 12	13 – 33	34 – 45
40	0 – 10	11 – 29	30 – 40
35	0 – 9	10 – 25	26 – 35
30	0 – 8	9 – 21	22 – 30

Maximum Point Value	Quality of Applicant's Response		
	Low	Medium	High
28	0 – 8	9 – 20	21– 28
25	0 – 7	8 – 18	19 – 25
21	0 – 5	6 – 15	16 – 21
20	0 – 5	6 – 14	15 – 20
15	0 – 4	5 – 10	11 – 15
14	0 – 4	5 – 9	10 – 14
10	0 – 2	3 – 7	8 – 10
8	0 -- 2	3 -- 5	6 -- 8
7	0 – 2	3 – 4	5 – 7
6	0 -- 1	2 -- 3	4 -- 6
5	0 – 1	2 – 3	4 – 5

About Priorities: There are three types of priorities in the Race to the Top competition.

- The absolute priority cuts across the entire application and should not be addressed separately. It will be 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.
- The competitive priority also cuts across the entire application. It is worth 15 points. Applicants will earn all or none of it, making it truly a competitive preference. In those cases where there is a disparity in the reviewers' determinations on the priority, the Department will award the competitive priority points only if a majority of the reviewers on a panel determine that an application should receive the priority points.
- The invitational priorities are addressed in their own separate sections. While applicants are invited to write to the invitational priorities, these will not earn points.

In the Event of a Tie: If two or more applications have the same score and there is not sufficient funding to support all of the tied applicants, the applicants' scores on criterion (A)(1)(ii), Securing LEA Commitment, will be used to break the tie.

IV. Reviewer Guidance for Criteria

A. State Success Factors

General Reviewer Guidance for (A)(1): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (A)(1)(ii):

- *The model Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), provided in Appendix D to this notice, is an example of a strong MOU.*

(A)(1) **(maximum total points: 65)** Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEAs' participation in it: The extent to which—

(i) **(maximum subpoints: 5)** 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 these goals, and is consistent with the specific reform plans that the State has proposed throughout its application;

(ii) **(maximum subpoints: 45)** The participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) 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 (MOUs) (as set forth in Appendix D) or other binding agreements between the State and its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) that include—

(a) Terms and conditions that reflect 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 Race to the Top plans; and

(c) Signatures from as many as possible of the LEA superintendent (or equivalent), the president of the local school board (or equivalent, if applicable), and the local teachers' union leader (if applicable) (one signature of which must be from an authorized LEA representative) demonstrating the extent of leadership support within participating LEAs (as defined in this notice); and

(iii) **(maximum subpoints: 15)** The LEAs that are participating in the State's Race to the Top plans (including considerations of the numbers and percentages of participating LEAs, schools, K-12 students, and students in poverty) will translate into broad statewide impact, allowing the State to reach its ambitious yet achievable goals, overall and by student subgroup, for—

(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 within two years of enrollment in an institution of higher education.

General Reviewer Guidance for (A)(2): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

(A)(2) **(maximum total points: 30)** Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans: The extent to which the State has a high-quality overall plan to—

(i) **(maximum subpoints: 20)** Ensure that it has the capacity required to implement its proposed plans by—

(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 Race to the Top 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 Race to the Top 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; and

(ii) **(maximum subpoints: 10)** Use support from a broad group of stakeholders to better implement its plans, as evidenced by the strength of statements or actions of support 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 (e.g., business, community, civil rights, and education association leaders); Tribal schools; parent, student, and community organizations (e.g., parent-teacher associations, nonprofit organizations, local education foundations, and community-based organizations); and institutions of higher education.

General Reviewer Guidance for (A)(3): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

(A)(3) **(maximum total points: 30)** Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps: The extent to which the State has demonstrated its ability to—

(i) **(maximum subpoints: 5)** 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;

(ii) **(maximum subpoints: 25)** 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.

B. Standards and Assessments

State Reform Conditions Criteria

General Reviewer Guidance for (B)(1): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (B)(1)(i)(b) – Significant Number of States:

- “High” points for a significant number of States are earned if the consortium includes a majority of the States in the country.
- “Medium” or “low” points are earned if the consortium includes one-half of the States in the country or less.

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (B)(1)(ii):

- “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.
- No “Medium” points are assigned for this criterion.
- “Low” points are earned for a high-quality plan to adopt by a later specified date in 2010.
- No points are earned for a plan that is not high-quality or for a plan to adopt later than 2010.

(B)(1) (maximum total points: 40) Developing and adopting common standards:

The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to adopting a common set of high-quality standards, evidenced by (as set forth in Appendix B)—

(i) **(maximum subpoints: 20)** The State's participation in a consortium of States that—

(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

(b) Includes a significant number of States; and

(ii) **(maximum subpoints: 20)** (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

(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.¹

¹ Phase 2 applicants addressing selection criterion (B)(1)(ii) may amend their June 1, 2010 application submission through August 2, 2010 by submitting evidence of adopting common standards after June 1, 2010.

General Reviewer Guidance for (B)(2): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (B)(2)(ii) – Significant Number of States:

- “High” points for a significant number of States are earned if the consortium includes a majority of the States in the country.
- “Medium” or “low” points are earned if the consortium includes one-half of the States in the country or less.

(B)(2) (maximum total points: 10) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments: The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to improving the quality of its assessments, evidenced by (as set forth in Appendix B) the State's participation in a consortium of States that—

- (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
- (ii) Includes a significant number of States.

Reform Plan Criteria

General Reviewer Guidance for (B)(3): In judging the quality of the applicant's plan and annual targets (if any) for this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

(B)(3) (maximum total points: 20) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments: The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), 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 (as defined in this notice) 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).

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

State Reform Conditions Criteria

General Reviewer Guidance for (C)(1): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (C)(1):

- Applicants earn two (2) points for every element the State has, out of 12 elements possible.

(C)(1) **(maximum total points: 24)** Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system: The extent to which the State has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice).

Reform Plan Criteria

General Reviewer Guidance for (C)(2): In judging the quality of the applicant's plan and annual targets (if any) for this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

(C)(2) **(maximum total points: 5)** Accessing and using State data: The extent to which 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 (e.g., 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.²

General Reviewer Guidance for (C)(3): In judging the quality of the applicant's plan and annual targets (if any) for this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

(C)(3) **(maximum total points: 18)** Using data to improve instruction: The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan to—

- (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;
- (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

² Successful applicants that receive Race to the Top 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.

professional development to teachers, principals, and administrators on how to use these systems and the resulting data to support continuous instructional improvement; and

(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 (e.g., students with disabilities, English language learners, students whose achievement is well below or above grade level).

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

State Reform Conditions Criteria

General Reviewer Guidance for (D)(1): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (D)(1):

- The criterion must be judged for both teachers and principals.

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (D)(1)(i):

- "High" points are earned by States that have alternative routes that (a) permit providers who operate independently of institutions of higher 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).
- "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 (as defined in this notice).
- "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 (as defined in this notice).

(D)(1) **(maximum total points: 21)** Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals: The extent to which the State has—

- (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 higher education;
- (ii) Alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) that are in use; and
- (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.

Reform Plan Criteria

General Reviewer Guidance for (D)(2): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion and annual targets, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (D)(2):

- *The criterion must be judged for both teachers and principals.*

(D)(2) **(maximum total points: 58)** Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance: 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 (as defined in this notice)—

(i) **(maximum subpoints: 5)** Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student;

(ii) **(maximum subpoints: 15)** 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;

(iii) **(maximum subpoints: 10)** 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

(iv) **(maximum subpoints: 28)** Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding—

(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.

General Reviewer Guidance for (D)(3): In judging the quality of the applicant's plan and annual targets for this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

(D)(3) **(maximum total points: 25)** Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals: 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) **(maximum subpoints: 15)** 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

(ii) **(maximum subpoints: 10)** 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.

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.

General Reviewer Guidance for (D)(4): In judging the quality of the applicant's plan and annual targets for this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (D)(4):

- *The criterion must be judged for both teachers and principals.*

(D)(4) **(maximum total points: 14)** Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs: The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(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

(ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice).

General Reviewer Guidance for (D)(5): In judging the quality of the applicant's plan and annual targets (if any) for this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

(D)(5) **(maximum total points: 20)** Providing effective support to teachers and principals: The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan for its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to—

(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

(ii) Measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of those supports in order to improve student achievement (as defined in this notice).

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

State Reform Conditions Criteria

General Reviewer Guidance for (E)(1): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (E)(1):

- 10 points are earned by States that can intervene directly in both schools and LEAs.
- 5 points are earned by States that can intervene directly in either schools or LEAs, but not both.
- 0 points are earned by States that cannot intervene in either schools or LEAs.

(E)(1) (maximum total points: 10) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs: The extent to which 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.

Reform Plan Criteria

General Reviewer Guidance for (E)(2): In judging the quality of the applicant's plan and annual targets for this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

(E)(2) (maximum total points: 40) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools: The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) **(maximum subpoints: 5)** 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; and

(ii) **(maximum subpoints: 35)** 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).

F. General

State Reform Conditions Criteria

General Reviewer Guidance for (F)(1): In judging the quality of the applicant's response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (F)(1)(i):

- "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.

- “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.
- “Low” 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 decreased from FY2008 to FY2009.

(F)(1) **(maximum total points: 10)** Making education funding a priority: The extent to which—

(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

(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.

General Reviewer Guidance for (F)(2): In judging the quality of the applicant’s response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (F)(2)(i):

- “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.
- “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 (e.g. 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.
- “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.
- No points are earned if the State has no charter school law.
- 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 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 (e.g., 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.e., unproven) charter schools from starting.

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (F)(2)(iii):

- “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.
- “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.
- “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.
- No points are earned if the State has no charter school law.

(F)(2) (maximum total points: 40) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools: The extent to which—

(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.

(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.

(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.

(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.

(v) The State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools (as defined in this notice) other than charter schools.

General Reviewer Guidance for (F)(3): *In judging the quality of the applicant’s response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).*

(F)(3) (maximum total points: 5) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions: The extent to which 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.

V. Reviewer Guidance for Priorities

Absolute Priority Guidance: The application will be judged to ensure that it has met the absolute priority set forth below. 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.

Priority 1: Absolute Priority – Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

To meet this priority, the State's application must comprehensively and coherently address all of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria in order to demonstrate that the State and its participating LEAs are taking a systemic approach to education reform. The State must demonstrate in its application sufficient LEA participation and commitment to successfully implement and achieve the goals in its plans; and it must describe how the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs, will use Race to the Top and other funds to increase student achievement, decrease the achievement gaps across student subgroups, and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

Competitive Priority Guidance: The application will be judged to determine whether it has met the competitive preference priority set forth below. The competitive preference 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.

Priority 2: Competitive Preference Priority – Emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM). (competitive preference points: 15, all or nothing)

To meet this priority, the State's application must have a high-quality plan to address the need to (i) offer a rigorous course of study in mathematics, the sciences, technology, and engineering; (ii) 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 (iii) prepare more students for advanced study and careers in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including by addressing the needs of underrepresented groups and of women and girls in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

Invitational Priority Guidance: No points are awarded for invitational priorities.

Priority 3: Invitational Priority – Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes.

The Secretary is particularly interested in applications that include practices, strategies, or programs to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (pre-kindergarten through third grade) by enhancing the quality of preschool programs. Of particular interest are proposals that support practices that (i) improve school

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

Invitational Priority Guidance: No points are awarded for invitational priorities.

Priority 4: Invitational Priority – Expansion and Adaptation of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems.

The Secretary is particularly interested in applications in which the State plans to expand statewide longitudinal data systems to include or integrate data from special education programs, English language learner programs,³ early childhood programs, at-risk and dropout prevention programs, and school climate and culture programs, as well as information on student mobility, human resources (*i.e.*, information on teachers, principals, and other staff), school finance, student health, postsecondary education, and other relevant areas, with the purpose of connecting and coordinating all parts of the system to allow important questions related to policy, practice, or overall effectiveness to be asked, answered, and incorporated into effective continuous improvement practices.

The Secretary is also particularly interested in applications in which States propose working together to adapt one State's statewide longitudinal 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.

Invitational Priority Guidance: No points are awarded for invitational priorities.

Priority 5: Invitational Priority – P-20 Coordination, Vertical and Horizontal Alignment.

The Secretary is particularly interested in applications in which the State plans to address how early childhood programs, K-12 schools, postsecondary institutions, workforce development organizations, and other State agencies and community partners (*e.g.*, child welfare, juvenile justice, and criminal justice agencies) will coordinate to improve all parts of the education system and create a more seamless preschool-through-graduate school (P-20) route for students. Vertical alignment across P-20 is particularly critical at each point where a transition occurs (*e.g.*, between early childhood and K-12, or between K-12 and postsecondary/careers) to ensure that students exiting one level are prepared for success, without remediation, in 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 (as defined in this notice) have access to the broad array of opportunities and services they need and that are beyond the capacity of a school itself to provide.

Invitational Priority Guidance: No points are awarded for invitational priorities.

Priority 6: Invitational Priority – School-Level Conditions for Reform, Innovation, and Learning.

The Secretary is particularly interested in applications in which the State's participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) seek to create the conditions for reform and

³ The term English language learner, throughout this notice, is meant to include students who are limited English proficient, as defined in section 9101 of the ESEA.

innovation as well as the conditions for learning by providing schools with flexibility and autonomy in such areas as--

- (i) Selecting staff;
- (ii) Implementing new structures and formats for the school day or year that result in increased learning time (as defined in this notice);
- (iii) Controlling the school's budget;
- (iv) Awarding credit to students based on student performance instead of instructional time;
- (v) Providing comprehensive services to high-need students (as defined in this notice) (e.g., by mentors and other caring adults; through local partnerships with community-based organizations, nonprofit organizations, and other providers);
- (vi) Creating school climates and cultures that remove obstacles to, and actively support, student engagement and achievement; and
- (vii) Implementing strategies to effectively engage families and communities in supporting the academic success of their students.