

# **FY 2013 Race to the Top – District Guidance and Frequently Asked Questions**



**U.S. Department of Education  
Washington, D.C. 20202**

**Updated July 2013**

**Purpose of the Guidance**

The purpose of this guidance is to provide information about the Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 Race to The Top – District competition. The guidance provides the U.S. Department of Education’s interpretation of various statutory provisions and does not impose any requirements beyond those included in the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District Notice of Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria (NFP) and applicable laws and regulations. In addition, it does not create or confer any rights for or on any person.

The U.S. Department of Education will provide additional or updated program guidance as necessary on its Race to the Top – District Web site, [www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district/index.html](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district/index.html). If you have further questions that are not answered here, please email [2013.racetothetop.district@ed.gov](mailto:2013.racetothetop.district@ed.gov).

**Contents**

A. Overview of the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District Competition..... 3  
B. Grant Awards ..... 4  
C. Eligibility..... 6  
D. Priorities under the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District Competition ..... 15  
E. Selection Criteria..... 18  
F. General Application Requirements and Program Information..... 28  
G. Uses of Funds ..... 32  
H. Program Requirements ..... 37  
I. Application Submission ..... 40  
J. Application Review and Selection ..... 42  
K. Transparency, Accountability, Reporting, and Other Obligations ..... 43  
L. Resources and Information..... 44

## **A. Overview of the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District Competition**

### **A-1. What is the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition?**

The Race to the Top – District program is designed to build on the momentum of other competitions conducted under the Race to the Top program and to support bold, locally directed improvements in learning and teaching that will directly improve student achievement and educator effectiveness.

In that regard, the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition will encourage and reward those local educational agencies (LEAs) (as defined in the notice<sup>1</sup>) or consortia of LEAs that have the leadership and vision to implement the strategies, structures, and systems needed to implement personalized, student-focused approaches to learning and teaching that the Department believes will produce excellence and ensure equity for all students.

An LEA or consortium of LEAs receiving an award under this competition will build on the experiences of States and districts in implementing reforms in the four core educational assurance areas (as defined in the notice) through Race to the Top and other key programs. A successful applicant will provide teachers with the information, tools, and supports that enable them to meet the needs of each student and substantially accelerate and deepen each student’s learning. These LEAs will have the policies, systems, infrastructure, capacity, and culture to enable teachers, teacher teams, and school leaders to continuously focus on improving individual student achievement and closing achievement gaps. These LEAs will also make equity and access a priority and aim to prepare each student to master the content and skills required for college- and career-readiness, provide each student the opportunity to pursue a rigorous course of study, and accelerate and deepen students’ learning through attention to their individual needs. As important, they will create opportunities for students to identify and pursue areas of personal academic interest--all while ensuring that each student masters critical areas identified in college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready high school graduation requirements.

### **A-2. What are eligibility requirements, absolute priorities, selection criteria, and competitive preference priorities?**

Eligibility requirements are the requirements that an applicant must meet in order to be eligible for funding. The eligibility requirements for the fiscal year (FY) 2013 Race to the Top – District competition are summarized in section C of this document and set forth in full in the notice.

Absolute priorities are the items that an applicant must address in its application in order to receive an award. For the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition, the Department will only consider applications that meet Absolute Priority 1 and one of Absolute Priorities 2 through 5.

---

<sup>1</sup> The NFP establishes the priorities, requirements, definitions, and selection criteria and the Notice Inviting Applications (NIA) explains how the priorities, requirements, definitions, and selection criteria established in the NFP apply to the FY 2013 competition. When we refer to the term “notice” in these FAQs, we are referring to the NIA. Many relevant sections of the notice are included in this document for the convenience of applicants. The Department will publish the NFP and the NIA for the Fiscal Year 2013 Race to the Top – District competition in the Federal Register. The final NFP and NIA will be posted on the Race to the Top –District Web site at [www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district) once they are published in the Federal Register.

Selection criteria are the criteria that peer reviewers use in evaluating applications and thus are the focal point of an application's peer review. A panel of peer reviewers will use the selection criteria to assign points to an application based on how well an applicant addresses these selection criteria. The FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition has six categories of selection criteria: Vision, Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform, Preparing Students for College and Careers, LEA Policy and Infrastructure, Continuous Improvement, and Budget and Sustainability.

Competitive preference priorities provide additional points to the applicants that decide to address them. The FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition includes one competitive preference priority--Results, Resource Alignment, and Integrated Services, which focuses on the applicant's integration of public or private resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools' resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students (as defined in the notice), giving highest priority to students in participating schools with high-need students (as defined in the notice).

The NFP and NIA will be posted to the Race to the Top – District Web site at [www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district) once they are published in the *Federal Register*.

**A-3. If a potential applicant missed the deadline, should it still submit an intent to apply for FY 2013 Race to the Top – District funds?**

No. Filing an intent to apply is optional. There is no need for a potential applicant to submit an intent to apply after the deadline. The Department will use information from the intent to apply submissions in developing the process for reviewing applications. Potential applicants that did not submit an intent to apply form may still apply to the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition, and potential applicants that submitted an intent to apply are not required to apply. Further, no additional points or preference will be awarded to those applicants that completed the intent to apply form.

As part of the Department's commitment to transparency, a detailed list of potential applicants that submitted an intent to apply for the FY 2013 competition by the deadline will be posted on our Web site at [www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district). The list will not include any applicants that submitted an intent to apply after the deadline.

**B. Grant Awards**

**B-1. How much funding is available for the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition?**

For FY 2013, Congress appropriated approximately \$550 million for grants to States or LEAs, in order to continue carrying out Race to the Top activities. Of this amount, approximately \$520 million is available after taking into account sequestration. The Department anticipates awarding approximately \$120 million to LEAs through a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition.

**B-2. How many Race to the Top – District grants will the Department award in FY 2013?**

The number of grants will depend on the quality of the applications received and the size of the awards made to the top-ranking applicants. The Department anticipates awarding about 5-10 FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grants.

**B-3. What will be the sizes of the grant awards?**

The maximum grant award will depend on the number of participating students who would be served under the grant. An applicant’s budget request for all years of its project must fall within the applicable budget range shown in the table below. We will not consider an application that requests a budget outside the applicable range of awards. An applicant’s budget must not be greater than or less than the applicable range of awards, and must be appropriate for and consistent with the plan it proposes in its application.

<b>Number of participating students</b>	<b>Award range</b>
2,000-5,000 or Fewer than 2,000, provided those students are served by a consortium of at least 10 LEAs and at least 75 percent of the students served by each LEA are participating students (as defined in the notice)	\$4-10 million
5,001-10,000	\$10-20 million
10,001-20,000	\$20-25 million
20,001+	\$25-30 million

**B-4. Do the grant amounts listed in the budget range chart represent the award amount for each of the four years, or does it represent the total four-year award?**

The grant amounts listed in the budget range chart represent the total four-year award. These may be found in the award range column of the budget range chart in Program Requirement 1.

**B-5. What is the timeline for obligating and spending FY 2013 Race to the Top – District funds?**

In accordance with the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6, Division F), the Department must obligate all FY 2013 Race to the Top – District funds to grantees by December 31, 2013.

Grantees must plan to complete all activities outlined in their approved applications and obligate all FY 2013 Race to the Top – District funds by the end of the four-year grant period. Grantees will have 90 days after the end of their grant period to liquidate funds (see 34 CFR 80.23(b)). Any FY 2013 Race to the Top – District funds that are not obligated and liquidated by December 31, 2018, will revert to the U.S. Department of Treasury.

Grantees may be reimbursed for pre-award costs from the date their award was announced. (Please see question G-7 for details on costs of preparing proposals for potential Federal awards.)

**B-6. Must an LEA be the payee for a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant?**

Only an LEA or a separate, eligible legal entity is eligible to receive a grant, and typically only an LEA or a separate, eligible legal entity would serve as the payee for a grant. If selected for a grant, an LEA or a separate, eligible legal entity may be able to designate a different payee and could work with the Department at that time to ensure that appropriate procedures are followed. For instance, a different payee may be an entity that is hired through an appropriate procurement procedure to assist the grantee with fiscal management. If an LEA or a separate, eligible legal entity chooses a different payee, the selection must also be consistent with the LEA's State laws and procedures. While a grantee may acquire the services of an outside entity to assist with administrative fiscal tasks, a grantee is ultimately responsible for ensuring that all requirements of the grant are met. In particular, the grantee is responsible for overseeing the use of grant funds and for ensuring that the project is carried out in accordance with the approved grant application and all applicable Federal requirements (see 34 CFR 75.700-702), including the requirements for financial management systems contained in 34 CFR 80.20.

**C. Eligibility**

**C-1. Which entities are eligible to apply for FY 2013 Race to the Top – District funds?**

Individual LEAs (as defined in the notice) and consortia of LEAs that meet the eligibility requirements noted below and that are located in one of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico may apply. Successful applicants (i.e., grantees) from the previous Race to the Top – District competition may not apply for additional funding.

To be eligible, an applicant must serve a minimum of 2,000 participating students or may serve fewer than 2,000 participating students, provided those students are served by a consortium of at least 10 LEAs and at least 75 percent of the students served by each LEA are participating students.

At least 40 percent of participating students (as defined in the notice) across all participating schools (as defined in the notice) must be students from low-income families, based on eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch subsidies under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act, or other poverty measures that LEAs use to make awards under section 1113(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA). If an applicant has not identified all participating schools (as defined in the notice) at the time of application, it must provide an assurance that within 100 days of the grant award, it will meet this requirement.

An applicant must demonstrate its commitment to the core educational assurance areas (as defined in the notice), including, for each LEA included in an application, an assurance signed by the LEA's superintendent or chief executive officer (CEO) that:

- The LEA, at a minimum, will implement no later than the 2014-2015 school year, a teacher evaluation system (as defined in the notice), a principal evaluation system (as defined in the notice), and a superintendent evaluation (as defined in the notice);
- The LEA is committed to preparing all students for college or career, as demonstrated by being located in a State that has adopted college- and career-ready standards (as defined in the notice), or measuring all student progress and performance against college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in the notice);

- The LEA has a robust data system that has, at a minimum, an individual teacher identifier with a teacher-student match and the capability to provide timely data back to educators and their supervisors on student growth (as defined in the notice);
- The LEA has the capability to receive or match student-level preschool-through-12<sup>th</sup> grade and higher education data; and
- Any disclosure of or access to personally identifiable information in students' education records complies with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

Required signatures for the LEA or lead LEA in a consortium are those of the superintendent or CEO, local school board president, and (where applicable) local teacher union or association president. If a consortium applicant has established itself as a separate eligible legal entity and is applying for a grant on its own behalf, a legal representative of the consortium must sign the application.

**C-2. May a consortium include fewer than 10 LEAs?**

Yes, so long as the consortium serves a minimum of 2,000 participating students (as defined in the notice) and meets all eligibility requirements in the notice, it is eligible to apply.

**C-3. May an intermediate service unit, educational service agency, or charter management organization apply for an award?**

For purposes of the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition, an intermediate service unit, educational service agency, or charter management organization would be eligible to apply for an award under the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition only if it meets the definition of “LEA” in the notice. Under that definition, an eligible entity must be recognized under applicable State law as an LEA and meet the definition of LEA in section 9101(26) of the ESEA.

**C-4. Could a non-LEA partnering organization such as a non-profit business partner or a charter management organization apply as a consortium applicant on behalf of a number of LEAs?**

As stated in the notice, one way that a consortium of LEAs may apply for a grant is by establishing a separate, eligible legal entity to apply for a grant on its own behalf. A separate legal entity established to apply for this grant must meet all of the requirements for group applicants described in the notice, and must comprise only LEAs. Typically pre-existing legal entities such as a charter management organization or a non-profit business partner will not qualify as LEAs nor will they qualify as separate, eligible legal entities. Whether a consortium qualifies as a separate, eligible entity will depend on facts specific to that consortium. The Department will not advise individual prospective applicants on whether they qualify as LEAs or separate, eligible entities.

The Department notes that a consortium of LEAs may also apply for a grant by designating one LEA member of the consortium to apply for the grant on behalf of the consortium. If a charter management organization is recognized under applicable State law as an LEA and meets the definition of LEA in section 9101(26) of the ESEA, it may be designated as an LEA lead in a consortia application. These consortia applicants must also meet the requirements for consortia applicants described in the notice.

**C-5. May a school within one LEA be a participating school (as defined in the notice) in an application from another LEA or consortium of LEAs?**

No. A school may participate only in an application that includes its LEA.

**C-6. How does an applicant determine the number of participating students and may an applicant increase over time the number of its participating students?**

At the time of the application, an applicant must provide an actual or approximate count of the number of participating students who would receive services under the project. If an applicant does not have a specific list of participating schools at the time of the application, the applicant must make an assurance that it meets the eligibility requirement. An applicant will have 100 days from the date of the grant award to provide the list of participating schools as described in Program Requirements (7)(ii). An applicant may plan in its proposal to increase the number of participating students over the course of the grant (e.g., by adding participating schools or students); however, an applicant must propose in its application to serve at least 2,000 participating students at the time of award (unless the applicant is a consortium of ten or more LEAs and at least 75 percent of the students served by each LEA are participating students, as defined in the notice). However, an applicant must base its requested award amount on the number of participating students it proposes to serve at the time of application or within the first 100 days of the grant award (i.e., budget request must be within the award range for the number of participating students at the time of application).

For example, if an applicant proposes to serve 5,100 students in year 1 with a plan to increase the number of participating students each year of the grant, that applicant's budget request may provide for an increase each year to support the additional students. However, it may not exceed \$20 million, which is the maximum amount in the award range for the number of participating students in the first year of the project, even if the applicant proposes to serve more than 10,000 students in year 4 of the grant.

**C-7. When determining the number of participating students, may an applicant use a cumulative count of students over the grant period to determine its applicable award range?**

No. At the time of the application, an applicant must provide an actual or approximate count of the number of participating students who would receive services in the first year of the project. This actual or approximate count of participating students must not be cumulative. (See also FAQ C-6.)

**C-8. May an applicant include early learning or adult education students in its count of participating students (as defined in the notice)?**

An LEA may apply for a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant for all or a portion of its schools. For a student to count as a participating student (as defined in the notice), the student must be considered part of the LEA (as defined in the notice).<sup>2</sup> The LEA definition references the

---

<sup>2</sup> The notice defines "local educational agency" as "an entity as defined in section 9101(26) of the ESEA, except that an entity described under section 9101(26)(D) must be recognized under applicable State law as a local educational agency." Section 9101(26) of the ESEA reads:

(26) Local educational agency  
(A) In general



ESEA definitions of both elementary and secondary schools, which defer to how State law defines the terms except that the ESEA definition of “secondary school” specifically excludes any education beyond grade 12. LEAs should consult with officials in their State to determine whether their early learning or adult education students are considered part of “public elementary schools or secondary schools” under State law.

**C-9. How does an applicant calculate the percentage of participating students (as defined in the notice) from low-income families in order to determine whether it meets the eligibility requirement (1)(c)?**

An applicant determines the percentage of students from low-income families by dividing the number of participating students (as defined in the notice) who are from low-income families by the total number of participating students across all participating schools (as defined in the notice). Therefore, it is possible for an individual participating school to have less than 40 percent participating students who are low-income, as long as overall, across all participating schools, 40 percent of participating students are low-income.

In the case of a consortium, the applicant should calculate the percentage of participating students from low-income families in the same way.

For instance, in the example below, the consortium includes two LEAs. The applicant should take the total number of participating students who are from low-income families in participating schools within those two LEAs, divide by the total number of participating students within these two LEAs, and multiply by 100. This is the percentage of participating students across all participating schools in the consortium example below.

$$(1,150 \text{ (total from column D)} / 2,200 \text{ (total from column B)}) * 100 = 52.27\%$$

In the consortium depicted in the example below, 52.27% of participating students are from low-income families and, thus, it would meet the 40 percent threshold included in eligibility requirement (1)(c).

---

The term “local educational agency” means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary schools or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or of or for a combination of school districts or counties that is recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary schools or secondary schools.

(B) Administrative control and direction

The term includes any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary school or secondary school.

(C) BIA schools

The term includes an elementary school or secondary school funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs but only to the extent that including the school makes the school eligible for programs for which specific eligibility is not provided to the school in another provision of law and the school does not have a student population that is smaller than the student population of the local educational agency receiving assistance under this chapter with the smallest student population, except that the school shall not be subject to the jurisdiction of any State educational agency other than the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

(D) Educational service agencies

The term includes educational service agencies and consortia of those agencies.

(E) State educational agency

The term includes the State educational agency in a State in which the State educational agency is the sole educational agency for all public schools.

**Example Table for (A)(2) from the Application**

			School Demographics								
			Raw Data Actual numbers or estimates (Please note where estimates are used)						Percentages		
			A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
LEA (Column relevant for consortium applicants)	Participating School	Grades/Subjects included in FY 2013 Race to the Top – District Plan	# of Participating Educators	# of Participating Students	# of Participating high-need students	# of Participating low-income students	Total # of Participating low-income students in LEA or Consortium	Total # of Students in the School	% of Participating Students in the School (B/F)*100	% of Participating students from low-income families (D/B)*100	% of Total LEA or consortium low-income population (D/E)*100
School District A	Elementary 1	K-5 Math	25	700	575	500	1,150	700	700/700 = 100%	500/700 = 71.4%	500/1,150 = 43.48%
School District A	Middle School 2	6-8 Math	5	500	400	300	1,150	900	500/900 = 55.56%	300/500 = 60%	300/1,150 = 26.09%
School District B	Middle School 3	7-8 Math	10	1,000	600	350	1,150	1,500	1000/1,500 = 66.7%	350/1,000 = 35%	350/1,150 = 30.43%
<b>TOTAL</b>			45	2,200	1,575	1,150	1,150	3,100	2200/3,100 = 70.97%	1,150/2,200 = 52.27%	100%

**C-10. What school year data should an applicant use in its application response, including in performance measure tables?**

An applicant should use the most current and accurate data in its FY 2013 Race to the Top – District application.

**C-11. If an educational service agency or some other entity meets the notice’s definition of LEA but is unable to demonstrate its commitment to the core educational assurance areas (as defined in the notice inviting applications) by having its superintendent or CEO sign the assurance in eligibility requirement (1)(d), may it apply as a consortium’s lead applicant or as a member of a consortium?**

No, the superintendent or CEO of each member LEA included in an application must sign the assurance in eligibility requirement (1)(d). An LEA that cannot meet each part of this assurance is not eligible to be a consortium’s lead applicant or a member of a consortium. However, such an LEA may partner with an eligible applicant. (See also FAQ C-19.)

**C-12. Must an applicant include all students or schools served by the LEA(s) in its proposed project?**

An applicant may include in its proposed project all or a portion of its schools (e.g., lowest-performing schools, secondary schools, schools connected by a feeder pattern), specific grades

(e.g., preschool through third grade), or subject-area bands (e.g., middle school math). While an applicant is not required to include all students or schools served by the LEA(s) in its application, an applicant must demonstrate how the total number of participating students is a significant number of the students in its participating schools.

**C-13. Must all LEAs in a consortium be from the same State?**

No. Consortia may include LEAs from multiple States, so long as each member of the consortium is an LEA, as defined in the notice.

**C-14. May an LEA sign on to more than one FY 2013 Race to the Top – District application?**

No.

**C-15. If an LEA or a lead LEA has more than one local teacher union/association president, must that LEA obtain signatures for all of them?**

If an LEA or lead LEA has more than one local teacher union/association, that LEA must submit the signature from either a representative of the “exclusive agent” or a signature from the chair of a union/association roundtable.

**C-16. Are charter schools eligible applicants?**

Public charter schools that meet the definition of an LEA in the notice and meet the other eligibility requirements set forth in the notice are eligible to apply for a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant individually or as members of a consortium. Public charter schools that do not meet the notice’s definition of an LEA may be included as participating schools in an eligible applicant’s proposal.

**C-17. Are LEAs from the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, the freely associated states of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau eligible to apply for a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant?**

No. The statutory definition of “State” (section 14013 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)) does not include the U.S. Territories or the Freely Associated States. Therefore, for the purposes of the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition, an eligible LEA is an LEA located within one of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

**C-18. Are BIE-funded LEAs eligible to apply for a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant?**

Department of the Interior/Bureau of Indian Education (BIE) schools that meet the definition of LEA in the notice and meet the other eligibility requirements set forth in the notice are eligible to apply for a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant individually or as members of a consortium.

**C-19. In its Race to the Top – District grant proposal, may an applicant partner with organizations that are not eligible to apply?**

Yes. An applicant may choose to partner with organizations that do not meet the eligibility requirements of the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition, such as educational service

agencies, regional centers, institutions of higher education, or local or national not-for-profit organizations.

**C-20. Are Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) schools eligible to apply for a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant?**

No. DoDEA schools are not eligible to apply for a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant because they do not meet the definition of an LEA in the notice.

**C-21. Will a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant be terminated if (a) its number of participating students (as defined in the notice) drops below 2,000; (b) the number of participating LEAs in a consortium is reduced; or (c) for a consortium serving fewer than 2,000 students that was eligible for an award because it included at least 10 LEAs serving at least 75 percent of their students, one or more of the LEAs in a consortium drop out or no longer serve 75 percent of its students during the grant period? (See eligibility requirement (1)(b))**

Significant changes in the number of participating students, the number of LEAs in a consortium, or the percentage of students served by an LEA in a consortium could affect a grantee's ability to meet the goals in its approved application or affect the scope of a grantee's project. The Department would review and consider such changes case by case. Such changes could result in partial or complete termination of the grant. Grantees must inform the Department of any substantive changes in their approved grant application, which would include a decrease in the number of participating students, as soon as the grantee is aware of the changes.

**C-22. Will a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant be terminated if its percentage of participating students (as defined in the notice) from low-income families drops below 40 percent during the grant period? (See eligibility requirement (1)(c))**

Significant changes in the percentage of participating students from low-income families could affect a grantee's ability to meet the goals in its approved application or affect the scope of a grantee's project. The Department would review and consider such changes on a case-by-case basis; they could result in partial or complete termination of the grant. Grantees must inform the Department of any substantive changes in their approved grant application, which would include a decrease in the percentage of participating students from low-income families, as soon as the grantee is aware of the changes.

Evaluation Systems

**C-23. What are the requirements for superintendent evaluations? (See eligibility requirement (1)(d)(i)(C))**

For the purpose of the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition, the Department defines "superintendent evaluation" as "a rigorous, transparent, and fair annual evaluation of an LEA superintendent that provides an assessment of performance and encourages professional growth. This evaluation must reflect: (1) the feedback of many stakeholders, including but not limited to educators, principals, and parents; and (2) student outcomes, including student growth for all students (including English learners and students with disabilities)." LEAs are not required to make superintendent evaluation results public.

**C-24. Does the superintendent evaluation (as defined in the notice) requirement apply to charter school LEAs that do not have a superintendent? (See eligibility requirement (1)(d)(i)(C))**

Yes. The charter school LEA should have a system for evaluating the performance of its lead administrator, and such an evaluation would serve as the superintendent evaluation for that LEA.

**C-25. Must an LEA have implemented teacher, principal, and superintendent evaluation systems (as defined in the notice) at the time of the application? (See eligibility requirement (1)(d)(i))**

At the time of the application, the applicant must assure that teacher, principal, and superintendent evaluation systems (as defined in the notice) will be implemented no later than the 2014-2015 school year. The evaluation systems need not be in place at the time of submission of the application.

**C-26. Must the teacher, principal, and superintendent evaluation systems (as defined in the notice) be implemented district-wide or just in participating schools? (See eligibility requirement (1)(d)(i))**

These evaluation systems (as defined in the notice) must be implemented in all schools in the district no later than the 2014-2015 school year. However, in LEAs where charter schools have additional flexibility (as determined by the chartering authorizer or under State law), the charter schools may elect to implement separate evaluation systems, so long as they meet the definitions in the notice.

**C-27. Must a consortium of LEAs use the same teacher and principal evaluation system (as defined in the notice) across all LEAs in the consortium? (See eligibility requirements (1)(d)(i)(A) and (1)(d)(i)(B))**

No. All LEAs in a consortium do not have to use the same teacher and principal evaluation system (as defined in the notice) but every LEA must implement a teacher and principal evaluation system (as defined in the notice). Each LEA in a consortium must assure that it will implement teacher, principal, and superintendent evaluation systems (as defined in the notice) by the 2014-2015 school year.

**C-28. May an LEA use its State's teacher and principal evaluation systems (as defined in the notice) or must it create new systems? (See eligibility requirements (1)(d)(i)(A) and (1)(d)(i)(B))**

An LEA may use its State's evaluation systems, as long as the systems include all the elements of teacher and principal evaluation systems defined in the notice.

Eligibility Requirements

**C-29. How may an LEA demonstrate its commitment to preparing all students for college and careers? (See eligibility requirement (1)(d)(ii))**

To demonstrate its commitment to preparing all students for college and careers, an LEA must include in its application an assurance that it is in a State that has adopted college- and career-ready standards (as defined in the notice) or that it measures all student progress and performance against college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in the notice).

(See section V of the application for program-specific assurances for individual LEA applicants and section VI of the application for program-specific assurances for consortia applicants.)

**C-30. May an LEA use its State’s longitudinal data system (SLDS) to demonstrate that it has the capability to receive or match student-level preschool-through-12<sup>th</sup> grade and higher education data? (See eligibility requirement (1)(d)(iv))**

Yes. We encourage LEAs to use the SLDS, rather than develop a redundant system, so long as its SLDS has the capability to match student-level preschool-through-12<sup>th</sup> grade and higher education data. Alternatively, LEAs may use an outside partner or vendor to provide such data.

**C-31. Are consortia applicants required to create a single data system to share student-level data? (See eligibility requirements (1)(d)(iii) and (1)(d)(iv))**

No. Consortia applicants are not required to create a single data system to share student-level data (as defined in the notice) among participating LEAs. As noted above, we encourage LEAs to use existing data systems, such as an SLDS, if those systems enable the applicant to meet the relevant eligibility requirements. If a consortium applicant decides to create a single data system that would require student-level data sharing among participating LEAs, the system must comply with FERPA.

The Department’s Family Policy and Compliance Office (FPCO) is available to provide technical assistance for developing FERPA-compliant systems; to request assistance contact FPCO at [FERPA@ed.gov](mailto:FERPA@ed.gov) or the Privacy Technical Assistance Center at [PrivacyTA@ed.gov](mailto:PrivacyTA@ed.gov).

**C-32. What does it mean for an LEA to have the capability to receive or match student-level preschool-through-12<sup>th</sup> grade and higher education data? (See eligibility requirement (1)(d)(iv))**

An LEA should have a way of collecting and using data on its students from preschool through higher education (e.g., having the ability to track where a recent high school graduate attends college). An LEA need not have a sophisticated data system, but should have a way to access this type of information, either by matching P-12 and higher education data, or by receiving that information from others (e.g., from the State or an outside provider).

**C-33. In eligibility requirement (1)(e), what does it mean for the signature of the local teacher union or association president to be “applicable”?**

If an LEA employs teachers who are represented by a teacher union/association (in a bargaining or non-bargaining State), then the signature of the local teacher union/association president is applicable. If signatures are not applicable, then the absence of these signatures will not affect the application. The application directs LEAs to provide an explanation as to why the signature of the local teacher union or association president is not applicable in the table provided in the Program-Specific Assurances section of the application. For individual LEA applicants this can be found on page 17 in section V, and for consortia applicants the table can be found on page 23 in section VI.

**C-34. What does it mean to be “represented by a teacher union/association” (see FAQ C-33) for LEAs located in States where collective bargaining is prohibited or where laws about collective bargaining are ambiguous or silent?**

In States where collective bargaining is prohibited, the teacher union signature is “not applicable” under eligibility requirement (1)(e) or application requirement (3) and an LEA could receive points under selection criterion (B)(4)(a)(ii) by submitting “at a minimum, evidence that at least 70 percent of teachers from participating schools (as defined in the notice) support the proposal.”

In States where laws about collective bargaining are ambiguous or silent, decisions about representation often are made at the local level. In such cases, it is typically up to the local school board to recognize a representative. If the local board has recognized an exclusive representative, then those teachers are considered to be represented and the signature requirement is “applicable” under eligibility requirement (1)(e) and application requirement (3). In that case, an LEA could receive points under selection criterion (B)(4)(a)(i) by submitting “evidence of direct engagement and support for the proposals from teachers in participating schools (as defined in the notice).” If the local board in a State where laws are ambiguous or silent has not recognized an exclusive representative, the requirements for a teacher union signature are not “applicable,” and an LEA could receive points under selection criterion (B)(4)(a)(ii) by submitting “at a minimum, evidence that at least 70 percent of teachers from participating schools (as defined in the notice) support the proposal.”

**C-35. Must an LEA have persistently low-achieving schools or low-performing schools in order to be eligible to apply?**

No. Having persistently lowest-achieving schools or low-performing schools is not an eligibility requirement. It is a selection criterion. Selection criterion (B)(1)(b) asks an applicant to demonstrate a clear track record of success in achieving ambitious and significant reforms in its persistently lowest-achieving schools or its low-performing schools. As stated in question F-1, while each selection criterion has a point value, meeting a selection criterion is not a requirement of the competition. If an applicant only partially addresses a selection criterion, or does not address a selection criterion, it will receive partial points, or it will not receive points for the criterion, but it will still be eligible to compete.

**D. Priorities under the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District Competition**

*Absolute priorities*

**D-1. Are there priorities that an applicant must meet in order to receive a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant?**

There are five absolute priorities in the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition. Each applicant *must* address Absolute Priority 1, Personalized Learning Environments. To meet this priority, an applicant must coherently and comprehensively address how it will build on the core educational assurance areas (as defined in the notice) to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching through the personalization of strategies, tools, and supports for students and educators that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards (as defined in the notice) or college- and career-ready graduation requirements (as defined in the notice); accelerate student achievement and deepen student learning by meeting the academic needs of each student; increase the effectiveness of educators; expand student access to the most effective educators; decrease achievement gaps across student groups; and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

An applicant must address Absolute Priority 1 across its responses to the selection criteria and does not write to Absolute Priority 1 separately.

If an applicant has not met Absolute Priority 1, the applicant will not receive a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant.

In addition, each applicant must also indicate in its application one priority from Absolute Priorities 2-5:

- *Absolute Priority 2*, Non-Rural LEAs in Race to the Top States
- *Absolute Priority 3*, Rural LEAs in Race to the Top States
- *Absolute Priority 4*, Non-Rural LEAs in non-Race to the Top States
- *Absolute Priority 5*, Rural LEAs in non-Race to the Top States

“Race to the Top States” are those that received Phase 1, 2, or 3 Race to the Top grants: Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Tennessee. LEAs in States that received only a Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge grant must indicate Absolute Priority 4 or 5.

**D-2. How will peer reviewers score Absolute Priority 1?**

The peer reviewers will not assign scores for Absolute Priority 1. Absolute Priority 1 cuts across the entire application and should not be addressed separately. The peer reviewers will assess applications against Absolute Priority 1, after fully reviewing and evaluating the applications to ensure that the application has met the priority. If an application has not met the priority, it will be eliminated from the competition. In those cases where there is a disparity in the reviewers’ determinations on the priority, Absolute Priority 1 is met only if a majority of the reviewers on a panel determine that an application meets the priority.

**D-3. In the case of an applicant that is made up of a consortium of LEAs that has both rural and non-rural members, or LEAs in both Race to the Top States and non-Race to the Top States, which of the Absolute Priorities 2-5 should the applicant indicate?**

The following chart explains which of the Absolute Priorities 2-5 an applicant should select:

<b>If more than 50 percent of an applicant’s participating students (as defined in the notice) are in:</b>	<b>...the applicant should select Absolute Priority...</b>
Non-rural LEAs in States that received awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competitions	2
Rural LEAs (as defined in the notice) in States that received awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competitions	3
Non-rural LEAs in States that did not receive awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competitions	4
Rural LEAs (as defined in the notice) in States that did not receive awards under the Race to the Top Phase 1, Phase 2, or Phase 3 competitions	5



**D-4. How is “rural LEA” defined for the purpose of Absolute Priorities 3 and 5?**

For the purpose of the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition, the Department defines “rural LEA” as “an LEA, at the time of the application, that is eligible under the Small Rural School Achievement (SRSA) program or the Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) program authorized under Title VI, Part B of the ESEA. Eligible applicants may determine whether a particular LEA is eligible for these programs by referring to information on the Department’s Web site at [www2.ed.gov/programs/reapsrsa/eligible13/index.html](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/reapsrsa/eligible13/index.html).”

This definition was initially included in the notice of final supplemental priorities and definitions for Discretionary Grant Programs, published in the *Federal Register* on December 15, 2010 (75 FR 78486-78511).

**D-5. Will Absolute Priorities 2 through 5 affect an applicant’s scores?**

Applicants’ responses to Absolutely Priorities 2 through 5 will not affect an applicant’s score or provide additional points; instead, this information will allow the Secretary to select a diverse group of grantees. Among those high-quality applications that score well enough to fund, the Secretary may separately consider applicants located in rural and non-rural LEAs, as well as applicants located in Race to the Top and non-Race to the Top grantee States.

Competitive Preference Priority

**D-6. Are there priorities for which an applicant may receive additional points if it successfully addresses the priorities?**

Yes. The FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition includes one competitive preference priority--Results, Resource Alignment, and Integrated Services. This priority emphasizes the applicant’s integration of public or private resources in a partnership designed to augment the schools’ resources by providing additional student and family supports to schools that address the social, emotional, or behavioral needs of the participating students, giving highest priority to students in participating schools with high-need students. To meet this priority, an applicant may propose to provide student and family supports that focus on a subset of these needs. An applicant may receive up to 10 additional points if it successfully addresses the priority.

**D-7. May an applicant choose to partner with multiple organizations under the competitive preference priority?**

Yes.

**D-8. May partnerships with public or private organizations be existing partnerships, or must there be new partnerships specifically developed in response to the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition?**

Partnerships with public or private organizations may be existing partnerships.

**D-9. Will applicants that set a high number of desired results receive more points under the competitive preference priority?**

Applicants will not be judged based on the number of desired results they set. Instead, they will be judged based on the quality of their desired results, partnerships, and plans for implementation.

In addition, they will be judged on how well their plans under the competitive preference priority align with and support the applicant's broader FY 2013 Race to the Top – District reform strategy.

**D-10. Must an applicant collect population-level results for all students?**

No. An applicant must have a plan for how it will collect data on results for all students, but is only required to collect the result measures for the participating students.

**D-11. Will grantees be able to share student-level data with external public or private partner organizations, such as public health or social service providers?**

Grantees may only share student-level data (as defined in the notice) with partner organizations in a manner that is consistent with FERPA. In most instances, this will require securing parental consent. FERPA allows LEAs to share student-level data without consent in limited instances, such as to conduct an audit or evaluation of a Federal- or State-supported education program. FERPA would not allow partner organizations to receive student-level data without consent for the purpose of administering services to students. Therefore, we encourage partner organizations to obtain FERPA data-sharing consent from parents.

To request technical assistance regarding FERPA, contact FPCO at [FERPA@ed.gov](mailto:FERPA@ed.gov) or the Privacy Technical Assistance Center at [PrivacyTA@ed.gov](mailto:PrivacyTA@ed.gov).

**E. Selection Criteria**

*Vision*

**E-1. In the event that an applicant includes all its schools and students as participating schools and students, how will it address selection criterion (A)(3) regarding how it will “support district-wide change beyond the participating schools?”**

An LEA that proposes to serve all schools and students in the LEA will not be penalized. In responding to selection criterion (A)(3), the applicant may simply note that all schools and students will be served.

**E-2. Must all applicants submit ambitious yet achievable annual goals, overall and by student subgroup (as defined in the notice), for each of performance areas (a) through (d) under selection criterion (A)(4)?**

Yes. To successfully address each area (a) through (d) under selection criterion (A)(4), applicants must submit ambitious yet achievable annual goals that are equal to or exceed State ESEA targets, where applicable, overall and by student subgroup (as defined in the notice), for each participating LEA.

**E-3. Should an LEA within a State whose State educational agency (SEA) has requested, but has not yet received approval for, ESEA flexibility use existing ESEA targets and goals for student outcomes to determine its targets and goals for selection criteria (A), or should it base its student outcome targets and goals on those proposed in its SEA's ESEA flexibility request?**

To respond to selection criteria (A), an applicant should use its State's existing, approved targets and goals, either via the State's approved ESEA flexibility request or its Title I Accountability Workbook, found at: [www.ed.gov/eSEA/flexibility/requests](http://www.ed.gov/eSEA/flexibility/requests) or [www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplans03/index.html](http://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/stateplans03/index.html).

**E-4. For which grades and subjects must an applicant establish goals in its response to selection criterion (A)(4)?**

To successfully address criterion (A)(4), at a minimum, an applicant must establish goals, overall and by student subgroup, for each grade in the LEA(s) for which the State administers assessments in reading or language arts and in mathematics under the requirements of the ESEA.

**E-5. In table (A)(4)(b), how are subgroups and comparison groups identified?**

In table (A)(4)(b), the applicant provides its targets and goals to decrease achievement gaps. "Achievement gap" is defined in the notice as the difference in the performance between each subgroup within a participating LEA or school and the statewide average performance of the LEA's or State's highest-achieving subgroups in reading or language arts and in mathematics as measured by the assessments required under the ESEA, as amended. In this table, the applicant is asked to identify subgroups and comparison groups. "Subgroup" is defined in the notice as each category of students identified under section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA, and any subgroup (including combined subgroups) used in the State accountability system that is approved by the Department in a State's request for ESEA flexibility. The comparison group is the LEA's or State's highest-achieving subgroup in reading or language arts and in mathematics as measured by the assessments required under the ESEA.

**E-6. May an applicant respond that future goals for improved student outcomes are "to be determined?" (See (A)(4) tables)**

The application requests that applicants identify target goals for student outcomes (tables (A)(4)(a) - (A)(4)(e)). Because these tables are part of selection criterion (A) Vision, peer reviewers will examine the applicant's goals in the context of the applicant's proposal and will reward applicants for developing "ambitious yet achievable" goals that are equal to or exceed ESEA targets for the LEA(s), overall and by student subgroup, for each participating LEA. In order to be "ambitious yet achievable," a goal should be meaningful for the applicant's proposal and for assessing implementation progress, successes, and challenges. An applicant could choose to enter "to be determined" for future goals, but applicants should understand that this decision is not fully responsive to the application's request for "ambitious yet achievable" goals.

**E-7. What is the difference between the goals in selection criterion (A)(4) and the performance measures in (E)(3)?**

The goals in selection criterion (A)(4) apply to all students and schools in the LEA and are focused on student outcomes. The performance measures in (E)(3) apply only to participating students (as defined in the notice) and participating schools (as defined in the notice) and help measure ongoing progress during implementation and provide leading indicators of success. Please note, the Department will use both goals and performance measures to manage grantee implementation after the awards are made.

**E-8. May a consortium use aggregate data to complete tables (A)(4)(a) – (A)(4)(e) or must it include a separate table for each member LEA?**

Selection criterion (A)(4) requires a consortium applicant to respond for each LEA in a consortium. An applicant may add rows or include a separate chart for each participating LEA as needed.

*Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform*

**E-9. How does the Department distinguish between a low-performing school and a persistently lowest-achieving school?**

The Department defines a “low-performing school” as one that is in the bottom 10 percent of performance in the State, or that has significant achievement gaps, based on student academic performance in reading or language arts and in mathematics on the assessments required under the ESEA, or that has a graduation rate (as defined in the notice) below 60 percent.

The Department defines a persistently lowest-achieving school, as determined by the State, consistent with the requirements of the School Improvement Grants (SIG) program authorized by section 1003(g) of the ESEA,<sup>3</sup> as:

- Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that (a) is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring or the lowest-achieving five Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State, whichever number of schools is greater; or (b) is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years; and
- Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I funds that (a) is among the lowest-achieving five percent of secondary schools or the lowest-achieving five secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, whichever number of schools is greater; or (b) is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 CFR 200.19(b) that is less than 60 percent over a number of years;
- To identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools, a State must take into account both (1) the academic achievement of the “all students” group in a school in terms of proficiency on the State’s assessments under section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA in reading or language arts and in mathematics combined; and (2) the school’s lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the “all students” group.

**E-10. For what year do applicants need to report school-level expenditure data?**

Applications must report school-level expenditure data for the most recent year for which those data are available. The Department expects that, for most LEAs, these data would be for the 2011-2012 school year. If an LEA is not yet able to report data for the 2011-2012 school year, it must report data for the 2010-2011 school year and explain why those are the most recent data available.

**E-11. What protocol should applicants follow in reporting expenditure data?**

Applicants should follow the 2011-2012 school year Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) guidelines when reporting school expenditure data. These guidelines align with the related

---

<sup>3</sup> The Department considers schools that are identified as Tier I or Tier II schools under the SIG program (see 75 FR 66363) as part of a State’s approved applications to be persistently lowest-achieving schools. A list of these Tier I and Tier II schools can be found on the Department’s Web site at [www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/index.html](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/index.html).

requirements in the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District notice. The table below provides a summary of the types of expenditures LEAs should include and exclude from their calculations. For more information, see “2011-12 CRDC Table Layouts and Definitions” (Office of Management and Budget (OMB) # 1875-0240), located at [www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/data.html](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/data.html)).

Type of Expenditure	
For All School-Level Expenditures	
Exclude	Expenditures paid from Federal funds other than Impact Aid and State Fiscal Stabilization Fund if used under the Impact Aid authority
Include	Expenditures paid from Federal Impact Aid funds and State Fiscal Stabilization Fund if used under the Impact Aid authority
Exclude	Special education
Exclude	Adult education
Exclude	School nutrition programs
Exclude	Summer school programs
Exclude	Preschool programs
Exclude	Expenditures made by regional educational agencies on behalf of schools
For Personnel Expenditures	
Include	Incentive pay and/or bonuses
Include	Supplemental pay for additional roles
Exclude	Employee benefits
For Non-Personnel Expenditures	
Include	Professional development
Include	Instructional materials/supplies
Include	Computers/software/technology
Include	Contracted services
Include	Library books/media center materials
Include	Other non-personnel expenditures (specify in comment field below)

**E-12. How does the Department distinguish between instructional and support staff? (See selection criterion (B)(2))**

The table below shows the Census Bureau’s classification of four types of school-level personnel who are involved in instructional and support functions, based on the F-33 survey of local government finances. “Instructional staff” includes teachers and instructional aides. “Support staff” includes staff who provide support services to students, staff who provide support for instructional staff, and staff involved in school administration, as described in the table below.

Instruction	Includes teachers and instructional aides
Support services – pupils	Includes guidance counselors, nurses, attendance officers, speech pathologists, and other staff who provide support services for students
Support services – instructional staff	Includes staff involved in curriculum development, staff training, and operating the library, media, and computer centers
Support services – school administration	Includes principals and other staff involved in school administration.

Source: “2011-12 CRDC Table Layouts and Definitions” (OMB # 1875-0240), located at [www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/data.html](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/data.html).

**E-13. How could an LEA demonstrate that it has made its expenditure data public beyond submitting it through the CRDC?**

Some examples of ways that an LEA could make its expenditure data public beyond submitting it through the CRDC include, but are not limited to, publishing the required CRDC data on its Web site or including a link on its Web site that leads readers to the required data on the CRDC’s Web site.

**E-14. If stakeholders send letters of support directly to the Department, can these letters be considered as part of an application? (See selection criterion (B)(4)(b))**

No. Only those letters of support that an applicant submits with its application will be considered in the review of applications.

*Preparing Students for College and Careers*

**E-15. How often must an LEA update individual student data (as part of personalized learning environments) for the updates to be considered “frequent?” (See selection criterion (C)(1)(b)(iv)(A))**

LEAs should consider the appropriate frequency of updates in consultation with teachers, principals, and, as appropriate, experts in personalized learning environments.

**E-16. What are appropriate ways for LEAs to determine students’ mastery? (See selection criterion (C)(1)(b)(iv)(A))**

LEAs may use a wide range of valid and reliable methods to determine student mastery. The Department encourages LEAs not to limit themselves to standardized summative assessments. LEAs should keep in mind that determinations of student mastery should (1) be aligned with college- and career-ready standards or college- and career-ready high school graduation requirements, (2) predict successful execution of the same competency or skill in the future, and (3) predict students’ abilities to attain subsequent competencies or skills in a scope and sequence or learning progression. Both LEA and consortia applicants should also keep in mind that determinations of mastery should be as consistent as possible across classrooms and schools.

**E-17. How should teachers serving preschool to third-grade students be identified as effective or highly effective? (See selection criterion (C)(2)(a)(iv))**

Preschool to third-grade teachers should be identified as effective or highly effective under the LEA or State's teacher evaluation system.

**E-18. What assessments of student growth of preschool to third-grade students might LEAs use in teacher or principal evaluation systems? (See selection criterion (C)(2)(a)(iv))**

In determining student growth for preschool to third-grade students, measures of student achievement should be developmentally appropriate and, to the extent possible, reflect assessments in a comprehensive assessment system (as defined in the Race to the Top Early – Learning Challenge notice: [www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2011-08-26/pdf/2011-21756.pdf](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/FR-2011-08-26/pdf/2011-21756.pdf)).

LEA Policy and Infrastructure

**E-19. What are examples of ways that LEAs could provide access to content, tools, and other resources during out-of-school time? (See selection criterion (D)(2)(a))**

In addressing the requirements of selection criterion (D)(2)(a), we would expect LEAs, working with the students and families in the community, to propose appropriate, cost-effective strategies for providing access to resources outside of the regular school day. For example, an LEA could provide students and families with access to computers, digital content, and other resources at home with a device checkout program, at a school library or community center after regular school hours, or at a reduced cost or on a sliding scale based on income. An LEA might also propose to create an online Web portal that includes academic resources based on student academic interests and needs.

**E-20. Why is it important for parents and students to have the capability to export student information in an open data format? (See selection criterion (D)(2)(c))**

Parents and students need to be able to maintain a record of school performance data just as they would maintain an immunization record or other personal information. Allowing parents and students to download their data electronically makes it possible for a parent or student to combine data from school, extracurricular activities, or online learning experiences that students may participate in on their own. These data can form the basis of electronic personal learning profiles and can inform students' personal learning plans.

**E-21. Should the data in an open data format be made available for all students in the LEA(s) or only participating students?**

Under selection criterion (D)(2)(c), the applicant creates a plan to address how its LEA(s) and school infrastructure will support personalized learning by using information technology systems that allow parents and students to export their information in an open data format (as defined in the notice) and to use the data in other electronic learning systems. Whichever students an applicant proposes to make information available for in an open data format should be consistent with its plan and reflect the unique circumstances in the LEA(s). Reviewers will judge the extent to which the applicant's plan meets this criterion.



Continuous Improvement

**E-22. How are the required performance measures different from the applicant-proposed performance measures? (See selection criterion (E)(3))**

In addition to the required performance measures detailed in selection criterion (E)(3), applicants must propose their own performance measures under selection criterion (E)(3). The Department recognizes that applicants will have different leading indicators of success and will therefore need performance measures tailored to their own proposals. For example, if an applicant is proposing to serve students from prekindergarten through grade 3 through its project, the applicant might propose as a performance measure the number and percentage of children who demonstrate at the beginning of kindergarten mastery of age-appropriate standards across multiple domains of early learning as determined using developmentally appropriate early learning measures.

Peer reviewers will use selection criteria (E)(3)(a)-(c) of the notice to evaluate required and applicant-proposed performance measures. Applicants should have a total of approximately 12-14 performance measures, including required and applicant-proposed measures.

**E-23. What data tables should applicants complete for applicant-proposed performance measures?**

For applicant-proposed performance measures, applicants should complete data tables that provide both baseline data and annual targets. Applicants should tailor the data tables to provide the most relevant and complete information for applicant-proposed measures. Peer reviewers will be looking for performance measures and annual targets that are ambitious yet achievable, and are meaningful for the applicant's proposal and for assessing implementation progress, successes, and challenges.

**E-24. What data should an LEA use for baseline data if it will not have final 2012-2013 results prior to the application deadline?**

If an LEA does not have 2012-2013 baseline data available prior to the application deadline, it may use preliminary 2012-2013 data or final 2011-2012 data. When final 2012-2013 data become available, an LEA that receives a grant will provide these updated data.

**E-25. If an application is targeting a specific grade band, does it need to have performance measures in (E)(3) for all grades?**

No. The application must include performance measures only for the participating students and schools in the plan. Therefore, if an application targets a specific grade band, only the performance measures for that specific grade band must be included.

**E-26. If applying as a consortium, should the (E)(3) performance measure tables be completed for each member LEA or may the consortia submit aggregate data and targets?**

Applicants may respond to the (E)(3) performance measure tables by submitting aggregate data and targets for the consortium or separate data and targets for each LEA within the consortium, depending on the applicant's plan.



**E-27. May an applicant respond that future targets for performance measures are “to be determined?” (See (E)(3) tables)**

The application requests that applicants identify targets for performance measures (tables in (E)(3)). Because these tables are part of selection criterion (E) Continuous Improvement, peer reviewers will examine the applicant’s targets in the context of the applicant’s proposal and will reward applicants for developing “ambitious yet achievable” targets. Additionally, as part of selection criterion (E)(3)(c), in its narrative the applicant must describe how it will review and improve performance measures over time if the applicant considers the performance measures entered in the corresponding table to be insufficient to gauge implementation progress over the course of the grant. An applicant could choose to enter “to be determined” for future targets, but applicants should understand that this decision is not fully responsive to the application’s request for “ambitious yet achievable” targets and could affect the scoring of this criterion.

**E-28. In table (E)(3)(b) should “highly effective teachers and principals” (who are included in table (E)(3)(a)) also be included when calculating the percentage for “effective teachers and principals”?**

Yes, the term “effective teachers and principals” in table (E)(3)(b) is inclusive of “highly effective teachers and principals” from table (E)(3)(a).

**E-29. Which categories of students are included in the Department’s definition of “subgroup?” (See selection criterion (E)(3))**

For the purpose of the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition, the Department defines “subgroup” as “each category of students identified under section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA and any combined subgroup used in the State accountability system that is approved by the Department in a State’s request for ESEA flexibility.” Section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA includes economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency.

***Budget and Sustainability***

**E-30. How does the Department distinguish between ongoing operational costs and one-time investments? (See selection criterion (F)(1)(c)(ii))**

Ongoing operational costs are those that grantees will need to cover during and after the grant period, whereas one-time investments are initial project costs that grantees will not need to cover after the beginning of the grant. An example of an ongoing operational cost would be personnel, whereas an example of a one-time investment would be technology infrastructure.

**E-31. Must each project budget include a funding request for each of the four years of the budget?**

No. An applicant’s FY 2013 Race to the Top – District budget request should reflect the costs and time needed to support its proposed plan. For example, if an applicant proposes to complete a project in Year 2, it is not required to request funds for this project in Years 3 or 4. An applicant should provide a justification for these requests in the narrative portion of the budget. In addition, an applicant need not allocate its total funding request evenly across each year of the budget.

**E-32. What is the start and end date for the budget periods?**

All grants will begin on the day the Department awards the grant (expected by the end of December 2013) and end four years later (December 2017). In creating budgets, grantees may choose to have four equal budget years, or may define the budget years in some other way. For example, an LEA might choose the following budget years to align with its fiscal year:

- Year 1: December 21, 2013 – September 30, 2014
- Year 2: October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015
- Year 3: October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016
- Year 4: October 1, 2016 – December 20, 2017.

This example illustrates that Year 1 may be shorter than 12 months and Year 4 may be longer than 12 months. A grantee may also choose to make Year 1 longer than 12 months and Year 4 shorter than 12 months. Applicants should indicate in their budget estimates the number of months in each budget year and the work occurring during those years.

**E-33. In preparing the Project-Level Budget Narrative using Table 4-1, what information should be included in the Total column?**

The Project-Level Budget Narrative and Table 4-1 (see pages 74-79 of the application) should include costs for each project year and across all four years of the project. Under each budget category (e.g., Personnel, Fringe, Travel, etc.) within the table, the applicant should clearly identify total costs by year, provide sufficient itemization to demonstrate how costs were calculated, and include the total costs for each item across all four years of the project. Applicants may provide this information in a single row of the table, or across multiple rows, organized by project and year.

In the example below, the Total column includes the total cost of the Project Director for each project year and the total cost of the Project Director across all four years of the project. As shown here, some expenses may not cost the same across each year of the grant, particularly contractual expenses. Therefore applicants must include the total amount for each expense by project year and over the grant period.

<b>Table 4-1: Project-Level Itemized Costs</b>					
<b>Cost Description and Justification (including whether the cost is one-time investment or ongoing operational cost)</b>	<b>Year 1 Cost</b>	<b>Year 2 Cost</b>	<b>Year 3 Cost</b>	<b>Year 4 Cost</b>	<b>Total Cost</b>
<b>1. Personnel</b> Explain the importance of each position to the success of the project and connections back to specific project plans. If curriculum vitae, an organizational chart, or other supporting information will be helpful to reviewers, attach in the Appendix and describe its location.					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Director: The Project Director will be responsible for the overall leadership and management of the Race to the Top – District Grant. The Project Director will be responsible for the day-to-day management and operations of grant activities.</li> <li>One Position: 100% FTE</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$50,000 (to ensure adequate time to hire a project director)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$75,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$75,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$75,000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>\$50,000 + \$75,000 x 3 years = \$ 275,000</li> </ul>

**E-34. How will grantees cover the costs incurred by travelling to FY 2013 Race to the Top grantee meetings?**

Grantees may pay for travel expenses to grantee meetings, such as training or technical assistance meetings, out of their FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant. While the Department has not yet finalized its specific trainings and other meetings for FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grantees, we expect that grantees will participate in several meetings each year. As the Department finalizes its meeting plans for FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grantees, it will work with grantees to make any necessary adjustments to their FY 2013 Race to the Top – District budgets.

**E-35. Where in the budget should an applicant include items such as laptops, printers, and desktop computers that it considers equipment but that cost less than \$5,000? Should these items be included under supplies or equipment?<sup>4</sup>**

In general the Department considers items with a value of less than \$5,000, such as laptops, printers, and desktop computers, to be supplies. If an LEA's capitalization policy defines these items as equipment, an applicant may include them under the equipment category in the budget. Applicants are reminded that they may not apply their indirect cost rates to equipment.

**F. General Application Requirements and Program Information**

**F-1. If an LEA does not meet a selection criterion, or does not respond to one, is it still eligible to compete for a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant?**

Yes. While each selection criterion has a point value, meeting a selection criterion is not a requirement of the competition. If an applicant does not address a selection criterion, it will not receive points for the criterion, but it will still be eligible to compete. If an applicant addresses the criterion, but does so only partially or poorly, it may receive partial or no points as determined by peer reviewers. If an applicant receives partial or no points on a criterion, it may still be awarded a grant if the overall application score is high enough. By contrast, an applicant must meet Absolute Priority 1, one of Absolute Priorities 2 through 5, the eligibility criteria, and, if awarded, the program requirements and any applicable grant conditions.

**F-2. What is an applicant's responsibility for providing its State and mayor or comparable official with an opportunity to comment on its application?**

Each LEA included in an application must provide its State at least 10 business days to comment on the LEA's application and submit as part of its application package: (a) the State's comments or, if the State declined to comment, evidence that the LEA offered the State 10 business days to comment; and (b) the LEA's response to the State's comments (optional).

Similarly, each LEA included in an application must provide its mayor or comparable official at least 10 business days to comment on the LEA's application and submit as part of its application package: (a) the mayor's or city or town administrator's comments or, if that individual declines to comment, evidence that the LEA offered such official 10 business days to comment; and (b) the LEA's response to the mayor's or city or town administrator's comments (optional).

LEAs applying as part of a consortium that are in the same State or have the same mayor or comparable official may jointly solicit comments from shared States or mayors or comparable officials.

The peer reviewers will consider comments from States and mayors or comparable officials and the applicant's optional response(s) as part of the selection criteria (B)(3) and (B)(4) during the

---

<sup>4</sup> 34 CFR 80.30 provides the following definitions:

- *Equipment* means tangible, nonexpendable, personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of \$5,000 or more per unit. A grantee may use its own definition of equipment provided that such definition would at least include all equipment defined above.
- *Supplies* means all tangible personal property other than *equipment* as defined in this part.

peer review of the application. An applicant may include any separate response statement as an appendix. We recommend that any response statements follow the relevant comments and be included in the same appendix.

**F-3. What agency or individual at the State level should provide comments on the application?**

The Department has not identified a specific agency or office within the State that must comment on a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District application. An LEA should consult its State to determine the appropriate agency or office within the State (such as the Governor’s office, SEA, or Attorney General’s office) that will comment on FY 2013 Race to the Top – District applications.

**F-4. If a State does not participate in Intergovernmental Review, must an applicant provide the State with the opportunity to comment on its FY 2013 Race to the Top – District application?**

Yes. This application requirement is separate from intergovernmental review.

**F-5. May an applicant revise its application in response to comments from the State or mayor or comparable official?**

Yes. An applicant may revise its application after it receives comments from the State or mayor or comparable official. An applicant may choose not to revise the application but rather to include a response to the State’s or mayor’s comments in the Appendix of the application. Finally, an applicant also may choose not to include any revisions or response to comments. Regardless of whether the applicant chooses to revise its application or respond to comments received from the State or mayor, the Department must receive the applicant’s final FY 2013 Race to the Top – District application by 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time on October 3, 2013.

**F-6. May a State or mayor or comparable official decline to comment on an application?**

Yes.

**F-7. If a State or mayor’s office preemptively announces that it will not comment on FY 2013 Race to the Top – District applications, must the applicant still provide the opportunity for the 10 business day comment period and submit evidence of this opportunity in its application materials?**

Yes. The State and local comment periods are application requirements; therefore an applicant must provide 10 business days for State and local comment and submit evidence of this opportunity as part of its application package. An applicant should use its discretion when determining how to include this evidence in its application. (See also FAQ F-2)

**F-8. If LEAs apply as a consortium, must each LEA in the consortium give its State or mayor or comparable official an opportunity to comment on the application?**

Yes.

**F-9. If an LEA has more than one mayor or comparable official, must the LEA give each mayor or comparable official an opportunity to comment on its application?**

Yes.

**F-10. How must LEAs applying as a consortium establish their consortium?**

For LEAs applying as a consortium, the application must indicate, consistent with 34 CFR 75.128, whether one member of the consortium is applying for a grant on behalf of the consortium (lead LEA), or whether the consortium has established itself as a separate, eligible legal entity and is applying for a grant on its own behalf. If one member of the consortium is applying for a grant on behalf of the consortium, the application must be signed by the superintendent or CEO, local school board president, and local union/association president (where applicable) of that LEA. On the other hand, if the consortium has established itself as a separate, eligible legal entity and is applying for a grant on its own behalf, a legal representative of the consortium must sign the application.

Consistent with 34 CFR 75.128, consortium applicants must also include with the application copies of all memoranda of understanding (MOUs) or other binding agreements that describe the consortium governance structure (as defined in the notice) and the individual LEA's role in the structure, as well as bind each member of the consortium to every statement and assurance made in the application. Each LEA must submit an MOU signed by the superintendent/CEO, local school board president, and local union/association president (where applicable) of that LEA. If any LEA has more than one local teacher union/association, that LEA should submit the signature from either a representative of the "exclusive agent," or a signature from the chair of a union/association roundtable.

Furthermore, the consortium application must also include an assurance signed by each LEA's superintendent or CEO. The assurance must guarantee that each LEA:

- At a minimum, will implement no later than the 2014-2015 school year, a teacher evaluation system; a principal evaluation system; and a superintendent evaluation;
- Is committed to preparing all students for college or career, as demonstrated by being located in a State that has adopted college- and career-ready standards, or measuring all student progress and performance against college- and career-ready graduation requirements;
- Has a robust data system that has, at a minimum, an individual teacher identifier with a teacher-student match and the capability to provide timely data back to educators and their supervisors on student growth;
- Has the capability to receive or match student-level preschool-through-12<sup>th</sup> grade and higher education data; and
- Disclose or provide access to personally identifiable information in students' education records in compliance with FERPA.

(See section VI of the application for program-specific assurances for consortia applicants.)

**F-11. May an LEA enter or leave a consortium receiving FY 2013 Race to the Top – District funds?**

Yes. The consortium applicant must provide a detailed consortium governance structure (as defined in the notice) that explains the protocols for consortium members to change roles within, enter, and leave the consortium.

However, significant changes to a consortium's membership could affect a grantee's ability to meet the goals in its approved application or affect the scope of a grantee's project. The Department would review and consider such changes on a case-by-case basis and they could result in partial or complete termination of the grant. A grantee must inform the Department of any substantive changes in its approved grant application, which would include changes to a consortium's membership, as soon as the grantee is aware of the changes.

**F-12. If a group of LEAs applies as a consortium, what is the grantee entity?**

As explained above in question F-10, if a group of LEAs chooses to apply as a consortium, the members must either designate one member of the group to apply for the grant on behalf of the group (lead LEA) or establish a separate, eligible legal entity to apply for the grant. In either case, the members must enter into an agreement that details the activities that each member of the group will perform and binds each member of the group to every statement and assurances made by the applicant in the application. The applicant must include in its application such a signed written agreement for each LEA in the group. For more information on applying as a consortium, please see 34 CFR 75.127-129.

If the Secretary makes a grant to a consortium, the lead LEA in the consortium is the grantee and is legally responsible for (1) the use of all grant funds, (2) ensuring that the project is carried out by the consortium in accordance with Federal requirements, and (3) ensuring that indirect cost funds are determined as required under 34 CFR 75.564(e). In addition, each member of the consortium is legally obligated to carry out the activities it agrees to perform and use any funds it receives in accordance with Federal requirements that apply to the grant.

**F-13. If one member of a consortium applies for and receives a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant on behalf of the consortium and the consortium then establishes itself as a separate legal entity, may the new entity become the grantee?**

It may be possible for the Department to implement a grant transfer after an award is made if the transfer involves only a change in the legal recipient (i.e., all other aspects of the grant remain unchanged). A grant transfer is a complex process and, before approving one, the Department would review a number of items in order to ensure that:

- The transfer does not circumvent or appear to circumvent the Department's competitive grant process;
- The need for the project or activity that existed at the time of the original award still exists;
- The terms and conditions of the transfer are acceptable to both the original grantee and the new entity;
- The new entity meets all standards of eligibility for the grant program;
- The new entity agrees to carry out future activities as specified in the original application and, if possible, keeps the same key personnel to manage the grant as were identified in the original grant;

- The new entity continues to serve the same population with the same level of service as the original grantee;
- The change is made in a timely manner; and
- No increase in funding over the original amount of the award is required.

The transfer agreement template to be completed by all parties and more details on the process for transferring a grant can be found at Appendix U to the Department's Discretionary Grant Handbook; see [www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/foia/foia-hb-01.pdf](http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/leg/foia/foia-hb-01.pdf).

**F-14. If a group of LEAs applies as a consortium, which LEA(s) may procure goods and services on behalf of the consortium?**

If a group of LEAs chooses to apply as a consortium, the members must enter into an agreement that details the activities that each member of the group will perform and binds each member of the group to every statement and assurance made by the applicant in the application. The group may specify in this agreement which LEA(s) may procure goods and services on behalf of the consortium. Applicants should ensure that all procurement arrangements comply with the relevant State laws.

**F-15. May consortia applicants involve external, non-LEA partners in their application?**

Yes. Consortia applicants may contract with external non-LEA partners to support the execution, implementation, or governance of their grant project in accordance with Education Department General Administrative Regulation (EDGAR) 80.36. Because grantees must use appropriate procurement procedures to select contractors, applicants should not include information in their grant applications about specific contractors that may be used to provide services or goods for the proposed project if a grant is awarded.

**G. Uses of Funds**

**G-1. What are the allowable uses of FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant funds and what uses of funds are prohibited?**

In general, FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant funds must be used to implement the applicant's approved FY 2013 Race to the Top – District plan, including the applicant's approved budget; the budget must be consistent with the Department's administrative regulations as well as OMB's cost principle circulars, such as A-87.<sup>5</sup> The ARRA places several restrictions on the use of FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant funds, as described below. With these exceptions, applicants have considerable flexibility in designing their plans and, therefore, have considerable discretion in determining how grant funds will be used, consistent with their approved plan, if they are awarded a grant.

As noted above, the ARRA places several restrictions on uses of Race to the Top grant funds as follows:

---

<sup>5</sup> For OMB's cost principle circulars, see [www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars).



- Section 14003 of the ARRA prohibits Race to the Top funds from being used for:
  - Payment of maintenance costs;
  - Stadiums or other facilities primarily used for athletic contests or exhibitions or other events for which admission is charged to the general public;
  - Purchase or upgrade of vehicles;
  - Improvement of stand-alone facilities whose purpose is not the education of children, including central office administration or operations or logistical support facilities; or
  - School modernization, renovation, or repair that is inconsistent with State law;
- Section 14011 of the ARRA prohibits Race to the Top funds from being used to provide financial assistance to students to attend private elementary or secondary schools, unless the funds are used to provide special education and related services to children with disabilities as authorized by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA); and
- Section 1604 of the ARRA prohibits Race to the Top funds from being used for any casino or other gambling establishment, aquarium, zoo, golf course, or swimming pool.

**G-2. May a grantee make subgrants?**

No. Grantees under the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition may not make subgrants to other entities. However, grantees may award contracts for services related to their grant activities. If multiple LEAs apply as a consortium for a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant, they may access the funds, consistent with the consortium agreement, through the LEA that serves as the fiscal agent.<sup>6</sup>

**G-3. May FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant funds be used to support early learning activities?**

Yes. The FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition includes a competitive preference priority for Results, Resource Alignment, and Integrated Services, which encourages applicants to include support for early learning programs in their overall FY 2013 Race to the Top – District plans. Consistent with those approved plans, FY 2013 Race to the Top – District funds may be used to support early learning activities.

**G-4. May private schools receive FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant funds?**

No. The statutory language authorizing funds for the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition specifically provides that States or their LEAs are the eligible applicants for FY 2013 Race to the Top funds. FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant funds may not be provided to private schools through a grant or subgrant and a private school may not be a member of a consortium, and there is no requirement that private school students, teachers, or other educational personnel participate in FY 2013 Race to the Top – District on an equitable basis (as required in some ESEA programs). Furthermore, FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant funds may not be used to provide financial assistance to students to attend private schools, although funds may be used to provide special education and related services to children with disabilities as authorized by the IDEA. However, an LEA or consortium has the flexibility to use its FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant funds to include private school students, teachers, and other educational personnel in activities that the LEA deems appropriate, and may contract with private schools for appropriate secular activities, consistent with the LEA/consortium’s plan.

---

<sup>6</sup> A consortium’s fiscal agent and lead LEA are not required to be the same entity.

**G-5. Are there “supplement, not supplant” requirements for the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grants?**

No. The FY 2013 Race to the Top – District program grant does not include “supplement, not supplant” requirements.

**G-6. May a grantee use FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant funds to pay for pre-award costs with grant funds?**

Grantees are eligible to be reimbursed for pre-award costs from the date their award is announced. All pre-award costs are incurred at the grantee’s risk (i.e., the Secretary will not reimburse costs that are unallowable, unreasonable, or otherwise ineligible according to the Department’s applicable regulations and/or OMB cost principles).

**G-7. May a grantee charge the costs it incurs in preparing its application for the FY 2013 Race to the Top competition?**

The Department has determined that direct costs charged to the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District program grant should only be incurred for substantive program activities consistent with the grantee’s proposal. For that reason, we will not permit a grantee to charge costs for preparing its application as direct costs to the program.

However, a grantee may treat costs associated with preparing its grant application, including the costs of a grant writer, as indirect costs. Specifically, OMB Circular A-87,<sup>7</sup> Attachment B, Section 33, provides that the costs of preparing proposals for potential Federal awards are allowable. Proposal costs should normally be treated as indirect costs and should be allocated to all activities of the governmental unit utilizing the cost allocation plan and indirect cost rate proposal.

**G-8. What is the difference between direct costs and indirect costs?**

OMB Circular A-87, which applies to LEAs, describes direct costs as those that can be identified specifically with a particular cost objective. The circular provides examples of typical direct costs, which include:

- Compensation of employees for the time devoted and identified specifically to the performance of those awards.
- Cost of materials acquired, consumed, or expended specifically for the purpose of those awards.
- Equipment and other approved capital expenditures.
- Travel expenses incurred specifically to carry out the award.

*See* OMB Circular A-87, Attachment A, Section E.1.

Indirect costs, by contrast, are those (a) incurred for a common or joint purpose benefiting more than one cost objective, and (b) not readily assignable to the cost objectives specifically benefitted, without effort disproportionate to the results achieved. (*See* OMB Circular A-87, Attachment A, Section F.1.) Indirect costs represent the expenses of doing business that are not

---

<sup>7</sup> For OMB’s cost principle circulars, see [www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars).

readily identified with a particular grant project function or activity, but are necessary for the general operation of the organization and the conduct of activities it performs. Indirect costs are generally administrative costs such as the salaries and expenses for staff engaged in organization-wide (general) activities. Typical indirect costs include the costs of procurement, payroll, personnel functions, maintenance and operations of space, data processing, accounting, auditing, budgeting, or communications. A cost may not be allocated as an indirect cost if any other cost incurred for the same purpose, in like circumstances, has been assigned as a direct cost.

**G-9. How may an applicant include indirect costs in its FY 2013 Race to the Top – District budget?**

An LEA or consortium of LEAs may use FY 2013 Race to the Top – District funds for indirect costs, consistent with its approved FY 2013 Race to the Top – District budget. If an LEA chooses to include such costs, it must use the current approved indirect cost rate approved by the State educational agency (SEA) in a manner consistent with 34 CFR 75.561. The indirect cost rate must be applied in accordance with the terms and procedures established by the SEA. If a grantee receives an approved indirect cost rate during the grant period different than the rate included in its originally approved budget, the grantee may request to revise its FY 2013 Race to the Top – District budget to reflect the revised rate. In cases where the revised rate is higher than the approved rate, the Department may consider allowing the grantee to shift direct costs to indirect costs in order to recover indirect costs at the higher negotiated indirect cost rate.

If multiple LEAs apply as a consortium, the indirect costs for the consortium are limited to the amount derived by applying the rate of the lead LEA (34 CFR 75.564(e)). As there is no “supplement, not supplant” requirement for FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grants, applicants may use either the unrestricted or the restricted indirect cost rate, at their discretion, when developing their FY 2013 Race to the Top – District budget.

An applicant may apply its indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of each contract on a yearly basis (subject to that being consistent with its Indirect Cost Rate Agreement), and not against the full amount of each contract.

If awarded a grant, an applicant should expect to submit verification of a valid indirect cost agreement during budget negotiations. For more information about indirect cost rates, please refer to the Department’s *Cost Allocation Guide for State and Local Governments*. This guide may be found at: [www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocfo/fipao/guideigcwebsite.pdf](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocfo/fipao/guideigcwebsite.pdf).

**G-10. May contractors charge indirect costs? For a contractor to charge indirect costs, would it first have to have an approved indirect cost rate?**

Yes, contractors (entities receiving funds via procurements from a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grantee) may charge indirect costs to their FY 2013 Race to the Top – District awards, subject to the limitations of applicable local, Federal, and State rules regarding indirect costs. If a contractor has an indirect cost rate approved by the cognizant Federal agency or by the State under a delegation agreement between the State and the cognizant Federal agency, then it must apply the approved rate. If a contractor does not have an approved indirect cost rate, the grantee must ensure that the indirect costs the contractor proposes to charge are reasonable and necessary to the contractor’s performance under the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant and comply with all applicable local, State, and Federal rules.

Grantees are responsible for ensuring that each entity to which it distributes funds charges only reasonable and allowable indirect costs to the grant. Please note that although the approved rate is the maximum rate that an entity receiving program funds may apply, it may choose to apply a lesser rate. The Department will expect grantees to regularly monitor indirect costs charged to the grant to ensure that the costs charged are reasonable and necessary to performance under the grant.

In addition, a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grantee may distribute funds through memoranda of understanding, interagency agreements, or other mechanisms authorized by State procurement laws. The same rules apply to entities that receive program funds through these means, and the grantee is still responsible for ensuring that each entity to which it distributes funds charges only reasonable and allowable indirect costs to the grant.

Please note that grantees and entities receiving program funds via procurements or other means may apply their approved or recognized indirect cost rate only against the first \$25,000 of any contract, and only under circumstances that require meaningful administrative support in distributing and handling the contracted funds.

**G-11. What must a grantee do in order to claim indirect costs under its FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant?**

Department regulations provide that each SEA, on the basis of a plan approved by the Secretary, shall approve an indirect cost rate for each LEA that requests it to do so (34 CFR 75.561). A grantee that is not an LEA, such as a consortium that has established itself as a separate legal entity, and does not already have an indirect cost rate must obtain a current indirect cost rate from its cognizant Federal agency in order to charge those costs to its grant. The cognizant Federal agency is generally the Federal department or agency providing the grantee with the most direct Federal funding subject to indirect cost support (or an agency otherwise designated by OMB).

For additional information about obtaining an approved indirect cost rate or applying for an indirect cost rate, you may contact a cost negotiator using the information provided at the following link: [www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocfo/fipao/icgreps.html](http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocfo/fipao/icgreps.html).

**G-12. If, at the time it receives its FY 2013 Race to the Top grant award, an LEA grantee does not have an indirect cost agreement from its SEA with its cognizant Federal agency, how should it go about obtaining an indirect cost agreement?**

An LEA must contact its SEA's business office to obtain information about obtaining an indirect cost rate. A consortium that establishes itself as a separate, eligible legal entity should contact the Department for further instructions on how to obtain an indirect cost rate.

**G-13. Is the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District program subject to a restricted indirect cost rate?**

No. Under 34 CFR 75.563, programs that are subject to a non-supplanting requirement must use a restricted indirect cost rate. Because the ARRA does not include a non-supplanting requirement, the Race to the Top – District program is not subject to a restricted indirect cost rate. Therefore, grantees may use either the restricted or unrestricted rate.

**G-14. May a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grantee use its grant funds to purchase real property?**

No. The ARRA and the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District notice do not authorize Race to the Top – District grantees to use grant funds for the acquisition of real property. Consistent with 34 CFR 75.533, no grantee may use its grant for acquisition of real property unless specifically permitted to do so under the authorizing statute or implementing regulations for the program.

**G-15. May an applicant use FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant funds for construction?**

An applicant may propose to use FY 2013 Race to the Top – District funds for modernization, renovation, or repair projects to the extent that these projects are consistent with implementing its proposed FY 2013 Race to the Top – District plan. As provided in section 14003 of the ARRA, an applicant may use funds under this section for construction. However, consistent with its May 11, 2009, guidance for the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund program, found at: [www2.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/guidance-mod-05112009.pdf](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/statestabilization/guidance-mod-05112009.pdf), the Department discourages applicants from using FY 2013 Race to the Top – District funds for construction.

**G-16. What rules must grantees follow regarding procurement or contracting for goods and services?**

Procurement transactions made with FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant funds must be conducted in a manner providing full and open competition, consistent with the standards in 34 CFR 80.36 and any conditions upon which the grant is made. 34 CFR 80.36 requires that grantees use their own procurement procedures (which reflect State and local laws and regulations) to select contractors, provided that those procedures meet certain standards.

Because grantees must use appropriate procurement procedures to select contractors, applicants should generally not include information in their grant applications about specific contractors that may be used to provide services or goods for the proposed project if a grant is awarded.

**G-17. May a third party procure goods or services on behalf of a grantee?**

Yes. A third party may procure services on behalf of a grantee provided that (a) doing so is consistent with the agreement between the third party and the grantee, (b) the procurement process complies with applicable Federal, State, and local procurement laws, regulations, and processes, and (c) the third party is not responsible for managing funds received under the grant.

## **H. Program Requirements**

**H-1. What are the program requirements for the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition?**

The Department of Education will monitor grantees on their implementation of these requirements once grant awards have been made. Peer reviewers will not score program requirements.

1. Budget requirements: For the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition, an applicant's budget request for all years of its project must fall within the applicable budget range as follows:

Number of participating students (as defined in the notice)	Award range
2,000-5,000 or Fewer than 2,000, provided those students are served by a consortium of at least 10 LEAs and at least 75 percent of the students served by each LEA are participating students (as defined in the notice)	\$4-10 million
5,001-10,000	\$10-20 million
10,001-20,000	\$20-25 million
20,001+	\$25-30 million

The Department will not consider an application that requests a budget outside the applicable range of awards.

2. A grantee must commit to participate in any national evaluation of the program and work with the Department and with a national evaluator or another entity designated by the Department to ensure that data collection and program design are consistent with plans to conduct a rigorous national evaluation of the program and of specific solutions and strategies pursued by individual grantees. This commitment must include, but need not be limited to—
  - (i) Consistent with 34 CFR 80.36 and State and local procurement procedures, grantees must include in contracts with external vendors provisions that allow contractors to provide implementation data to the LEA, the Department, the national evaluator, or other appropriate entities in ways consistent with all privacy laws and regulations.
  - (ii) Developing, in consultation with the national evaluator, a plan for identifying and collecting reliable and valid baseline data for program participants.
3. LEAs must share metadata about content alignment with college- and career-ready standards (as defined in the notice) and use through open-standard registries.
4. LEAs in which minority students or students with disabilities are disproportionately subject to discipline (as defined in the notice) and expulsion (according to data submitted through the Department’s Civil Rights Data Collection, which is available at <http://ocrdata.ed.gov/>) must conduct a district assessment of the root causes of the disproportionate discipline and expulsions. These LEAs must also develop a detailed plan over the grant period to address these root causes and to reduce disproportionate discipline (as defined in the notice) and expulsions.
5. Each grantee must make all project implementation and student data available to the Department and its authorized representatives in compliance with FERPA, as applicable.
6. Grantees must ensure that requests for information (RFIs) and requests for proposal (RFPs) developed as part of this grant are made public, and are consistent with the requirements of State and local law.
7. Within 100 days of award, each grantee must submit to the Department--
  - (i) A scope of work that is consistent with its grant application and includes specific goals, activities, deliverables, timelines, budgets, key personnel, and annual targets for key performance measures; and
  - (ii) An individual school implementation plan for participating schools (as defined in this notice).
8. Within 100 days of award, each grantee must demonstrate that at least 40 percent of participating students (as defined in the notice) in participating schools (as defined in the notice) are from low-income families, based on eligibility for free or reduced-price lunch subsidies under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act, or other poverty measures that LEAs use to make awards under section 1113(a) of the ESEA.

**H-2. Must a grantee employ an external evaluator to assess the effectiveness of its project?**

No. However, a grantee must cooperate in any national evaluation of the program conducted by the Department per Program Requirement 2.

**H-3. What discipline rates should applicants use when determining whether minority students or students with disabilities are disproportionately subject to discipline pursuant to program requirement 5?**

Applicants that participated in the 2009-2010 Civil Rights Data Collection (CRDC) should use discipline rates recorded in the 2009-2010 CRDC in the following tables:

SCH-0035 and SCH-0036: Table 1 – Corporal Punishment  
SCH-0035 and SCH-0036: Table 2 – Students receiving one or more in-school suspensions  
SCH-0035 and SCH-0036: Table 3 – Students receiving only one out-of-school suspension  
SCH-0035 and SCH-0036: Table 4 – Students receiving more than one out-of-school suspension  
SCH-0035 and SCH-0036: Table 5 – Expulsions with educational services  
SCH-0035 and SCH-0036: Table 6 – Expulsions without educational services  
SCH-0035 and SCH-0036: Table 7 – Expulsions under zero-tolerance policies  
SCH-0035 and SCH-0036: Table 8 – Referral to law enforcement  
SCH-0035 and SCH-0036: Table 9 – School-related arrest

Applicants that did not participate in the 2009-10 CRDC should use discipline rates they are preparing for the tables listed above for the 2011-12 CRDC.

More information on these tables is available at [http://crdc2011.org/downloads/02\\_SY\\_2011-12\\_CRDC\\_Table\\_Layouts.pdf](http://crdc2011.org/downloads/02_SY_2011-12_CRDC_Table_Layouts.pdf).

To determine disproportionality, applicants should compare the rate of disciplinary actions for minority students and for students with disabilities with the rate of such actions toward non-minority or non-disabled students, respectively, in that district.

**H-4. If an LEA is currently in an agreement with the Department’s Office for Civil Rights or currently has a plan to address disparities in its discipline or expulsion rate disparities, will it still be required to undergo a district assessment and develop a plan under program requirement 4?**

An LEA in which minority students or students with disabilities are disciplined at disproportionately high rates must examine its data and understand the underlying causes for the disparity, and from that understanding develop a plan to address these causes and reduce disproportionate discipline practices and expulsions in general. There is no single approach to assessing or addressing such disparities and their causes. If an LEA has already initiated such an effort prior to the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition, and if the LEA receives a grant, the Department will work with each grantee case-by-case to see if pre-existing efforts are sufficient or can be supplemented to address this program requirement.

**H-5. Does an applicant have to complete its assessment of disproportionate discipline and expulsion rates prior to submitting its application?**

No. The assessment is a program requirement, in other words a requirement with which an applicant must comply with if it receives an award. If an applicant receives a grant under FY



2013 Race to the Top – District, over the grant period it will conduct an assessment of disproportionate discipline and expulsion rates and develop a plan to address root causes and reduce disproportionate discipline and expulsions.

## **I. Application Submission**

### **I-1. Must applicants use the application format available on the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District Web site?**

An applicant may either use the application the Department has provided on the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District Web site ([www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district/applicant.html](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district/applicant.html)) or format its own tables and application, so long as that application looks substantially similar to the Department’s application, contains all of the same information, in the same order that it is presented in the Department’s application, and is submitted in accordance with all other requirements. An applicant may not change any of the text or language in the Department’s application. In other words, an applicant may cut and paste the text and tables from the Department’s application into its own application document, but may not change any of this information.

### **I-2. In using the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District application as a template, may an applicant delete text that does not add to the substance of the applicant’s submission?**

Yes, an applicant may choose to delete text from the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District application when it prepares its application submission. For example, an applicant may decide to delete sections of the application that provide guidance or instructions, such as Part I. Application Introduction, Instructions, and Submission Procedures, or Part XII. Definitions.

### **I-3. What is the purpose of the electronic budget spreadsheet, and where can an applicant find a copy?**

We strongly suggest that applicants use the Department’s FY 2013 Race to the Top – District electronic budget spreadsheets, instructions, and forms included in this application package to build their budgets. These electronic budget spreadsheets have formulas built into them that are intended to help applicants produce the budget tables that they submit as part of their response to selection criterion (F)(1). Applicants should include the relevant tables in the appropriate place in their proposal (e.g., by copying and pasting from the electronic budget spreadsheets into the appropriate place in the Applicant’s proposal). Also, applicants should submit the completed electronic budget spreadsheets with the rest of the application. The electronic budget spreadsheets (e.g., .XLS or .XLSX formats) will not be given to or used by peer reviewers to judge or score criterion (F)(1) but will be used by the Department during the budget review. An applicant can find the electronic budget spreadsheet on the Race to the Top – District Web site, [www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district/index.html](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district/index.html).

See FAQ I-7 for more information on the submission process.

### **I-4. Must an applicant provide original signatures in its application?**

Individual LEA applicants must submit signed originals of Parts IV, V, and VII of the application, and the applicant LEAs for a consortium application must submit signed originals of



Parts IV, VI, VII of the application and a signed memorandum of understanding from each member LEA of the consortia (as described in Part XIII of the application).

**I-5. May an applicant include signature pages electronically?**

Yes. An applicant may scan signature pages and submit them as a .PDF. If an applicant is selected to receive an award, the applicant must submit original paper copies of all signed pages before an award is made. As such, the Department recommends that when the applicant submits its application, it also include signed original paper copies of the relevant parts of the application.

**I-6. Should applicants include hyperlinks in their applications?**

No. Applicants should *not* include hyperlinks to Web sites in their applications. Reviewers will be instructed not to follow such hyperlinks. We understand that hyperlinks can be a convenient way to provide information; however, because hyperlinks can be updated after the deadline for submitting applications, they cannot be considered as part of the application.

**I-7. What file types must an applicant use in its application?**

Applicants must submit their application in electronic format on a CD or DVD, with CD-ROM or DVD-ROM preferred. We strongly recommend that the applicant submit three CDs or DVDs. Each of these three CDs or DVDs should include the following four files:

- (1) A single file that contains the body of the application narrative, including required budget tables, that has been converted into a searchable .PDF document. Note that a .PDF created from a scanned document will not be searchable;
- (2) A single file that contains all application appendices in a .PDF format;
- (3) A single file in a .PDF format that contains all of the required signature pages. The signature pages may be scanned and turned into a PDF. Consortia applicants should also include all signed MOUs or other binding agreements for each LEA in the consortium; and
- (4) A single, separate file of the completed electronic budget spreadsheets (e.g., .XLS or .XLSX formats) that includes the required budget tables and budget justifications (the spreadsheets will be used by the Department for budget reviews).

Each of these items must be clearly labeled with the LEA's or lead LEA's name, city, state, and any other relevant identifying information. Applicants also must not password-protect these files.

Additionally, please ensure that: (1) all three CDs or DVDs contain the same four files; (2) the files are not corrupted; and (3) all files print correctly. The Department is not responsible for reviewing any information that is not able to be opened or printed from your application package. In addition to the electronic files, applicants must submit signed originals of certain sections of the application. An individual LEA applicant must submit signed originals of Parts IV, V, and VII of the application. An application from a consortium of LEAs must include signed originals of Parts IV, VI, and VII of the application as well as a signed MOU from each LEA in the consortium (as described in Part XIII of the application). The Department will not review any paper submissions of the application narrative and appendices.

**I-8. Should an applicant format its application in color or in black and white?**

When the Department prints the applications for reviewers, the applications will not be printed in color. Therefore, we recommend that applicants format their applications in black and white.

**I-9. May tables be placed in the Appendix?**

An applicant may include tables either in the narrative of the application or in the Appendix. When making this determination, an applicant should consider what is most helpful for the peer reviewers. For evidence or attachments included in the Appendix, the applicant should note in the narrative the location where the information can be found and provide a table of contents for the Appendix.

**I-10. Must an applicant adhere to the recommended page limits?**

No. As stated in the application, the Department strongly recommends that applicants limit their application narrative to no more than 200 pages. This page limit is recommended, but not required.

The recommended page limit does not apply to the appendices; however we strongly recommend that you limit appendix length to the extent possible.

**I-11. What is the deadline for submitting an application to the Department?**

The Department must receive the application by 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, on or before October 3, 2013. If we receive an application after the application deadline, we will not consider that application.

**J. Application Review and Selection**

**J-1. What process will the Department follow after applications are submitted?**

The Department will screen applications that are submitted in accordance with the requirements in the notice and determine eligible applications based on whether they have met all of the eligibility requirements. All eligible applicants will be reviewed and scored by a panel of peer reviewers. The peer reviewers will come from various backgrounds and professions. The Department will thoroughly screen all reviewers for conflicts of interest to ensure a fair and competitive review process.

**J-2. What is the competition schedule?**

Applications are due October 3, 2013. The peer review will take place after the application deadline and the Department will make awards by December 31, 2013.

**J-3. Will an applicant receive its scores from the peer reviewers?**

Following the completion of the peer review process and after awards are made, each applicant will receive the comments and scores provided by the peer reviewers for its application.

**J-4. Which sections of an application and reviewer feedback will the Department make public? Will reviewers' comments for all applications be made public?**

To foster transparency and openness, the Department plans to post all successful applications and their final comments and scores on its Web site at the conclusion of the competition. Depending on the number of applications it receives, the Department might also post unsuccessful applications and their final scores. The names of the reviewers will be removed. Applicants may choose to make their applications and scores publicly available at any time.

**J-5. How will the Secretary make final decisions to award grants under the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District competition?**

The Department will develop a rank order of applications based on the peer reviewers' evaluation of their quality according to the selection criteria. In accordance with 34 CFR 75.217(c)(3), the Secretary will make final awards after considering the rank ordering and other information, including an applicant's performance and use of funds and compliance history under a previous award under any Department program. As noted in the notice, each of Absolute Priorities 2 - 5 constitutes its own funding category. Among those high-quality applications that score in the fundable range, the Secretary may separately consider applicants located in rural and non-rural LEAs, as well as applicants located in Race to the Top and non-Race to the Top grantee States.

**K. Transparency, Accountability, Reporting, and Other Obligations**

**K-1. What are the reporting requirements for the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District program?**

Each grantee receiving FY 2013 Race to the Top – District funds must submit to the Department an annual report that must include a description of its progress to date on its goals, timelines, activities, deliverables, and budgets, and a comparison of actual performance to the annual targets the grantee established in its application for each performance measure. Further, a grantee receiving funds under this program is accountable for meeting the goals, timelines, activities, deliverables, budget, and annual targets established in the application; adhering to an annual fund drawdown schedule that is tied to meeting these goals, timelines, activities, deliverables, budget, and annual targets; and fulfilling and maintaining all other conditions for the conduct of the project. The Department will monitor a grantee's progress in meeting its goals, timelines, activities, deliverables, budget, and annual targets and in fulfilling other applicable requirements. In addition, the Department may collect additional data as part of a grantee's annual reporting requirements.

To support a collaborative process between the grantee and the Department, the Department may require that applicants that are selected to receive an award enter into a written performance agreement or cooperative agreement with, or complete a scope of work to be approved by, the Department. If the Department determines that a grantee is not meeting its goals, timelines, activities, deliverables, budget, or annual targets or is not fulfilling other applicable requirements, the Department will take appropriate action, which could include a collaborative process between the Department and the grantee, or enforcement measures with respect to this grant, such as placing the grantee in high-risk status, putting it on reimbursement payment status, or delaying or withholding funds.

An LEA that receives a FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grant must also meet the reporting requirements for the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA) for

subaward and executive compensation data. More specific information regarding the FFATA reporting requirements is in K-2 below.

**K-2. What are the reporting requirements under the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA)?**

For new Federal grants awarded as of October 1, 2010, if the initial award is equal to or more than \$25,000, reporting of subaward and executive compensation data under FFATA is required. Grantees, referred to as “prime awardees,” must report using the FFATA Subaward Reporting System (FSRS), and must, therefore, register in FSRS. The key FFATA data reporting elements are: name of entity receiving award; amount of award; funding agency; Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) program number for grants; program source; award title; and location of the entity. To facilitate subaward reporting, the prime awardee must report information related to a subaward by the end of the month following the month the subaward or obligation was made. Similarly, the prime awardee must report the subawardee’s executive compensation data by the end of the month following the month the award or obligation was made. Additional information about FFATA reporting is available on the FSRS Web site at: [www.fsr.gov/](http://www.fsr.gov/), which includes links to FFATA FAQs and OMB Guidance on FFATA.

Unlike Phase 1 and Phase 2 grantees under the Race to the Top State competition, FY 2013 Race to the Top – District grantees do not need to meet the reporting requirements that apply to ARRA-funded programs, such as quarterly reports under section 1512(c) of the ARRA (ARRA Division A, section 1512(c)).

**K-3. Does the receipt of FY 2013 Race to the Top – District funds require recipients to comply with Federal civil rights laws?**

Yes. States receiving Federal FY 2013 Race to the Top – District funds must comply with Federal civil rights laws that prohibit discrimination based on race, color, national origin, sex, disability, and age.

**L. Resources and Information**

**L-1. What technical assistance will the Department offer to prospective applicants?**

The Department will provide application technical assistance webinars to provide information regarding the notice and the application itself and answer questions from potential applicants. The Department will post information about participating in these technical assistance webinars on the Department’s Web site at: [www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district/index.html](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district/index.html).

**L-2. Where can one obtain updated information or answers to questions or raise additional questions about the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District program?**

The Department will post updated information about the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District program on the Department’s Web site at: [www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district/index.html](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-district/index.html).

You may submit specific questions about the FY 2013 Race to the Top – District program to the following email address: [2013.racetothetop.district@ed.gov](mailto:2013.racetothetop.district@ed.gov). From time to time, we will update this document with relevant questions and answers.