



# Race to the Top

## Technical Review Form - Tier 2

### Kentucky Application #3000KY-1



**A. State Success Factors**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it</b>	65	62	63	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	4	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	45	45	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	13	13	
<b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
<p>Applicant became nationally recognized in 1990 with the landmark Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA). The Reform Act was significant in addressing funding inequities for education and the establishment of common set of state curriculum standards and an assessment and accountability system tied to new standards. Applicant's reform efforts have continued over the past 20 years and passage of Senate Bill 1 in 2009 provides evidence of a continued comprehensive reform agenda and strategies to deliver globally competitive levels of student achievement. Applicant has secured binding agreements for 100% of 174 LEAs in support of implementation of all parts of RTT plans. Mandated collective bargaining is not part of state law. The comprehensive endorsement of ALL LEAs ensures statewide impact of RTT reform agenda and student achievement expectations that is further outlined in application.</p>				
<b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)</b>				
<p>Applicant's state presentation provided a greater understanding of the systemic nature of their past and present reform agenda and how systemically it parallels their RTT application.</p>				
<b>(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans</b>	30	26	26	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	17	17	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	9	9	
<b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
<p>Applicant will expand its implementation efforts beyond current Eight Regional Service Centers which will increase its capacity to deliver expanded services to LEAs by redesign of Department of Education. This redesign will include a Race to the Top management office and the formation of 6 cross-functional Work Teams that will be responsible for engaging organizations, key state partners and postsecondary institutions. Applicant has demonstrated significant collaboration over the years between Department of Education and Senate and House. Examples include KERA, Senate Bill 1 and House Bill 176. Applicant's strategy to develop broad stakeholder support is evident in the number of constituencies that were involved with Race to the Top Advisory Council meetings. This support will be valuable in the implementation stages of the plan.</p>				

<b>(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22</b>	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4	4	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	18	18	
<b>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
<p>Applicant has made documented progress throughout this application in all four education reform areas. Noteworthy, is the work that has been influenced by nationally recognized curriculum and assessment consultant on "Leading Professional Development in Classroom Assessment for Learning" across the state and the creation of a comprehensive Statewide Longitudinal Data System (SLDS). Applicant's student learning outcomes data indicate some mixed achievement gap results but there are overall positive trend improvements in NAEP proficiency data and increases in graduation and college enrollment rates that validate current reform efforts. However, additional capacity building among the LEAs must occur to meet student achievement expectations.</p>				
<b>Total</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>111</b>	

**B. Standards and Assessments**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20	20	
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20	20	
<b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
<p>Applicant passed Senate Bill 1 in 2009 that included state adoption of new Common Core standards in 7 subjects aligned to a balanced assessment system. Applicant was one of first states to join Common Core Standards Consortium (48 states). Applicant's Common Core adoption is scheduled in February, 2010, several months in advance of criterion's deadline. Senate Bill 1 provides comprehensive and purposeful positive direction for the adoption and the implementation of the internationally benchmarked Common Core Curriculum that is aligned to college entry requirements, professional learning sessions around the new standards and integration of standards into teacher and principal preparation programs.</p>				
<b>(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9</b>	
<b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
<p>Applicant has impressively committed participation in 4 consortiums to support the development of a balanced assessment system that supports the Common Core Standards: Consortium Developing Balanced Assessments (30 states); SMARTER Consortium (18 states); MOSAIC Consortium (24 states); and RTT Common Assessment Consortium (12 states).</p>				
<b>(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>20</b>	
<b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
<p>Applicant has outlined Standards Roll-out and Professional Development Plan for deployment of Senate Bill 1. In addition, state has adopted, invested and implemented Classroom Assessment for Student Learning framework which provides teachers with a solid foundation of assessment literacy that will support transition</p>				

to new standards and balanced assessments. Applicant will need to address variance in capacity across LEAs as it continues to build upon teacher and administrator networks and incorporate virtual e-learning services communication options that will provide the needed support for the implementation of the Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (CIITS)

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

Applicant's description of the comprehensive plan for their Statewide Longitudinal Data System provided a greater understanding of how it provides access and support for classroom teachers in their day to day work and their professional development.

Total	70	67	69	
-------	----	----	----	--

**C. Data Systems to Support Instruction**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system</b>	24	24	24	

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant began the development of a statewide longitudinal data system in 2006 which has resulted in implementation of all 12 America COMPETES Act elements. It would be helpful if Applicant could provide additional details for elements 4 and 12.

<b>(C)(2) Accessing and using State data</b>	5	5	5	
--	---	---	---	--

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Since 1992 every school system has received student achievement data broken out by demographic groups. Applicant has recently integrated its data systems into a statewide data warehouse that anchors an expanded Statewide Longitudinal Data System (KY SLDS) which will include for the first time an integrated a P-20 Collaborative. The foundation infrastructure now in place will, in the future, enable data for the first time to go beyond district access to be readily accessible to principal and teachers. The availability of this data at the school level will be significantly beneficial and supportive of continuous school improvement efforts.

<b>(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction</b>	18	16	17	
---	----	----	----	--

**(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Applicant's concept of "assessment for learning" has ability to put key information and resources into the hands of direct-line stakeholders, teachers and principals takes using data to improve instruction to a new and significant level. Applicant's Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (CIITS) provides a "one stop shop" support system for professionals to access: curriculum resources, assessment resources, instructional resources, professional learning resources and school improvement resources.

**(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

Applicant's presentation created a greater understanding of the power of the one stop access the classroom teacher has to the comprehensive Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System.

Total	47	45	46	
-------	----	----	----	--

**D. Great Teachers and Leaders**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
--	-----------	--------	--------	------

<b>(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>19</b>	
<b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> Applicant has 7 defined alternative routes for administrator and teacher certification, including inclusion of providers operating independently of higher education institutions. Each option includes each of 5 criteria in the definition of alternative certification routes. During 2009-2010 school year 17% of new teachers came through alternative routes.				
<b>(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>52</b>	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	5	5	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	13	13	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	8	8	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	26	26	
<b>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> Applicant has restructured current performance evaluation system and with support of nationally recognized consultant, Richard Elmore, has created a comprehensive system of accountability and performance evaluation that incorporates authentic growth models which include measures of student learning for evaluation and development. However, this new system is dependent on an effective balanced assessment system and technology support (CIITS) that will enable professionals to develop an electronic "efficacy portfolio" that will be integral to their growth model evaluation process. The language is not clear that evaluations will occur annually. However, evaluations will have a continuum of proficiency levels. The assessment results from the growth model system will provide key data input to analyze effectiveness of teacher and administrator preparation programs and to provide more significant information in decisions regarding granting professionals tenure. Applicant might expand on implementation strategies for this bold initiative will help gather a critical mass of support and capacity building throughout state.				
<b>(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22</b>	
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	14	14	
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	8	8	
<b>(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> Applicant's recent Highly Qualified Summary Report impressively shows that teachers in high-poverty and high-minority schools are present in over 98% of the courses which, in fact, is at a higher rate than other schools. The new Growth Model Evaluation System will provide teacher and administrator performance effectiveness data that will go beyond the seat time NCLB definition of "highly qualified" and yield even better support in providing effective teachers in high-poverty or high-minority schools.				
<b>(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	
<b>(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> Applicant will develop a next generation Kentucky Educator Preparation Program report card that provides evaluative criteria on statewide teacher and principal preparation programs. The restructured report card will				

now have access to data from the new Growth Professional Evaluation System that will elevate the quality of this report.

<b>(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals</b>	20	18	18	
<b>(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> Applicant will revise their current approach to professional learning options for professionals and provide expanded opportunities for teacher and administrator development through a system of eight regional networks and virtual learning communities. More details would be helpful describing the professional development focus for capacity building at the LEA level in data-based instructional decision making.				
<b>Total</b>	138	123	123	

**E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs</b>	10	8	8	
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> Applicant's Revised Statute 160.346 enables Department of Education to intervene in persistently low-achieving schools and determine intervention direction from continuum of intervention programs. During the past several years over 600 schools received state intervention and have been held accountable for school improvement. In 2008, the Assist and Support School Improvement Success Teams Program was created. However, applicant acknowledges that present efforts have yielded incremental results that are not sufficient for these schools to meet future state student learning expectations. Therefore, applicant has increased its commitment and expectations with a new more centralized program for identified Educational Recovery Schools that will become part of state District 180, a Department of Education realignment program, that will provide school audits which will determine what schools will receive expanded educational recovery services.				
<b>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</b>	40	34	34	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	4	4	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	30	30	
<b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> Applicant will provide expanded support through Centers for Learning Excellence which will serve as intermediaries between the Department's District 180 team which will target selected schools through an audit process and identify them for special support as Educational Recovery Schools. Applicant's plan is well presented and creative. Applicant provides flexibility in choice option for models. Applicant's SAM support system is a sound practical idea. Applicant's increased commitment to expanding partnership with Teach America will provide additional quality educators for these schools.				
<b>Total</b>	50	42	42	

**F. General**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
--	-----------	--------	--------	------

<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	10	8	8	
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> Applicant's funding of public education in the last 2 financially challenged years has bucked the national state-wide trend that has resulted in funds for public education being cut. In 2009 46.5% of total state revenues were dedicated to education as compared to 43.6% of revenues in 2008. Applicant has a successful track record for equitable state funding of education across state through adopted funding formula that is part of the Support Education Excellence in Kentucky (SEEK) Program which ensures schools in high-need receive higher proportional funding than low-need schools.				
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	40	10	8	
<b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> Applicant has 174 LEAs, 144 (83%) have only one high school and 134 (77%) have only one middle school. As a result of the state's rural nature, debate regarding charter schools has received minimal attention (outside of Jefferson County) in Kentucky. Applicant makes a case that they have developed a "charter-like" structure that has created an environment for all public schools to become innovative and autonomous through the establishment of a school-based decision making (SBDM) form of school governance. Applicant make no mention of changing SBDM model.				
<b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)</b> Applicant clarified that there are no plans in the future for charter school legislation. However, the applicant's ability to operate innovative, autonomous public schools was reinforced.				
<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	5	4	4	
<b>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> Applicant notes several reform conditions beyond the inception of KERA in 1990. They include: Partnership with Wallace Foundation, universal administration of the ACT, landmark Senate Bill 1, and Kentucky Center for School Safety.				
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>20</b>	

**Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	15	15	15	
<b>Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> Applicant initiated a STEM Task Force in 2007 that produced a comprehensive plan, Kentuck's STEM Imperative - Competing in the Global Economy that has created a vision and has provided direction for state's STEM initiative. Applicant currently has several STEM programs in place that create increased access to a rigorous STEM driven culture. Noteworthy examples of programs are Advance Kentucky, nationally recognized Project Lead The Way, UTeach, regional Science Centers and Math and Science partnerships.				
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	

**Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		Yes	Yes	
<p><b>Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>                      Applicant has clearly communicated its commitment and actions in addressing all of the education reform areas. Clearly stated are plans for the adoption of internationally benchmarked standards and assessments. Clearly stated are the establishment of a professional evaluation program that will include performance-based student growth and achievement indicators as part of the evaluation criteria for teachers and principals that is supported by statewide longitudinal data warehouse system. Clearly stated are the expanded efforts of a comprehensive approach to improve practices and results in low-achieving schools.</p> <p><b>Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)</b>                      Dr. Holliday's response to the question of how high school students and classrooms will be different in five years as a result of embracing the four components of the RTT program demonstrated the quality of his significant leadership in making comprehensive school reform happen and the accountability he puts upon himself to make it happen.</p>				
<b>Total</b>		0	0	
<b>Grand Total</b>	500	424	426	



# Race to the Top

## Technical Review Form - Tier 2

### Kentucky Application #3000KY-2



**A. State Success Factors**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>65</b>	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	45	45	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	15	15	

**(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Kentucky has a long term and comprehensive plan that focuses on teacher development. The plan builds on strengths developed over the past 20 years of innovative and comprehensive school reform. There is a strong fit between the ARRA areas of educational reform and Kentucky's vision for the future. Kentucky is to be commended for gaining 100% commitment from its 174 LEAs and 153 teacher associations. Accompanying letters of support from the state teachers' and school administrators' associations are also exceptionally supportive. Since there is across-the-board support, the potential for statewide impact is very likely. The state's goals are ambitious and clearly focused on increasing student learning and achievement. Kentucky has a very positive track record of school reform.

<b>(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	20	20	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	10	10	

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Kentucky is in the process of redesigning its Department of Education. Six work teams have been formed to work on standards, assessments, professional learning, teacher effectiveness, a statewide longitudinal data system, and school improvement and school turnaround. The work will be done through networks and collaboration with regional cooperatives, universities and LEAs. Management systems following the principles of total quality management are in place. Budget streams align to work group areas of responsibility. Stakeholder support is exceptionally strong. Since there is 100% across-the-board support, the potential for statewide impact is very likely.

<b>(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>25</b>	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5	5	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	20	20	

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Kentucky has made significant progress in each reform area. Kentucky will be the first state to adopt the Common Core Standards. It has also made significant progress in the area of classroom assessment based upon the work of Rick Stiggins. Working with the Wallace Foundation it has redesigned all principal preparation programs and Masters programs for teachers. Recently the state has increased its "aggressiveness" in working with low performing schools. The state has a history of successful interventions. Student outcomes on NAEP and ESEA assessments at the fourth and eighth grade levels in mathematics have steadily improved. Progress in Reading has been less dramatic and somewhat flat. Achievement gaps persist and results are mixed. Graduation rates and college enrollments have steadily risen.

Total	125	120	120	
-------	-----	-----	-----	--

**B. Standards and Assessments**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards</b>	40	40	40	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20	20	
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20	20	

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The passage of SB 1 in 2009 has paved the way for the statewide adoption of the new Core Common Standards in consortium with 51 states and territories. Kentucky will roll out the standards in February, 2010.

<b>(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments</b>	10	10	10	
--	----	----	----	--

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

There is bipartisan commitment to a new balanced assessment system. Kentucky has worked with 4 consortia to develop assessment tools for evaluating the CCSs. The consortia are: 1) State Consortium Developing Balanced Assess (30 states); 2) Summative Multi State Assessment Resources for Teachers and Educational Researchers (SMARTER) (18 states); 3) Multiple Options for Student Assessment and Instruction Consortium (24 states); and 4) Race to the Top Assessment Consortium (12 states).

<b>(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments</b>	20	20	20	
--	----	----	----	--

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Kentucky has a high quality and detailed plan for transitioning to a balanced assessment system. It builds on existing strengths as well as many new and exciting initiatives. The state has very specific goals and activities identified to make the adoption and implementation process a reality. Kentucky has broad based stakeholder support, outside experts, established learning networks, regional education cooperatives, universities, and LEAs all moving in the same direction to roll out its new assessment strategies.

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

The state presentation left some concerns regarding the training and implementation of PLCs. The state will need to focus on implementation and fidelity to a well designed professional development process to ensure consistency and rigor across the state.

Total	70	70	70	
-------	----	----	----	--

**C. Data Systems to Support Instruction**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system</b>	24	20	20	
<b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> Kentucky's SLDS includes 10 out of 12 America Competes Act elements. Elements 4 & 12 appear to not be fully implemented.				
<b>(C)(2) Accessing and using State data</b>	5	5	5	
<b>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> With a foundational SLDS now in place, the emphasis will shift to access and usage by teachers, principals and superintendents. Professional development will focus on how to use the technology to access longitudinal data and on how to use this data to improve student learning. These goals are clearly focused and achievable.				
<b>(C)(3) Using data to Improve Instruction</b>	18	18	18	
<b>(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> The state will focus on building practitioner capacity and comfort levels with accessing and using data to improve what's happening in classrooms. A key goal is to provide teachers with "rapid-time" data. The state will build an online platform that will put key information and resources into the hands of practitioners. This platform is referred to as the Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (CIITS). It will allow practitioners to develop classroom assessments, conduct interim benchmark assessments, and monitor annual accountability testing. It will provide a wide range of tools pertaining to instructional strategies such as videos of highly effective lessons, grade books, electronic portfolios, etc. Finally it will provide a means for teacher growth through the housing of electronic portfolios, teaching observations, self-reflections, performance tasks, scores on various rubrics, etc. CIITS will be a "one stop shop" for teachers' professional needs. Finally higher education will be included in the development and piloting phases of CIITS. Researchers will have access to this rich database to study what works best in improving classroom practice.				
<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>43</b>	

**D. Great Teachers and Leaders**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals</b>	21	21	21	
<b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> Kentucky allows 7 alternative pathways to certification for both teachers and principals. These pathways are in use and are clearly supported by state laws, statutes, and regulations. There is a clear list of the 7 alternative pathways and a description of what each means. 10% of current teachers chose an alternative pathway, 17% of this year's teachers with no previous experience chose an alternative pathway. By far the most popular route is university based in which students take classes and are concurrently employed as teachers. Monitoring for shortages is completed at the district level. Kentucky also encourages and recruits innovative programs like Teach for America, Teach Kentucky, and U Teach, along with innovative Higher Education programs into its rural areas. Alternative pathways such as these greatly help in filling critical shortage areas.				

<b>(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>49</b>	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	5	5	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	15	15	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	8	8	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	21	21	

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Measuring student growth is well grounded in the belief that multiple measures of student learning must be considered. Fundamentally growth is defined as the increases in the number of relevant standards that the student has mastered. Artifacts can take many forms including benchmark and annual assessments, student exhibitions, pre and post assessment data, portfolios, and developmental scales in reading and math. To further balance the assessment program, formative classroom assessments for learning will be considered in measuring student growth and teacher effectiveness. The state is to be commended for developing a balanced assessment approach that requires both assessments of and for learning. Many creative and thoughtful ideas are offered for the development of new evaluation systems. The renewed emphasis on looking for multiple data sources to judge student growth is paramount. Teachers will be viewed as professionals in charge of their own professional development through collecting and reporting evidence of their own effectiveness in terms of student learning to their principals. An electronic portfolio will be employed. Also customized observation and feedback protocols will be developed. Each district will have the option of using a statewide instrument or developing their own assuming it meets reliability and validity criteria. The VAL ED model, developed at Vanderbilt University is being piloted to provide principals with 360-degree feedback from their teachers, supervisor and themselves as to how they are performing in areas linked to the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. The School Administrator Manager (SAM) program is also another creative means to free up principals so that they can become instructional leaders. A new evaluation system will be rolled out during the 2011-12 school year. Career options and responsibilities will be offered with a differentiated pay schedule. The state describes that all teachers will have authentic performance assessments on an annual basis. The current system with annual evaluations for new teachers and every three years for tenured teachers will remain in place. "Annual authentic performance assessments" is not clear or described in enough detail to judge whether it meets the intent of RTTT requirements calling for annual evaluations. Superintendents and principals will be able to make informed decisions about hiring, removal, compensation and professional development because of a rich database and enhanced accessibility. Differentiated pay for assuming career ladder like responsibilities include teacher leadership, working in high poverty and/or high minority schools, teaching in shortage areas, and national board certification. Professional development opportunities center around enhanced internships and learning opportunities with universities.

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

Annual authentic performance assessment (formative) is an important outcome, but should not supplant annual (summative) evaluations for all teachers.

<b>(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>17</b>	
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	10	10	
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	7	7	

**(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Kentucky has met targets for the distribution of highly qualified teachers. Now as the emphasis shifts to highly effective teachers, there are goals in place and plans to invite LEAs to pilot programs that ensure the equal distribution of highly effective teachers. What's learned from these pilots will be crafted into a more comprehensive plan in the future. The state also realizes that working conditions in high poverty/minority schools will need to be improved. It also realizes that it needs to work on changing teacher beliefs about school success factors. There is not a great deal of discussion about attracting teachers into critical shortage areas or subjects. A couple of creative ideas surfaced having to do with using "mobile" teachers on a regular basis to teach classes in schools with shortages and to use "Educational Recovery Specialists" in low performing schools. Finally, the application mentions the recruitment of Teach for America, Teach Kentucky and innovative higher education programs into rural areas.

<b>(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	
<b>(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> The state has a clear and actionable plan to link teacher and principal effectiveness to their preparation programs. This approach will help LEAs in making informed hiring decisions and also force preparation programs to make changes as needed or see their enrollments plummet. Simply measuring preparation program effectiveness will not necessarily make the program more effective. Supporting and expanding successful programs will lead to effectiveness.				
<b>(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	
<b>(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> Kentucky has a very thoughtful and creative plan for supporting its teachers and principals. The plan is tightly coupled to RTTT priorities. The plan is decentralized through statewide networks, regional centers, cooperatives and local district teams. Yet, the plan has strong input and direction from the state in that it makes recommendations and offers guidelines that are research based and nicely linked to the components of RTTT. The focus will be on job embedded professional learning rather than the old state requirement of 24 hours of yearly professional development. It will also nicely use the state's SLDS and CITS data systems. The creation of a residency model in undergraduate teacher education looks very promising. Moving from a 12-week clinical experience to a two-year residency with an effective teacher makes great sense.				
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>117</b>	

**E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools**

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>	<b>Tier 2</b>	<b>Init</b>
<b>(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> Kentucky has the legal and statutory authority to intervene in its persistently low performing school and school districts.				
<b>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	
<b>(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	
<b>(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>35</b>	

**(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The state has an exciting and innovative plan to turnaround its persistently low achieving schools. It reflects the models specified in RTTT. The state has a history of working with needy schools and has some noteworthy successes over the years. The states new plan is a leap forward. Building on its experiences with intervention teams, a new model or design has emerged. The model begins with the state identifying a school in need of assistance. The school is designated a Recovery School. Next an intermediary state group, District 180, conducts an extensive audit of the schools challenges and strengths and creates an action plan for its improvement. A regional educational center follows up with the requisite support e.g. providing an Educational Recovery Leader, a Team of Educational Recovery Specialists, and numerous professional development activities that are job embedded within the context of a professional learning community. The state will also place a School Administration Manager (SAM) in each of its identified schools. This manager will take care of managerial operations so that the Recovery Team Leader can focus solely on instructional leadership. The district will identify a "principal in waiting" and place him or her in the school as preparation to become the regular principal once the intervention has been fully implemented. Succession in leadership is one of the most significant factors in sustaining school reform and Kentucky's plan for a smoothe transition is truly exemplary.

**(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

Because of its rural nature Kentucky will in most cases (by default) choose the transformational model when intervening in its lowest achieving schools. Larger districts will have more options and decisions will be made in consultation between the SEA and LEA.

<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	
--------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	--

**F. General**

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>	<b>Tier 2</b>	<b>Init</b>
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> The percentage of total revenue used to support education grew by 2.9% between 2008 and 2009. State policies and budgeting formulas lead to equitable school funding.				
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	
<b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> Kentucky has no charter school law. The state facilitates site-based decision-making and school autonomy. As mentioned in the application, the state has been viewed as a pioneer in school reform and innovation for many years, but receives no points because it has no charter school law.				
<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	
<b>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> Kentucky's reform agenda dates back to 1990. The conditions for reform are very favorable. Numerous innovative ideas flow through out this application. The application is inspiring and a real learning opportunity for the nation to discover all of the creative and thoughtful ideas Kentucky has put forth to advance its school reform agenda.				
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>23</b>	

**Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	15	0	0	
<b>Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
A great number of STEM related ideas and initiatives are mentioned throughout the application. What appears to be lacking is an overall design process for implementing them. Participants will need to clearly know the basic purposes of STEM related activities. They will need to have a picture of what it will look like if STEM outcomes are realized and they will need a step by step action plan for getting there. Finally, participants need to know what their roles will be in implementing the various STEM initiatives.				
<b>Total</b>	15	0	0	

**Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		Yes	Yes	
<b>Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
The application comprehensively and coherently addresses all four of the reform area specified in the ARRA. State success factors demonstrate a very strong commitment from stakeholder groups and a well conceived plan to make school reform happen.				
<b>Total</b>		0	0	
<b>Grand Total</b>	500	423	423	



# Race to the Top

## Technical Review Form - Tier 2



Kentucky Application #3000KY3

### A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>65</b>	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	45	45	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	15	15	

**(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

(A)(1)(i) The applicant describes a coherent and comprehensive state reform agenda addressing all four ARRA improvement areas – standards and assessment (Involvement in the Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSSI) and the American Diploma Project (ADP), as well as multiple common assessment consortia; applying for Race to the Top (RTTT) assessment grants); data systems (integrating the State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) and other education and related data into a single data system, Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (CIITS), with secure levels of access for a variety of stakeholders); teachers and leaders (using detailed evaluation systems incorporating student data to identify areas of need and deliver targeted professional development, as well as revamping the state's tenure and dismissal models); and low-performing schools (coherent plan to address low-performing schools combining resources from RTTT, School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds, and state funds). The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (5 points) (A)(1)(ii) The applicant includes, as Appendix E, the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) detailing the scope of work, key roles and responsibilities of the state and the participating Local Education Agency (LEA), state recourse for LEA non-performance, and assurances. The MOU is sound and comprehensive, fulfilling the requirements of this criterion. All of the state's 174 LEAs have signed binding agreements of participation. Further, 100% of participating LEAs will implement every part of the state plan. Finally, the applicant indicates that 100% of the participating LEAs have provided all three requested signatures: the LEA Superintendent; the President of the Local School Board; and the local Teacher's Union Leader (100% of the 153 applicable LEAs). Since all participating LEAs have signed comprehensive MOUs, agreed to implement all parts of the state plan, and provided all three requested signatures, the applicant earns full points on this criterion. (45 points) (A)(1)(iii) The applicant indicates that all of the state's 174 LEAs will be participating in the grant. Therefore, the "participating LEAs" represent 100% of the state's LEAs, schools, K-12 students, and students in poverty in the state. So, if the participating LEAs meet the grant requirements, this will translate into universal statewide impact, including high-need students. The applicant specifies ambitious yet achievable state targets for increasing student achievement (as measured on state assessments and NAEP), decreasing achievement gaps between student subgroups, increasing high school graduation rates, and increasing college enrollment and completions. The state clearly plans to work on these goals whether or not it receives RTTT funds; the goals were set by the state for 2020, and the applicant provides "interim" goals for 2014 for the purposes of the RTTT application. In addition, the applicant indicates that without RTTT funds, the target timelines would be modified, but the goals would remain the same. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (15 points)

<b>(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	20	20	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	10	10	

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

(A)(2)(i) The applicant indicates that the Kentucky Department of Education has recently undergone a restructuring process that will assist in the coordination of its RTTT plans. The Department has been organized into the following six topical workgroups: Standards; Assessments; Professional Learning; Teacher Effectiveness; Kentucky Statewide Longitudinal Data System; and School Improvement and School Turnaround. The names of these workgroups clearly indicate their areas of responsibility, as well as demonstrate their alignment to the reform areas of the RTTT application. The applicant further indicates that the state is in the process of recalibrating its relationship with its districts, aiming to be a collaborative partner in reform. The state will provide significant leeway to its LEAs in innovations, reward LEAs monetarily with state funds for particularly effective practices, provide support through regional structures already in place, and hold LEAs responsible for progress and performance. The applicant indicates that the Kentucky Department of Education has an established protocol for grant administration and budget oversight. The applicant presents a budget, as Appendix G, both as an overview and broken down by project area, with detail for each project including categories and amounts of funding, justification for dollars requested, and timelines for completion of each of the sub-goals within each project area. The project goals and funding are aligned with the state goals described in the narrative of the application. In addition, the applicant indicates that other federal, state, and foundation dollars will be allocated to the RTTT priorities, allowing the state to make greater progress in each reform area than with RTTT funds alone. Finally, the applicant explains that the RTTT goals are part of a statewide twenty year strategic agenda. The four years of RTTT funding are expected to form a critical part of the agenda, but the agenda and its goals have been designed with longer-term sustainability in mind, including federal, state, and foundation resource allocation to priority areas. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (20 points)

(A)(2)(ii) The applicant has already indicated that the teacher's union representative in every applicable participating LEA has signed the district MOU, a significant achievement signaling practitioner buy-in at the district level. In addition, the applicant not only includes letters of support from the 14 members of the Kentucky Race to the Top Advisory Council, but indicates that the group met regularly to develop the current proposal. The Advisory Council represents a variety of constituency groups, including: multiple state agencies, legislative groups, teachers, principals, superintendents, school boards, school councils, educational cooperatives, parents, businesses, community organizations, and civil rights organizations. The applicant includes an additional 10 letters of support, including six from state universities, demonstrating the buy-in and commitment of the postsecondary sector to the state's RTTT goals. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (10 points)

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

The presence of both the Kentucky Commissioner of Education, Dr. Terry Holiday, and the Vice President of the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education (KCPE), Dr. Aaron Thompson, on the state panel of presenters provide a strong indication of cross-sector coordination in development, and support for implementation, of the state RTTT plan. In addition, the Executive Director of the Kentucky Education Association (KEA), Mary Ann Blankenship, was both present on the panel and made a strong statement of support for the state RTTT plan during the question and answer period, underscoring the strength of the support of the state's teachers' union for Kentucky's plan.

<b>(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5	5	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	15	15	

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

(A)(3)(i) The applicant describes progress made in the state in all four reform areas, and the source of funds used to drive that progress. In standards and assessment, the state used Federal American Recovery and Re-investment Act (ARRA) funds and state funds over many years to develop a strong system of statewide standards and assessments, which will now be revised based on the Common Core standards. In data systems, the state has used two rounds of Institute for Educational Sciences (IES) State Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) grants to make incredible progress in developing the state data system, with more improvements to follow. In teacher and leader effectiveness, the state has used foundation and state funding to develop new pathways to teacher and principal preparation and certification, as well as provide instructional supports to educators statewide. In school turnaround, the state used Title I School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds to develop and implement models of school turnaround that have shown remarkable levels of success. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (5 points) (A)(3)(ii) The applicant provides data in the narrative and in Appendix O that demonstrates that overall, the state's students have seen increases in 4th and 8th grade achievement levels in math, with flat levels of achievement in reading, since 2003. These increases hold for NAEP results and the state ESEA assessment. High school graduation rates and college enrollment rates have also increased among all subgroups since 2003. However, gaps between subgroups in achievement and graduation rates remained nearly constant since 2003. The applicant describes the inherent difficulty in connecting student achievement data to specific interventions, but provides some indication of the connection between data and state work in each area. The applicant earns 15 points on this criterion. (15 points)

Total		125	115	115	
-------	--	-----	-----	-----	--

## B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards</b>	40	39	39	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	19	19	
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20	20	

### (B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(B)(1)(i) The applicant is a member of the Common Core State Standards Initiative (CCSSI), a consortium of 51 states and territories to design a common set of K-12 standards that are internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness by high school graduation. Since the consortium includes a majority of the States in the country, the applicant receives "high" points for this criterion. In addition, the applicant provides most of the evidence requested in this criterion, in the form of: a signed Memorandum of Agreement documenting their participation in the consortium (Appendix P); a copy of the draft standards and anticipated date of completion (Appendices R, S, T, U, V and W); and a list of the states that are participating in the consortium (Appendix Q). However, the applicant does not provide documentation that the standards will be internationally benchmarked and lead to college- and career-readiness by high school graduation. The applicant earns 19 points on this criterion. (19 points) (B)(1)(ii) The applicant indicates that by Kentucky Senate Bill 1, the state is committed to adopting and implementing the Common Core standards by early 2010, and provides a viable timeline for adoption and implementation of the standards as Appendix X. The applicant further indicates that Kentucky was one of the first states to join the CCSSI, and will likely be the first state to adopt the standards (adoption is set for February 2010). The applicant provides detailed information in Section (B)(3) on the state's high-quality standards adoption and implementation plan, including vetting by multiple stakeholder groups. Given the high-quality plan, viable timeline, and leadership the state has shown in the development and implementation of the Common Core standards, the applicant is set to meet the August 2, 2010 deadline for adoption. The applicant earns 20 points on this criterion. (20 points)

<b>(B)(2) Developing and Implementing common, high-quality assessments</b>	10	9	9	
<p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b></p> <p>(B)(2)(I) The applicant indicates the state's intent to participate in four different assessment consortia, and includes descriptions, non-binding Memoranda of Understanding, and lists of participating states for each. The first, the State Consortium Developing Balanced Assessments (Balanced Assessments Consortium, Appendices Y and Z), will build a full assessment system aligned to the Common Core Standards, will provide an overall plan for an assessment system that will align the efforts of the other assessment consortia, and, according to the narrative and appendices of Kentucky's application, includes 30 states at the time of submission. The second, Summative Multi-State Assessment for Teachers and Education Researchers (SMARTER, Appendices AA and BB), plans to develop summative assessments aligned to the Common Core Standards, specifies in the MOU that the consortium is being constructed to apply for the Race to the Top Assessment Grant competition, and, according to the narrative and appendices of Kentucky's application, includes 18 states. The third, Multiple Options for Student Assessment and Instruction Consortium (MOSAIC, Appendices CC and DD), plans to develop formative assessments aligned with the CCSS common core standards and, according to the narrative and appendices of Kentucky's application, includes 24 states. The fourth, the Race to the Top Common Assessment Consortium (RTTT Common Assessment Consortium, Appendices EE and FF), plans to develop a balanced assessment system that includes formative and summative assessments aligned to the Common Core Standards, and, according to the narrative and appendices of Kentucky's application, includes 12 states at the time of submission. While the applicant includes descriptions of planned work for each of the consortia, there is no description of the state's role or extent of involvement in any of the consortia but the Balanced Assessment Consortium. The applicant earns 4 points on this criterion. (4 points) (B)(2)(II) The Balanced Assessments Consortium includes 30 states (according to Kentucky's application), earning "high" points. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (5 points)</p>				
<b>(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments</b>	20	20	20	
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b></p> <p>(B)(3) The applicant outlines the state's plan for rollout and implementation of the common core standards, and assessments built on those standards; the applicant also describes six plan-associated activities in some detail. The first activity, adopting and disseminating the Math and ELA standards, includes plans to publicly announce, distribute, communicate with key stakeholders about, and provide training for educators on, the new standards. The second activity, aligning PK-12 and postsecondary education around the new standards, includes plans to align standards with grade level expectations, and provide educators with support in implementing standards throughout the P-20 system. The third activity, building networks to deconstruct the standards and create high-quality aligned instructional supports, includes plans to assist educators in translating standards into effective instruction for all students. The fourth activity, ongoing professional learning around the new standards and assessments, includes plans to support educators in their efforts to provide standards-aligned curriculum, instruction, and assessment through online resources and continuous professional development using the state's Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (CIITS) and professional learning teams. The fifth activity, implementing a balanced assessment system, includes plans to work with multi-state consortia as well as the state's educator workforce to develop formative classroom, interim benchmark, and summative annual assessments aligned to the common core standards, and to implement those assessments in schools across the state. The sixth activity, increasing access to challenging courses, includes plans to use multiple state-level initiatives and Individual (student) Learning Plans to ensure access to and success in challenging courses for all students. This thorough, multi-pronged approach iterates a strong, well-designed implementation plan. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (20 points)</p>				
<b>Total</b>	70	68	68	

### C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	
<b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
<p>(C)(1) Through the information provided by the applicant in section (C)(1) and in Appendices NN through VV, the applicant provides evidence of fully implementing 10 of the 12 America COMPETES Act Elements, earning them 20 points on this criterion. Notes on appropriate evidence, or why evidence was not appropriate, are provided below for each element. (20 points) (1) Yes – a unique statewide student identifier through the Student Information System (SIS) – 2 points (2) Yes – enrollment, demographic, and program participation – 2 points (3) Yes – exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out, and completions information – 2 points (4) No – K-12 transcripts are provided to postsecondary, and postsecondary uses that data in feedback reports, but K-12 cannot access postsecondary data – 0 points (5) Yes – audit system assesses data quality, validity, and reliability – 2 points (6) Yes – Kentucky Core Content Assessment – 2 points (7) Yes – demographically disaggregated testing participation rates by grade and subject – 2 points (8) Yes – a teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students - 2 points (9) Yes – student-level transcript information, including information on courses completed and grades earned – 2 points (10) Yes – Explore, Plan, and ACT scores – 2 points (11) Yes – postsecondary institutions analyze information on student transitions and remedial coursework, and provide info back to K-12 in feedback reports – 2 points (12) No – several projects are described, but no additional data elements - 0 points</p>				
<b>(C)(2) Accessing and using State data</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	
<b>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
<p>(C)(2) The applicant describes a high-quality state plan to ensure access to, and use of, the state's SLDS data by various stakeholders. The state has won two IES longitudinal data system grants, one in 2005 that was used to develop the K-12 database, and one in 2009 that will be used to expand the system P-20 to include early learning and postsecondary data. The applicant describes three activities planned to increase data access and effective use. The first is a plan to expand the data system itself, increasing its functionality by adding preschool and postsecondary data, teacher and principal preparation and certification data, student financial aid and workforce data, and career and technology data. The second is a plan to improve accessibility to the data system, which will allow individual teachers and principals to access their students' data in a secure, longitudinal manner through an Identify Management System (for security) and the Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (CIITS) online portal (for integrated access to multiple data sources). The third is a plan to drive usage through the development and facilitation of professional learning opportunities, provided through regional networks to teachers and principals, as well as through state-level programs to legislators, researchers, and other stakeholders. The applicant's multi-faceted plan ensures that multiple stakeholders will not only have appropriate access to the state longitudinal data, but also will be trained to use that data effectively to improve student outcomes. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (5 points)</p>				
<b>(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	
<b>(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
<p>(C)(3)(i) The applicant presents a plan to build upon the existing state technology infrastructure to integrate various educational resources, including SLDS data, into a single portal-access resource center called the Continuous Instructional Improvement Technology System (CIITS). Because the CIITS will integrate curriculum, assessment, and instructional resources with student longitudinal data and professional development resources, it will serve as a "one stop shop" of instructional resources for teachers and principals across the state. Individual teachers and principals will have managed access to these resources. This consolidated approach to data storage and access will allow educators to have the specific information and resources they need to create targeted interventions to improve student outcomes. The applicant earns</p>				

full points on this criterion. (6 points) (C)(3)(ii) The applicant details a plan to use the state's nine regional networks to implement a capacity-building model of professional development around effective data use. The regional networks will together develop an in-state network of 400 statewide "master trainers" (administrators and teacher leaders) who will be able to deliver scalable professional development to schools, council and districts on: using the CIITS data system; using student data to inform instruction; and using instructional data to support continuous improvement strategies. Further, the applicant indicates that data use training will also be integrated into teacher and principal preparation programs across the state, ensuring all new educators are trained in the effective use of data through the CIITS system. The regional networks provide a strong state-level structure for coordinated delivery of professional development, while the use of job-embedded professional development (as opposed to isolated initiatives) allows for continuous educator improvement. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (6 points) (C)(3)(iii) The applicant acknowledges the need for external researcher access to the state's rich developing data resource through its SLDS and the CIITS system. The Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) plans to address this need through a competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The KDE expects to award contracts to researchers, both consultants and university-based, who propose qualitative and quantitative data analyses which are most likely to illuminate: the most effective school practices; what works best to increase educator effectiveness; and how educators are making use of the available data resources. While it is commendable that the KDE wants to select the best proposals for contracts to ensure rapid, effective results from research studies, the KDE does not plan to make the state database accessible to all researchers, limiting the rate at which illuminating findings are discovered and reported. The applicant earns 3 points on this criterion. (3 points)

Total	47	40	40	
-------	----	----	----	--

#### D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals</b>	21	21	21	

##### (D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

(D)(1)(i) The applicant describes the state's laws regarding alternative paths to teacher and principal certification, as well as the seven currently existing alternative paths to teacher certification, one of which also serves as an alternative path to principal certification. The applicant also describes how these seven paths address the five characteristics of alternative certification programs listed in the application guidelines. In summary: the state does provide options for providers other than postsecondary institutions to provide alternative certification routes; all routes currently in existence are selective, offer school-based experiences, and award the same level of certification that traditional preparation programs; several also significantly limit the amount of coursework required of candidates. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (7 points) (D)(1)(ii) The applicant describes the seven currently existing alternative paths to teacher certification, one of which also serves as an alternative path to principal certification, and how these seven paths address the five characteristics of alternative certification programs that are listed in the application guidelines. The applicant also specifies the percent of teachers and principals in the state that were certified via the alternative routes, as compared to all teachers and principals certified in the state, in the last year. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (7 points) (D)(1)(iii) The applicant describes the process by which the state determines teacher and principals shortage areas, then addresses methods utilized to fill these shortage areas. Shortage areas are determined at the district level by the percent of FTE educator positions in a certain subject area that are unfilled, served by educators on emergency certification, or served by educators whose preparation did not focus on the subject area. These percents are then collated and calculated at the state level; any area with more than 5% FTE calculation at the state level is considered a shortage area. Currently the state has shortages in math and science teachers, and employs alternative preparation routes to fill these shortage areas. As examples, the applicant describes the UTeach, Teach Kentucky, and ACES programs, all of which focus on preparing teachers specifically for

math and science instruction, particularly in middle school grades. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (7 points)

<b>(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>53</b>	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	5	5	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	15	15	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	10	5	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	28	28	

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

(D)(2)(i) The applicant describes a clear state plan to use multiple measures to assess and document student achievement and growth. Through the common core initiatives, student assessments will be linked to achievement of the Common Core standards. In addition to formative, benchmark, and summative assessments, student portfolios will include examples of student work and pre- and post-assessment data. This collection of multiple measures will create a rich resource of student learning and year-to-year growth, creating a strong base for measuring educator effectiveness. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (5 points) (D)(2)(ii) The applicant outlines a state plan to develop detailed specifications for measures of student learning in the "360 degree growth instruments" used to evaluate teachers and principals. The applicant further indicates that these evaluation instruments will be developed with the deep and ongoing participation of teachers and principals. Performance of individual teachers and principals will be rated on a quality index relative to educator standards. Through the CIITS (state education data) system, teachers and principals will be required to collect evidence of their own effectiveness throughout the year in "efficacy portfolios", which will be part of their self-assessment, used in their annual evaluations, and used to provide supports specific to individual needs to improve effectiveness. Lists and rubrics of indicators, in addition to descriptions of the continuum of effectiveness along those indicators, will be provided to all educators in a fair and transparent manner, allowing them to know the criteria by which they will be evaluated, as well as exactly what will constitute success. The specificity in the applicant's description of the growth instruments, quality index, and rubrics provide a strong indication that the evaluations will be rigorous, transparent, and fair. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (15 points) (D)(2)(iii) The applicant indicates that in the current state system of evaluation, teachers and principals are evaluated annually through an authentic performance evaluation, and at least once every three years through a standards-based summative evaluation. It is unclear whether the "annual authentic performance assessments" as described by the applicant are as rigorous as the "summative" evaluations teachers and principals will experience only once every three years, making it difficult to conduct continuous improvement efforts in the schools. As the student growth models described above are implemented, the applicant indicates that teachers and principals will receive constructive feedback and targeted support based on their ratings on the new growth-based evaluation instruments. In addition, through the enhanced state data system, teachers and principals will be able to access their students' data continuously, allowing them to tailor instruction appropriately and participate in continuous improvement efforts related to student performance and their own job performance. However, the applicant does not indicate how teachers and principals will be monitored on the use of this data to ensure the effective interpretation of results or the effective implementation of associated instructional improvement strategies. The applicant earns 8 points on this criterion. (8 points) (D)(2)(iv) The applicant comprehensively describes a coherent state process, to be implemented in conjunction with the new evaluation systems, to develop, promote, tenure, and remove teachers and principals, with evaluation data as the basis for all of these decisions. The evidence provided in this section signals that the applicant meets the requirements of this criterion. Evaluations will be used to determine areas in need of improvement for every teacher and principal; targeted professional development will be provided to every teacher and principal based on these assessed needs. Teachers and principals will be provided a variety of opportunities to increase their salary outside the normal salary progression schedule, including but not limited to: demonstrating effectiveness in terms of promoting student achievement and growth; taking on leadership roles; and serving in shortage areas. The applicant indicates that the use of the new evaluation

system (including significant student data in educator portfolios as evidence of effectiveness or ineffectiveness over time) for the purposes of granting tenure or confirming dismissals will: require no policy changes; render these processes more transparent; and simplify the basis for making such decisions. The applicant also presents ambitious yet achievable state targets for the implementation of each of these processes. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (28 points)

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

(D)(2)(iii) The state panel was asked about the difference between authentic performance evaluations, to be conducted every year for all teachers, and standards-based summative evaluations, to be conducted every year for untenured teachers, but only once every three years for tenured teachers. The panelists responded that the authentic performance evaluations would be formative and continuous, allowing all teachers to improve their performance and capacity continually over time. However, from the state panelists' response, it was unclear whether these assessments would be used for promotion, compensation, tenure, and dismissal decisions. The summative evaluations would clearly be used for these decisions; panelists stressed that such decisions should not be a surprise to teachers, and that they should have a sense of what would happen as a result of the summative evaluations, via the information received continuously through their formative authentic performance evaluations. While it is commendable that the state plans to implement a continuous formative evaluation system that will allow teachers to improve throughout the year, it is also clear that these assessments do not serve the same purpose as the summative evaluations, which are conducted only once every three years for tenured teachers. Since part of the application requirement for this criterion is "conducting annual evaluations" whose results are used in promotion, compensation, tenure, and dismissal decisions, the formative assessments should not supplant the summative assessments in annual evaluations. The applicant earns 5 points on this criterion.

(D)(2)(iv) Clarification was provided by state panelists on the performance targets for this section. Instead of indicating (as noted in the performance measures chart) that only 10% of LEAs would be implementing evaluation systems by the end of the grant period, the state instead meant to indicate that 100% of LEAs would be implementing the systems and using them for decision-making, but the state only expected 10% of teachers to be removed as a result of findings from that evaluation system. This strengthens the state's application in this section.

<b>(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	10	10	
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	10	10	

**(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

(D)(3)(i) The applicant indicates the state's dedication to equity, and outlines a clear plan to identify the number and percent of effective teachers and principals in both high- and low- minority and poverty schools, using the capacity that will be generated through the state's new longitudinal data system, currently in development. The applicant does not, however, provide the state's definitions of high- and low-minority/poverty schools. The applicant indicates that the state already has the capacity to track the number of highly qualified teachers and principals serving each type of school; the data provided by the applicant indicates that in terms of these numbers, highly qualified teachers and principals are currently equitably distributed across school types. By adding student achievement and growth measures to that data, the state will create capacity to identify the distribution of effective teachers and principals across schools. The applicant also presents a three-part plan to ensure equitable distribution: require and support districts in creating equity-focused data reports; identify, recruit, and retain effective teacher and principals in high-need schools; and increase the supply of teachers and leaders prepared to serve effectively in high-need schools. Specific interventions include, but are not limited to: improving working conditions; providing incentive pay; and expanding alternative certification routes specifically targeted at increasing the pipeline of educators ready to serve in high-need schools. The applicant provides ambitious yet achievable targets for

equitable distribution of highly effective educators, with steeper goals for high-risk schools. Although the applicant's plan is sound, the omission of the required evidence for this criterion – definitions of high-minority and high-poverty schools – significantly affects the final score on this criterion. The applicant earns 10 points on this criterion. (10 points) (D)(3)(ii) The applicant indicates that the interventions described in the previous section should also serve to increase the number and percent of effective teachers in hard-to-staff subject areas such as math and science. The applicant describes three additional interventions directed specifically at achieving the hard-to-staff subject areas goal: reimbursement to educators for the cost of coursework or other training needed to achieve certification in a hard-to-staff area; a salary supplement for teachers who are fully certified in hard-to-staff areas and willing to continue teaching those subjects; and a model of "mobile expertise" in which teachers with expertise in hard-to-staff subject areas will be compensated for taking their expertise "on the road", either literally or via technological means, to help increase the effectiveness of rural teachers in those subjects. The applicant also specifies ambitious yet achievable state targets relative to the hard-to-staff subject areas goal. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (10 points)

**(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

(D)(3)(i) Although the state did not provide definitions of high- and low-, minority- and poverty- schools in its application, the state panelists addressed this point in the question and answer period. They mentioned a quadrant system of high and low achievement gap schools, and high and low proficiency schools (presumably related to student test scores). Schools that demonstrated both high achievement gaps and low proficiency would be the first to be targeted by the state. The state panelists also mentioned plans to add a third dimension, growth, to this quadrant model. With growth added, the schools that would be targeted first would have high achievement gaps, low proficiency, and low growth. Further, the state's RTTT project manager, David Cook, mentioned that schools with 60% or more of their students in poverty were considered "high-poverty" schools, and schools with 30% or more of their students as minorities were considered "high minority" schools. However, when asked to identify where in the application this information was provided, the panelists were unable to do so.

**(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs**

14

11

11

**(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

(D)(4)(i) The applicant explains that the state's method for determining and publicizing the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs is through Kentucky's Education Preparation Programs "Report Card". The applicant further explains that, while the Report Card's ratings were previously based on the Quality Performance Index (this practice was discontinued in 2007 in response to stakeholder concerns about the calculation of quality measures), the ratings will now be based on the Effective Educator Preparation Index (EEPI) and the Effective Principal Preparation Index (EPPI). These indices will be developed in concert with the new student-growth-based evaluation systems for teachers and principals, and will include multiple measures of student learning as well as evaluation of pre-service teacher certification exam scores, competence, effectiveness, and retention rates. This will effectively link student achievement and growth data to the preparation programs in which the students' teachers and principals were trained. The applicant indicates that the "Report Cards" will continue to be publicly reported and used to evaluate teacher and principal preparation programs. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (7 points) (D)(4)(ii) The applicant indicates that the public reporting of the "Report Cards" will serve to direct more teacher education candidates to those programs that are most successful at producing effective educators. The applicant does not present any other plans to expand successful programs. The applicant indicates that programs will be evaluated according to the "Report Card" results, so programs producing large numbers of ineffective educators can be closed or refused accreditation, which will, in effect, limit the pool of preparation programs available in the state. The applicant earns 4 points on this criterion. (4 points)

**(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals**

20

20

20

**(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

(D)(5)(i) The applicant describes a leadership structure and, through it, the provision of professional development resources and programs to teachers and principals. At the state level, districts will be organized into nine regional "professional learning networks", which will be focused on coordination and delivery of teacher and principal professional development. The first priority in this new system will be to provide supports to teachers and principals in implementing the new common core standards system. At the district level, each district will assemble a leadership team of educators and administrators, whose role it will be to represent the district in the regional learning networks. At the school level, implementation will be coordinated by a school-based professional learning team, which will be informed by the district's participation in a regional network through the district leadership team. The supports that will be provided to teachers and principals will be continuous, job-embedded, and delivered through the newly-developed integrated educator data system, CIITS. Through these mechanisms, the state has plans to deliver individualized, data-driven professional development to all teachers and principals in the state, addressing each educator's specific needs as indicated through the results of their evaluations. The applicant indicates the state is also considering revising its teacher induction model to one based on clinical residency. The coordinated structure of professional development delivery, reaching from the state to the local levels, is promising in its capacity to deliver necessary supports to educators. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (10 points)

(D)(5)(ii) The applicant indicates that the state will use the CIITS system for both the delivery of targeted professional development and its evaluation. By tracking which professional development programs were implemented in which schools and for which educators, and connecting that with the student achievement and growth measures in the following years, the state will have the capacity to evaluate professional development programs directly on their impact on student achievement and growth. These evaluations will be used to revise, augment, or discard, as appropriate, educator professional development programs based on evidence of their efficacy in improving the effectiveness of teachers and principals. The applicant's presented plan for evaluation and continuous improvement of educator professional development programs shows significant promise. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (10 points)

Total	138	130	125	
-------	-----	-----	-----	--

### E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs</b>	10	10	10	
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
(E)(1) The applicant explains, citing appropriate state law, that the state has the authority to intervene directly in all districts as well as in schools within districts. By Kentucky Revised Statute 160.346, the Kentucky Department of Education has the authority to intervene in persistently low-achieving schools and implement one of five intervention options, while Kentucky Revised Statutes 158.780 and 158.785 enable the Kentucky Department of Education to intervene in LEAs. These statutes offer the state not only authority to intervene, but also significant power to implement changes at both the school and district levels. The applicant details the specifics of these authorities at length. Since the state has authority to intervene in both LEAs and schools, the applicant earns full points on this criterion. (10 points)				
<b>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</b>	40	40	40	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	35	35	
<b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				

(E)(2)(i) The applicant describes the process by which the state will identify its persistently lowest-achieving schools. The state will begin by selecting all schools that meet the federal definition of persistently lowest-achieving, then add all schools who have student scores ranked in the bottom 5% in proficiency, in Math and ELA combined across all student subgroups, for three consecutive years. Also added to the list will be those schools who have a persistent graduation rate of less than 60%. This process allows the state to intervene in all of its lowest-achieving schools regardless of Title I status without penalizing schools for their Title I status. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (5 points) (E)(2)(ii) The applicant describes a four-part plan to turnaround the lowest performing schools. The schools will be required to relinquish control to the state, at which point the state will: fundamentally change the operations model of the school, using one of the four intervention models specified in the RTTT application; develop a cadre of support providers; and appropriate the funding necessary to create a successful educational recovery. To implement this plan, the state will create: "District 180", a specific single statewide office for educational recovery services focused only on providing services to the lowest-performing schools; regional Centers for Learning Excellence, which will serve as intermediaries between District 180 and the Educational Recovery Schools; and teams of Education Recovery Leaders and Specialists, who will coordinate turnaround efforts in individual schools. In addition, the state will create certification and endorsement providers for Recovery Leaders and Specialists, and take necessary legislative action to support the creation of the school turnaround structure described above. The applicant indicates that over 200 schools have fallen into one of three tiers of state assistance categories since 2002; the state has been successful in improving conditions in all but 5 of those schools. In addition, the applicant provides data on specific turnaround models implemented by the state since 2003, and the numbers of schools turned around through each model. Finally, the applicant provides ambitious yet achievable targets for the state's school turnaround efforts for the duration of the grant. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (35 points)

Total	50	50	50	
-------	----	----	----	--

## F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	10	10	10	
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>				
<p>(F)(1)(i) The applicant includes state financial data documenting that, while total state revenues declined from FY 2008 to FY 2009, the percentage allocated to public education (elementary, secondary, and postsecondary) increased from 43.6% to 46.5% of total state revenues. In addition, this increase in percentage also translated to a real dollar increase of \$15 million for public education in the state, even as total state revenues declined by over \$500 million. This significant increase in percentage and dollars of funding devoted to public education, especially in a time of fiscal crisis, earns the applicant full points on this criterion. (5 points) (F)(1)(ii) The applicant indicates that the state uses the Support Education Excellence in Kentucky (SEEK) program to ensure equitable funding between high-need and other districts in the state. All LEAs in the state start from an equal funding base; however, this base is adjusted based on poverty (poorer districts get more funds), and on the number of Special Needs and ELL students (the larger the number, the more funds received). The state also requires a minimum property tax levy for all school districts; this amount is subtracted from the calculated per-pupil SEEK amount for districts. By making up the difference between tax levies and SEEK rates, the state guarantees equal funding across districts, with additional funding for high-need districts. Also by state law, districts allocate funding on a strict per-pupil basis to their schools. Thus schools are funded on the basis of size of student population served, not on need status, ensuring equitable per-pupil funding across high-need and other schools. The applicant provides dollar amounts of per-pupil funding as supporting evidence. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (5 points)</p>				
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	40	8	8	

**(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

(F)(2)(i) The applicant indicates that the state has no charter school law, thus no charter schools. The applicant earns no points on this criterion. (0 points) (F)(2)(ii) The applicant indicates that the state has no charter school law, thus no charter schools. The applicant earns no points on this criterion. (0 points) (F)(2)(iii) The applicant indicates that the state has no charter school law, thus no charter schools. The applicant earns no points on this criterion. (0 points) (F)(2)(iv) The applicant indicates that the state has no charter school law, thus no charter schools. The applicant earns no points on this criterion. (0 points) (F)(2)(v) The applicant indicates that through the establishment of a school-based decision making form of school governance, state legislation allows all public schools to become innovative and autonomous. Thus the rules governing all public schools in Kentucky are very similar to the ones governing charter schools in other states. Schools have chosen to exercise this authority by developing magnet schools or programs focused on specific subject areas, career training areas, and methods of instructional delivery. Magnet school models in the state are varied and include, but are not limited to: career academies; structured schools-within-schools, and Montessori programs. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (8 points)

**(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions**

5

5

5

**(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

(F)(3) The applicant describes a variety of other conditions established by the state that are favorable to education reform and increasing student achievement. These include: the state provision of preschool to all children; Extended School Services, providing additional instructional time for at-risk students; Family and Youth Resource Centers, providing wrap-around services to all schools, especially those in high-need areas; universal administration of the ACT college entrance exam; Graduate Kentucky, fostering stakeholder conversations about best practices in dropout prevention; the Kentucky Center for School Safety, ensuring a safe school environment for all children; and Achievement Gap teams, focused on identifying and disseminating best practices in closing the achievement gaps between student subgroups. The applicant earns full points on this criterion. (5 points)

**Total**

55

23

23

**Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	15	15	15	

**Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The applicant stresses a STEM focus throughout the application, making clear indications as to how work in three of the four ARRA reform areas – standards and assessments; teacher and principal effectiveness; and school turnaround – will apply specifically to STEM instruction. The applicant also provides a summary, in the competitive priority section, of their STEM plan. In this summary, the applicant describes state STEM initiatives by reform area, including information about which of the competitive priority areas are addressed by each initiative. In the area of standards and assessments, the applicant briefly describes four initiatives detailed in Section B: Advance Kentucky, Project Lead The Way, Student Technology competitions, and Science Centers. In the area of teacher and principal effectiveness, the applicant briefly describes three initiatives detailed in Section D: UTeach, the Mathematics and Science Partnership, and the Partnership Institute for Mathematics and Science Education Reform. In the area of school turnaround, the applicant briefly describes one initiative detailed in Section E: the coordination of STEM initiatives in turnaround schools (this includes references to the implementation of two other initiatives, Advance Kentucky and Project Lead the Way, in low-performing schools). Since points for the STEM Competitive Priority are awarded as all or nothing, and the applicant presents a multifaceted plan for inclusion of STEM priorities in its state education reform agenda, the applicant earns 15 points on this criterion. (15 points)

Total	15	15	15	
-------	----	----	----	--

**Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	

**Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The absolute priority is addressed by the applicant throughout the application. All four ARRA reform areas are comprehensively and coherently addressed, and 100% LEA participation and commitment is demonstrated. The applicant describes how the state's plans will translate to increased student achievement, decreased achievement gaps across subgroups, and increased graduation and college-going rates. The applicant meets the absolute priority.

Total		0	0	
-------	--	---	---	--

Grand Total	500	441	436	
-------------	-----	-----	-----	--



# Race to the Top

## Technical Review Form - Tier 2



Kentucky Application #3000ky-4

**A. State Success Factors**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
<b>(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it</b>	65	61	61	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	3	3	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	45	45	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	13	13	

**(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

A (1) (i) The state has proposed a coherent reform agenda. The agenda relies on some systems that are not in place and will be difficult to put in place state wide. The agenda addresses and integrates the four areas described in the ARRA. The proposal emphasizes building teacher capacity rather than improving student outcomes. 3/5 A (1) (ii) Each of the state's 174 LEAs has agreed to implement each element of the preliminary scope of work including the turnaround provisions (should they apply). The scope of work is explicit about which parts of the RTT application the LEAs are committing to. Other signatories include the union leaders (as applicable) and presidents of each local school board. The terms and conditions of the MOU reflect a strong commitment on the part of each LEA and signatory. In addition there was wide spread involvement by key stakeholders in the state's preparation of the application. 45/45 A (1) (iii) Translating LEA participation into state wide impact With one hundred percent of the LEAs in the state participating in all elements of the plan, all students in the state will be affected by this plan, including K-12 students in poverty. The state has also articulated achievable goals for increasing student achievement and decreasing achievement gaps. The state is not able to disaggregate some of its data to provide the level of detail regarding each sub group requested in the application. The state indicates that the pace of reform would be slowed without the RTT grant but that it would pursue the reforms none the less. 13/15

<b>(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans</b>	30	22	26	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	14	17	[REDACTED]
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	8	9	[REDACTED]

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

i. The state will rely on its department of education to provide leadership. The department has been reduced in size in recent years and is undergoing a reorganization to produce higher quality support. This effort has begun and will coincide with the implementation of the RTT grant. There is evidence of support and enthusiasm for the new state superintendent's leadership a suggestion that a rejuvenation of public education is underway. This effort will absorb the bulk of the RTT funds not required to go to LEAs. The focus of the described activities is on rebuilding the SEA's capacity to manage, monitor, and support rather than on support for the LEAs. LEAs will be expected to pay for and/or provide many of the support services associated with implementing the RTT plan. It is not evident that the state currently has effective and efficient processes for implementation in place. RTT grant funds will be used to create an RTT project management office that will provide these services. The state has competently planned to coordinate the

use of funds from many sources. Some of what is planned will involve reallocation or repurposing of funds. The RTT is said to be part of the state's 20-year improvement effort. This affirmation is not supported by any greater specificity, however. 14/20 i. Stakeholder Supports: There was wide spread involvement of stakeholders including teacher and principals' unions in the grant development process. In her letter, the teachers' union president expressed non specific reservations about federal policies incorporated in the application. She said, however, she thought they could be worked out. Neither the principal nor superintendent's union leaders expressed support for making student growth/achievement a significant factor in evaluations. The supporters include state agency leaders, IHE presidents, the state PTA, and leaders from interested NGO's. There was legislative support for implementing legislation but no letters of support. Business groups do not appear among the endorsers. [8/10]

**(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

The presenters demonstrated strong and committed leadership existed at the state level for the implementation of the plan. The presentation clarified that regional teams have historically been effective in disseminating and implementing reforms. The presentation clarified that the PLC's that are the delivery vehicle for the implementation of the reforms at the LEA and school levels are being developed in parallel with the roll out of the new standards and assessments. The impression was confirmed that there is reason to be concerned about the consistency and effectiveness of these "PLC's". It is also fair to note that the presenters acknowledged this issue and that the way they responded to questions about this matter indicated that they are likely to translate this awareness over time into more effective training and monitoring. Accordingly, additional points are awarded for each of the sub-criteria.

<b>(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	3	3
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	18	18

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

i. In the recent past, the state has begun initiatives that parallel the four ARRA reform areas. This includes acting on legislation (Senate Bill 1) to adopt new more rigorous curricular standards and better aligned assessments it includes supporting front line educators to become more assessment literate. The state has been working on a statewide longitudinal data system since 2006. The state has redesigned all principal preparation, and has revised its Masters program for teachers. With the Wallace Foundation, the state has begun several initiatives to improve teacher effectiveness and leadership. Starting in the early 1990's, the state began intervening in low performing schools. More recently, it has begun placing additional staff into struggling schools to enhance the school's leadership team. These efforts can be characterized as beginning or tentative moves toward the aggressive and focused changes contemplated by RTT. 3/5 ii. Improving student outcomes since 2003 or earlier a. Increasing student achievement as measured by specified tests: The gains in mathematics as measured by NAEP have been substantial at both grades 4 and 8. The gains in reading have been less significant, and reading achievement among 8th graders has shown a downward trend since 2003. The percentage of students meeting the proficient standard on NCLB tests for reading has increased substantially since 2003. There have been even greater gains on the NCLB tests for Math. The state believes that its relentless focus on learning generally rather than any one specific factor accounts for the gains. b. Results on closing achievement gaps: The state's results in closing achievement gaps among designated student sub groups (whites and black are the state's two primary racial sub groups) on both NAEP and ESEA math tests have been mixed. The same is true regarding gaps on the NAEP reading tests. There were moderate gains in closing the gaps on the ESEA reading test. The state indicates some valuable learning regarding closing the white-black gap from a seven district pilot now called the Achievement Gap Committee. The Committee now has a charge to share its learning statewide. iii. Graduation rates: The state does not follow current practices for calculating graduation rates and does not disaggregate to follow sub groups. It has a federal waiver enabling it to estimate a graduation rate for all students in the aggregated. There has been a nine percentage point increase in the state's graduation rate

from 1996 through 2006, and a gain of about five percentage points since 2003. Again the state believes that the overall emphasis on achievement accounts for the gains. The state also cites its focus on low performing schools using a comprehensive transformation approach. iv. College going has increased from 1992 through 2006 by 12 percentage points to 61 percent. Summary: The state has made substantial gains in achievement, graduation rates, and college going since it launched its first comprehensive school reform in the early 1990's. It is difficult, however, to see what it can bring from these successes that will inform its approach to RTT. [18/25]

Total	125	104	108	
-------	-----	-----	-----	--

**B. Standards and Assessments**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	40	40	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20	20	
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20	20	

**(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

i. Participating in a consortium developing high quality standards a. The state has joined and executed the requisite MOU to be part of the Common Core State Standards Initiative consortium of states. The work will entail developing common K-12 Math and English Language Arts standards that meet the requisite criteria. The state will also adopt similarly high quality standards in several other course areas.-10/10 b. The common core consortium includes a significant number of states as defined.-10/10 ii. The state anticipates adopting these common standards before August 2, 2010. -20/20 points

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10	10	
---	----	----	----	--

**(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

i. The state has demonstrated its commitment to improving the quality of its assessments to meet the criteria stated here. -5/5 ii. The state is participating with several consortia to develop assessments which meet the stated criteria. More than a majority of all the states are involved in the several consortia. -5/5

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	14	17	
---	----	----	----	--

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The state's plan is detailed. There are sound elements in the plan, and the reality appears to be that the state must inevitably rely on trainers training trainers several times over. The targets for implementing the Common Consortium standards and complementary annual summative assessments are highly ambitious. Concerns include the following aspects of the plan. The system for rolling out the standards and supports relies on regional networks that have not been successful in getting desired results in the recent past. The time lines for the networks to become highly competent support teams and to accomplish their assigned tasks are very tight. Because there will be nine regional networks involving many individuals communicating with multiple parties at the LEA and school levels, significant variations in how, when, and what is accomplished are likely to occur. Additional concerns include the following aspects of the plan. The regional networks will rely on LEA and school based professional learning teams to provide the professional development necessary for implementing the new standards and to create two new sets of formative assessments. Such teams doing this kind of work do not exist on a widespread basis. Building these kinds of professional learning teams is difficult, labor intensive, and takes years—not the months or weeks

allowed by the plan. Relying on large numbers of such teams to come into existence and function at the high level contemplated is not realistic and reduces the credibility/quality of the plan. 14/20

**(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

The comments regarding Tier II for A. 2 i., above, are applicable here, as well. For the reasons stated, additional points are awarded. 17/20

Total	70	64	67
-------	----	----	----

**C. Data Systems to Support Instruction**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	24	24	

**(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The state has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all the America COMPETES standards. 24/24

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	3	3
---------------------------------------	---	---	---

**(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The state's plan contains three activities. They are expanding the existing longitudinal data system, improving access, and driving usage. Expanding the system to include early childhood and post graduate data could add context for decision makers, but is not vital. The plan as outlined is very general regarding the professional development and its delivery. The same is true regarding what will be done to drive usage. There is no reason given for devoting resources to the unconventional objective of giving use of the system to legislators. It is also confusing to see the low target for use of the system by distinct administrators. The other targets are sufficiently ambitious: one hundred percent of teacher/principal use by Year 2 of the grant. 3/5

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	12	14	
--	----	----	----	--

**(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

i. The instructional improvement system ("CIITS") is the access portal for all stakeholders to using the data in the state's longitudinal data system (KYLDS). The system will be built in the early years of the grant and completed by 2011. Regional staff supported by 400 trainers will disseminate and coach district teams who will train colleagues. Detail is sparse on how this system will be put together and how it will meet the ambitious targets for use of the KYLDS. It is not clear whether the targets for use of the KYLDS conflict with the targets for the use of CIITS. The target for the former is 100% use by 2011-12 but only 12% use of CIITS in the same year. The lack of detail on the formation and operation of the training units and the seeming conflict between the two sets of use timelines reduces the quality of the plan and the credibility of the targets. 4/6 ii. The state's plan relies on 400 master trainers who will train district, school, and other stakeholders to use CIITS. Those trained are expected to train others. As noted above, this dispersed dissemination system could result in inconsistent outcomes. The concern about the potentially conflicting targets for the use of the two systems applies here as well as in "i.". 4/6 iii. The state plans to select the researchers who will have access to the data. The connection between the work of the selected researchers and the continuous improvement of the instructional materials and strategies used in the classroom is not clear. That less than 50% of teachers and principals will be using CIITS in Years 2 and 3 and usage will not reach 50% until Year 4. This could reduce the effectiveness and the applicability of the research. 4/6

**(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

The comments regarding Tier II for A. 2 i., above, are applicable to both "i." and "ii.". For the reasons stated, an additional point is awarded to the score for each sub-section. 5/6 for each sub-section. = 14/18

Total	47	39	41
-------	----	----	----

**D. Great Teachers and Leaders**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	17	17	

**(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

i. The state has authority to establish alternative routes to teacher and principal certification. Among the seven programs now in place for teachers, one or more contains the elements specified in the scoring rubric (providers other than IHEs, selectivity, school based experiences and ongoing support, limited coursework, same level of certificate as earned through traditional path). Five of the seven programs include all five elements. There is one alternative program for principals in use. It does not meet all five of the definitional criteria. 5/7 ii. All programs are in use. As of 2009-10, ten percent of teachers in the state came through an alternative certification program. Six percent of principals have done so. Last year, 17% of new teachers came through alternative routes, and less than one percent of principals did so. One of the teacher preparation programs is used by the vast majority of those seeking an alternative route. 7/7 sub points iii. The state uses data generated by each LEA to identifying areas of teacher/principal shortage. There are a few programs in place to help address these shortages and the state hopes to supplement them with more programs in the near term. The state also plans to identify the more effective of these efforts to better target its resources and support. 5/7

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	28	28
(i) Measuring student growth	5	3	3
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	10	10
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	3	3
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	12	12

**(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

i. The state anticipates using multiple measures of student growth. The number of measures and the number of possible combinations of measures contemplated preclude labeling the state's approach as "clear." 3/5 ii. The proposed timeline for developing an evaluation system is ambitious—In place by the end of 2010-11. Teachers and principals will have involvement in the design of their respective systems. As noted, the lack of clarity and potentially complex nature of definition of student growth is a significant concern. Too complex a definition will prevent educators from knowing what to do to improve. That will cause the system to be unfair and counterproductive. The state contemplates allowing teachers and principals to pick the evidence of their effectiveness. Adding this to a complex definition of student growth could make differentiating among teachers regarding their effectiveness (as defined) difficult or impossible. At this point in time, then, the plan cannot be said to be of high quality. 10 /15 iii. Once the state's data systems are in place and accessible, teachers and principals will have student performance available throughout the course of the year. Only those teachers who do not have tenure will receive annual summative evaluations. Those with tenure will be evaluated every three years. The standards that teachers will be evaluated against fill ten pages. That is before the introduction of student growth as a measure. Such voluminous standards make it difficult to know what to do to improve. They provide evaluators with a severe

challenge in providing meaningful and timely feedback. The standards for the performance of principals were not provided. It is not clear what the frequency of summative principal evaluations will be. As contemplated, the system will not be of high quality. 3/10 iv. Using evaluations to inform key decisions 12/28 a. It is not clear how that the evaluation system and the development of teachers and principals will be integrated with the several support programs described. 3/7 b. There is not a clear link described between the proposed evaluation system and the promotion or retention of teachers and principals. The bulk of the added compensation plans are based on credentialing or extra service. The one allusion to effective teachers does include a description of the linkage to the proposed (or existing) evaluation system. 3/7 c. There is no specific link described between the new, proposed evaluation system and decisions about tenure or full certification decisions. The state emphasizes that the proposed evaluation system will not require any changes in procedures or rules regarding tenure and certification. Instead, the state indicates that administrator's will be able to make more competent and transparent decisions because of the availability of student performance data to teacher and administrator alike. 3/7 d. Under state law, teachers and principals can be removed for ineffective performance regardless of tenure. The state indicates that such decisions will be the more transparent in the future because of the greater availability of student performance data. The narrative does not directly link the proposed evaluation system to these decisions. 3/7

<b>(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	10	10
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	5	5

**(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

i. The state has no definition of high minority or high poverty schools. There is no base line data on the distribution of effective teachers and principals. Thus, the changes projected are only estimates. Because the state's plan for identifying effective teachers using the proposed evaluation system will grow through pilot programs, the only verifiable changes in distribution will be determined by measuring what occurs in the districts piloting the evaluation system. For this reason, the targets (or "estimates") represent very modest or negligible effects state wide. Therefore, despite the fact that plan contains promising activities to increase the supply of potentially effective teachers, the absence of a measureable state wide impact and the modest targets prevent the plan being regarded as high quality. 10/15 ii. The state provides a group of initiatives and ideas that while not integrated could indeed produce an increased supply of teachers able to teach in hard to staff areas. Some of the initiatives may never come into being. The state describes a specific target only for the expansion of its Teach for America partnership. The results for the other programs are speculative. The annual overall targets for each category of teacher are the same. This detracts from their credibility. 5/10

<b>(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>
---	-----------	-----------	-----------

**(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

i. To affect this plan, the state will rely on its previous experience with developing ratings for its schools, the kinds of data to be produced or refined through initiatives in this grant proposal, and/or data already available in progress. This data will include the state's measures of teacher/principal effectiveness. The state intends to create an algorithm that will provide stakeholders and the public with a number that will indicate the state's rating of each teacher preparation program. This will be part of a report card for each program that will include other data relevant to potential enrollees, educators, policy makers, and the general public. The state intends to publish its first report card using these data in 2011. Presuming success in developing the underlying data, the plan is of high quality and the target suitably ambitious. 7/7 ii. The state anticipates that by publishing its report card it will put market forces into play that will cause the

expansion of the preparation programs that are most effective under its rating system. The state also anticipates its credentialing arm will require an enhanced pre-service clinical experience for new teachers. The state indicates it has confidence in its rating system. Arguably, then, it could intervene much more directly to expand effective programs and discontinue ineffective ones. Given the urgency of improving education including preparing programs, this plan cannot be said to be of the highest quality. The targets cannot be said to be sufficiently ambitious. 4/7

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	14	14
---	----	----	----

**(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

i. The state sees the current system of LEAs procuring their own professional development as leading to fragmentation. The state believes that the current approach will not provide the state's teacher/leaders with professional development of the quality necessary for the implementation of the initiatives described in this plan. To improve, the state will cause the formation of two networks based at the SEA and regional centers one for disseminating content and the other for fostering implementation of the reform initiatives. These networks will interface with LEA leadership teams and school based professional learning teams (PLCs). As noted there are two concerns with this approach to professional development. The first is because of the number of persons involved in the various networks and teams, there is a significant likelihood that the planned initiatives will not be implemented as uniformly or consistently as desired. In addition, given the time and coaching necessary to create an effective PLC at the school level, it does not appear that sufficient time and resources will be available to create enough PLCs capable of carrying out the many demanding and unfamiliar tasks that it is planned to ask of them. These concerns stated the plan is internally consistent and aligned with the various schedules that pertain to the various initiatives. Some substantial portion of the initiatives are likely to be implemented albeit not uniformly and those that are implemented in substantial part are likely to have significant beneficial effect on student learning and the conditions of teaching. The targets for the professional development via the networks are ambitious. The model of a teacher residency has merit. It is difficult to assess, however, because the inducements for the IHEs are not clear and the LEAs will have their resources already strained by the other initiatives they must manage. The absence of any target for producing teachers reinforces the impression that the plan is not fully credible. [7/10] ii. The plan delays evaluating of this professional development plan until 2012. This is not in keeping with principles of continuous improvement which calls for frequent formative assessments and evaluations. Annual evaluations based on qualitative feedback of the sort described in the performance measures is understood to provide valuable if not all encompassing feedback. Moreover, evaluations based on the data provided by the pilots and the initial phase in of the student growth measures could provide additional, albeit provisional data linking the program of professional development to educator effectiveness and student achievement. For these reasons the plan is not of the highest quality and the targets are not sufficiently ambitious. 7/10

Total	138	85	85
-------	-----	----	----

**E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10	10	

**(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

E. (1) The state has authority to intervene in the lowest achieving schools and LEAs. 10/10

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	25	31
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5

(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools

35

20

26

**(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

i. From 2010 through 2012, the state will use the federal definition of persistently lowest achieving school to identify schools for turnaround. In the fall of 2012, the state will expand the definition to include all schools that fail to meet the state's new accountability standards. From this group the state will identify schools whose student scores have ranked in the bottom 5% of proficiency in math and reading/language arts combined for the all students category for three consecutive years. The state will also include any high school that does not meet the above definition but has a graduation rate of less than 60 percent. The state's plan meets the criteria described in the notice. 5/5 ii. The recent turn around history of the state has positive aspects. The state will not continue to use its most recent approaches. Instead it will create a new approach and structure. The first step will be to subject all designated schools to a two phase audit. This will provide data for an SEA decision regarding what entity will be manage the each school's turn around. Some will be managed by the state through it's to-be-created District 180 management office. Others will be managed by the LEA (as opposed to the sitting principal and school council) and others will be managed by the council (apparently after removal of the sitting principal). The managing agent will identify a model to pursue. After this, how a school turns around and on what schedule is unclear. The primary focus of the state's plan is on creating a state level supervisorial office ("District 180") and three pilot regional offices called Centers for Learning Excellence. None of these entities currently exist. A primary function of each pilot Center is "liaison" between District 180 and the manager(s) of the identified schools. The Centers are to facilitate of the development of a series of external supports and supplementary programs for each school (e.g. parent training, after school program, dual credit programs at high schools). Another focus of the plan is the investment in the expansion of several existing, free-standing programs that will provide specialized services to identified schools. A third focus is the creation of new certification programs which will certify administrators and teachers to be recovery leaders and teacher coaches. A "recovery team" consisting of a certified recovery leader, one or more recovery specialists (i.e. teacher leader/coaches), and a school administrative manager will be placed in each identified school to lead it. The turnaround specialists will be available after 2011 when the first cohort of such persons completes certification. This series of activities are not knit together to represent a coherent approach to turning schools around. Accordingly, the plan is not of the highest quality. 20/35

**(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)**

The presentation clarified how turnaround schools will be identified. The criteria are sophisticated and will become more so during the life of the grant. The same data that make the analysis more sophisticated will assist those charged with a turnaround in analyzing the needs of the school identified. The presentation also clarified the nature of the audits that precede the selection of a turnaround model and why responsibility for turnarounds will be given to different agents (i.e. SEA, LEA, school site council) depending on the audit. These clarifications and explanations raise the quality of this aspect of the state's plan. Therefore, additional points are awarded. 26/35

Total	50	35	41
-------	----	----	----

**F. General**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	10	10	

**(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

i. The state increased funding to public education from 2008 to 2009. -5 sub points ii. The state's policies result in (a) equitable funding between high need LEAs and other LEAs and ( b) between high poverty schools and others within each LEA. -5 sub points

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	8	8
--	----	---	---

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

i. The state does not claim to have a charter school law. 0 sub points ii. N/A-0 sub points iii. N/A-0 sub points iv. N/A-0 sub points v. The state mandates that each public school be governed by a local school council whose autonomy is analogous to or the equivalent of the autonomy typically given charter schools in other states. 8/8

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	5	5
--	---	---	---

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Since 1990 the state has supported a variety of reforms and innovations designed to increase student achievement and graduation rates and to narrow achievement gaps. The state orchestrated a state wide overhaul of its entire K-12 system with the Kentucky Education Reform Act in 1990. Since then, legislation and policy changes have led to new standards and assessments, school and district intervention authority, modifications to make funding more equitable. The state also established state wide preschool, extended school services and instruction time for at risk students, and created family and your Resource Centers. Most recently the state has formed an ongoing partnership with the Wallace foundation to pilot reform including increasing the effectiveness of teachers/principals, instituted the universal administration of the ACT, and passed Senate Bill 1 in 2009 which foreshadowed the state's development of this reform package. The state has also created a Center for School Safety which provides evaluations, support, and a report to the public all of which foster improved school climate and safe environments for the state's school children. The state's over-all focus on achievement has been the impetus for the increased high school graduation rate, the increased college matriculation, and the gains experienced in student achievement since the early 1990's.

Total	55	23	23
-------	----	----	----

**Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15	15	

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

i. The state's plan has embedded in many initiatives activities that can increase the availability of rigorous courses of study in the STEM areas. Foremost among them are the recurring of Teach for America teachers and teacher preparation programs that identify promising teacher candidates and focus their preparation on subjects and locations where it is most difficult to staff such course. A proven activity that will be enhanced to increase the availability of rigorous courses is the expansion of the state's virtual school includes several existing or planned STEM initiatives that meet the three criteria: access to rigorous courses of study, collaboration with STEM-capable community partners, and preparation of more students for advanced study and careers. ii. The state's approach to reforming education hinges on the implementation of new common standards in math and science in grades K-8. Because these standards, along with those for English/language arts will be the vehicle for the induction of all teacher into the processes of assessment and evaluation, and because the plan relies heavily on technology both as a teaching and a working tool for teachers, the plan is highly likely to prepare all teaching to do more integration of STEM content across the grades. iii. Increasing the supply of effective teachers in the STEM disciplines is likely to increase the preparation of more students for advanced study and careers in the STEM disciplines. Because several of the teacher preparation programs are focused on placing the teachers in areas where the taking of advanced courses and the attending of college is not common, the placing of these teachers will also touch

underrepresented students and women with the message that they can succeed at both—hard courses and college.

Total	15	15	15
-------	----	----	----

**Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform**

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes	Yes	

**Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

The state has a long history of acting statewide to improve public education. The state faces unique problems centered on the dispersal of its school as dictated by its geography and the poverty of a very high percentage of its students. In addition to its historical achievements, the state has taken recent steps to initiate another, pervasive statewide reform. The state's leaders have organized to closely monitor their schools, and they have coalesced around this proposal for systematic change. The support for the plan is broad, and the successful implementation of the core reforms in standards, assessment, use of data, and an intense effort to turnaround failing schools will greatly benefit the students, families, and educators of the state. Concerns are raised in the comments about the viability of the proposed system of delivery for professional development. Given the state's geography and resources, the proposal to create multiple networks involving many people might well be the best adaption to both the strengths and challenges facing the state's educators. As noted, uneven implementation of the multiple initiatives is likely to occur in any large, people-based system. The good that could be accomplished by these reforms even if partially implemented or implemented over a longer time than planned will still have highly beneficial effects. For all these reasons, the state has met the ultimate priority.

Total		0	0
-------	--	---	---

Grand Total	500	365	380
-------------	-----	-----	-----



# Race to the Top

## Technical Review Form - Tier 1

### Kentucky Application #3000KY-5



#### A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>65</b>
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	45
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	15
<p><b>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b>            Kentucky does a good job of laying out its overarching strategy for education reform. As per the narrative, at the heart of their strategy is a focus on improving teacher practice to increase effectiveness. The state lays out a clear vision for reform that starts with students and is clearly connected to teachers as the main driver of student success while school leaders, districts and community members also play important roles. The state's path to accomplishing their vision is aligned to the four reform areas. Kentucky lays out a thoughtful timeline for the next three years for accomplishing their goals in implementing the reforms in standards and assessments, using data to improve instruction, ensuring great teachers and leaders and turning around failing schools. Kentucky has done a very good job in securing statewide support for its application. The state has 100% support from all of the 174 districts and they have all signed binding agreements with the state to implement the Race to the Top plans if Kentucky is funded, using the baseline language from the Memo of Understanding suggested in the Race to the Top guidance. It is also impressive that all the state's districts have signed on to all parts of the application. A detail summary table is attached on participating districts, including the superintendent, local board and teacher's association support, where applicable. Kentucky has done a very good job of laying out ambitious yet and achievable goals for student achievement, decreasing achievement gaps, increasing high school graduation rates and college enrollment and the number of students who complete at least a year's worth of college credit. The state has also secured 100% LEA participation in implementing these goals. Kentucky has set some ambitious goals for improving the states performance on the ACT and NAEP exam in reading and math by 2020 with interim goals for 2014. The applicant has also set a goal of reducing the achievement gap between low-income students and their higher income peers, between African-American and their white peers and for other groups, such as Hispanic students and students with an English Language Learner status, as measured on ACT, NAEP and the revised ESEA assessments. Additionally, Kentucky has set a goal of 85% of Kentucky students graduating from high school by 2020 with an interim goal of 80% by 2014. The state's best guess is that the current graduation rate is 75%. Finally, Kentucky has set some pretty ambitious college enrollment and first year completion goals.</p>		
<b>(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	20
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	10
<p><b>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b></p>		

Kentucky has a very good plan in place to ensure capacity to implement the Race to the Top (RTT) reforms and has broad stakeholder support for these reforms. In terms of capacity, the state is already in the process of redesigning its DOE to create work teams in the areas of Standards, Assessments, Professional Learning, Teacher Effectiveness, Statewide Longitudinal Data System and School Improvement and Turnaround. These teams will form the structure of the strategies put forth in the RTT application. The DOE plans to fully redesign its structure to increase collaboration across teams so that it can ultimately improve its focus on and support for districts and schools in the field. This process is being facilitated by the Center for Innovation and Improvement, who has helped other states in this process. Kentucky's Commissioner of Education will play a major leadership role in RTT reforms and the newly created work teams will be responsible for benchmarking and assessing improvements on their performance on an ongoing basis. The State will ultimately retain accountability for ensuring LEA progress and performance towards the RTT goals. Kentucky plans to create a Race to the Top program management office that will provide support to participating LEAs to implement the education reform agenda for RTT. This office will be responsible for driving implementation planning, budget reporting, and performance measurements and will also support the identification and replication of promising practices across the state among other key activities. Kentucky has done a good job of aligning the funds used for this grant, as described in the budget and budget narrative, to accomplish the state's plans and meet its targets and also plans to draw upon Title I and state school improvement funds for instance to implement this reform. The state has also already moved existing federal and state funding for testing to the new assessments that will be developed and the changes in the evaluation system for teachers will build on work already underway that has been funded by the Wallace Foundation. The state also plans to cultivate district-led innovation in areas such as STEM among other areas and has set aside over \$2,500,000 in its budget for such innovations. Kentucky has done a very good job of engaging key stakeholders in the RTT application and has built strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up and sustain their proposed plans. The Kentucky Race to the Top Advisory Council has met five times in the past five months and includes participation from teachers, principals and teacher union association in addition to parent associations and civil rights groups in addition to others who provide leadership in the state. The state also surveyed over 2,400 individuals on their RTT plans and got back pretty positive support for the majority of their initiatives from a variety of stakeholders.

<b>(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>19</b>
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	15

**(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

Kentucky has made some strides in the past years in each of four education reform areas and has used its ARRA and other Federal and State funding to pursue such reforms. The state began an effort to revise its standards to make them more rigorous, college aligned and internationally benchmarked from the spring of 2009, before the details of RTT was fleshed out. The state also made progress in 2009 in supporting teachers to become more assessment literate through seminars titled, "Leading Professional Development in Classroom Assessment for Learning". In terms of data systems, Kentucky recently made some progress in expanding its data systems and has pursued the creation of a comprehensive statewide longitudinal system since 2006. As for great teachers and leaders, although the state has made strides in efforts like redesigning principal preparation and teacher Master's programs, it's not clear that these efforts have led to an increase yet in teacher and leader effectiveness. Finally, the state claims to have made some progress in efforts to turn around low-performing schools and launched the Distinguished Educator program, which prepares the most effective educators statewide to serve as supports to schools in need of improvement. Kentucky has mixed results in improving student outcomes. It has made some progress in improving student outcomes overall and by student subgroup since 2003 on both the NAEP data and state assessments. On NAEP, the state went up by 24 percentage points from 1992 to 2009 for fourth graders in math and 17 percentage points for eighth graders in math. The state's assessments show a similar trajectory but

the change in assessments in between 2006 and 2007 made it challenging to compare data. As for reading, Kentucky has made similar progress. On NAEP, proficiency increased over 10 percentage points for fourth graders in reading/English/language arts between 1992 and 2007 although there was slight decrease for eight graders in 1990 to 2009. Scores in the most recent years from 2003 to 2007 have been mixed, with fourth grade NAEP scores increasing 3 percentage points, yet eight grade reading has declined 6 percentage points. State assessments in reading as similar to the NAEP results, even with the change in assessments between 2006 and 2007—across all grades, the percentage of students proficient or above in reading increased 19 percentage points from 2003 to 2009 and slightly increased from 68% in 2007 to 69% in 2009. Given all of this, Kentucky attributes these increases to its overall approach to increase student achievement in the past years. While this is commendable, it does bring up the question of whether the state has made real connections to which specific reforms are actually working to make gains in student achievement. In terms of closing achievement gaps, Kentucky has mixed results here as some gaps have widened and others have narrowed. For instance, the black-white achievement gap increased by 15 points for fourth graders on the NAEP between 1992 and 2009. In terms of socioeconomic status, the poverty achievement gap increased by 14 percentage points from 1996 to 2009 on the NAEP. In terms of the state assessments, again progress on achievement gaps have been mixed. Across all grades, achievement gaps remained largely steady and the black-white achievement gap widened by 2 percentage points from 2003 to 2009. Again, although Kentucky states that it has been committed to closing the achievement gap through efforts like the Closing the Achievement Gap Advisory Council, it's not clear what actions or strategies have specifically been put in place historically to address the achievement gap so it's not clear what lessons the state has learned. Although Kentucky states in its narrative that it is not yet able to measure graduation rate according to the four-year or extended-year adjusted cohort graduate rate methodologies, it did share that it had a 9 percentage point increase in graduation rates between 1996 and 2006, which was the fourth largest gain among states during that period of time.

<b>Total</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>114</b>
--------------	------------	------------

## B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	20
<b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</b> Kentucky has demonstrated its commitment to adopting a common set of high-quality standards for K-12 standards in English language arts and math. The state is participating in the NGA and CCSSO consortium, which currently has 51 states and territories. An MOU stating Kentucky is a part of the consortium and that the standards produced will be aligned with college and work expectations and be internationally benchmarked is attached along with a draft of the standards, which will be finalized at the end of February/early March. Kentucky is far ahead in its plan to develop and adopt common standards. The state has already passed Senate Bill 1 which mandates the adoption of new standards, with the first wave focused on Math and English/Language Arts to be done by February 2010, which is ahead of the RTT deadline of August 2, 2010. Kentucky appears to be very committed to adopting the Common Core standards. The full process and timeline for Kentucky to adopt the new standards is conveyed as evidence in the attached appendix and details on Senate Bill 1.		
<b>(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</b> Kentucky is a member of four different consortia working to develop assessment tools for evaluating the Common Core Standards. One consortium, the State Consortium Developing Balanced		

Assessment of the Common Core Standard, has thirty states participating. The MOU for Kentucky's participation is attached to the application in the appendix.

<b>(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>18</b>
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:  Kentucky has a strong plan in place to support the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments. Kentucky's Senate Bill 1 mandates that the state's DOE and the Council of Postsecondary Education work together to plan and implement a comprehensive process for revising academic content standards in all areas, and revising the statewide assessment program for implementation in 2011-12. The Bill includes clear implementation requirements and sequencing. Once this Bill passed, multiple stakeholders collaborated to create high-quality plans for the statewide transition to and implementation of the standards and assessments. These plans include timelines for adoption and dissemination of the standards, development of the assessments and a new approach to professional development, along with other key success factors related to implementation. Kentucky has also set goals to ensure that students, teachers, parents, school leaders and other community members are educated on and understand the new standards and assessments. They have also set a goal of successfully implementing the standards and assessments in all classrooms so that all students in Kentucky are prepared for success in the 21st century. The big concern with Kentucky's plan here is that the state didn't adequately address how it would deal with variances across LEAs in terms of the execution of their plan.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>68</b>

### C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:  According to the narrative, Kentucky states that it is fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system that meets all twelve America COMPETES Act elements.</p>		
<b>(C)(2) Accessing and using State data</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:  Kentucky has a high-quality plan in place to ensure that data from the statewide longitudinal data system are accessible to and used to inform and engage key stakeholders and support decision-makers in continuous improvement of efforts of the state in areas such as instruction, management and overall effectiveness. Kentucky's overarching goal is to ensure that stakeholders across the state can access meaningful longitudinal information at any time through an online portal log-in based on their role and needs, and that uses that information to improve the system and student outcomes for all students. The key activities for the state over the next several years includes expanding the Kentucky State Longitudinal Data System across P-20 and workforce environment to enable the work across the four reform areas. This will include expanding existing sources and adding new data. The state will also work to improve accessibility so that teachers can ideally have access to their student data in a less time-intensive way. Finally, the state hopes to increase usage of the data system by developing and facilitating professional development opportunities for more stakeholders to understand how to access and use the data to make better decisions in their positions.</p>		
<b>(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>
<p>(C)(3) Reviewer Comments:  Kentucky has a good quality plan in place to build a Continuous Instructional Technology System (CIITS)-an online platform that will put key information and resources at the finders of teachers,</p>		

principals and administrators so that they can access data on curriculum, assessment, resources, professional learning and school improvement resources. That state has also set some measurable goals to ensure use of the system by LEAs in the coming years. The first step in this plan is for Kentucky to build the online platform by mid 2011, which will be rolled out in stages as it is developed. After all stakeholders have access to the system, the state will provide access to professional learning around access and use of the CITTS so that they can use the platform, use data to understand student needs and inform instruction and use instructional data in professional learning teams to support continuous improvement. Finally, as a part of its plan, the state wants to make sure that the data and resources in the system will be accessible to researchers in order to evaluate the success of various materials, strategies and approaches to educating a diverse group of students across the state. Based on the narrative, Kentucky appears to be very committed to working with third party evaluators to assess what supports are working to improve teacher effectiveness and student learning.

<b>Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>47</b>
--------------	-----------	-----------

#### D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>
<b>(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:  Kentucky has had legislation in place for alternative certification since the early 1990s and in 2003 the Legislature allocated resources to assist in the creation, expansion and implementation of alternative certification programs. The state seems to have conditions in place that allow it to provide high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals. There are currently seven defined alternative routes to teacher and administrator certification in place in the state and according to the narrative, all seven meet the state accreditation standards and Kentucky's bar for teacher and principal preparation programs. The Kentucky Alternative Certification Legislation is attached to the application. According to the narrative, these alternative routes can also have providers that are institutions of higher education or providers operating outside these institutions, the routes are selective in accepting candidates, provide supervised, school-based experiences and ongoing support such as effective mentoring and coaching and limit the amount of coursework required or have options to test out of courses. Kentucky also goes on to list all the programs that are in use in the application and includes their elements against the definition of alternative certification that is included in the RTT guidance. The state also provides a narrative listing the total number of teachers and principals who were certified in the past academic year through these programs. Finally, Kentucky's process for monitoring, evaluating and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage is completed at the district level.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>37</b>
(i) Measuring student growth	5	3
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	9
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	5
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	20
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:  Although Kentucky has a plan in place to improve teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance, the state seems to have taken a slow approach to how they want to ultimately measure student growth and this is concerning and impacts its entire plan to improve teacher and leader effectiveness. Kentucky also does not address the RTT definition of 'effective' and 'highly-effective' teachers in the narrative. The state plans to approach measuring student growth in two ways: through demonstration of significant student growth towards student mastery through multiple measures and through the educator use of formative assessments to inform instruction. Although this sounds good,</p>		

the reader is left wondering how the state plans to measure 'significant' and if there is ultimately an expectation for how far teachers and principals are expected to move students during a year of instruction. The nature of student growth is not clear. The state does have a plan in place to design and implement an evaluation system and it will differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories and take into account data on student growth and teacher and principal behaviors among other things. Although the state has not finalized this, student growth will most likely only count for 30-50% of the determination of teacher and principal effectiveness. Based on the narrative, it appears that Kentucky is putting more weight on the behaviors that lead to improvements in student learning but it seems somewhat premature to prioritize behaviors equally to student growth when it's not clear that these behaviors lead to student growth. This stance on student growth is also problematic since it's such a huge part of the overall RTT efforts for great teachers and leaders and is very connected to all the other reform areas. Kentucky's plan for conducting annual evaluations is also concerning. According to the narrative, Kentucky plans to do annual evaluations for teachers who are pre-service, in an internship or probationary (pre-tenure) but everyone else will receive annual authentic performance assessments that will provide formative feedback to them on their performance. Teachers who have tenure will receive a summative evaluation every three years. Although the state writes that this will allow administrators to focus on providing evaluations for teachers that need it the most, this does not address the fact that teachers who might have more experience in the classroom may not be effective in producing growth with their students. Kentucky does plan to ensure that teachers and principals have access to their performance information and annual evaluations any time by logging onto the CIITS. Kentucky does have a plan in place to use its growth model results to inform decisions around professional development. The state plans to restructure the Kentucky Teacher and Principal Internship Programs to align with the newly defined growth rubrics for teachers and principals to enable a system of evaluation and support throughout the career of teachers and principals in these programs. Kentucky already has a system in place for differentiated compensation, which includes career options for teachers and principals that include National Board Certification. It appears however that the state isn't rethinking these opportunities given that student growth will now be a factor moving forward in determining teacher and leader effectiveness. Kentucky does not plan to change its policy for granting tenure, which typically takes place after a 4-year probationary period. According to the narrative, when it comes to decisions about tenure, the state plans to draw more on the performance data from the growth model that will be a part of determining teacher effectiveness moving forward. Kentucky plans to use the new-growth based evaluation systems to provide principals and superintendents with information on teachers and principals over the course of the year. This will allow these administrators to always have a sense of where teachers and principals are performing and to have the conversations necessary to provide support or to dismiss them if their performance does not improve.

<b>(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>17</b>
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	10
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	7

**(D)(3) Reviewer Comments:**

Kentucky does not provide a definition of high-poverty and high-minority schools in their state. Since they have also not made a decision on measuring student growth, it is difficult to understand how the state will be able to implement their plan for improving the effectiveness of teachers and principals in the state. At the same time, the plan they have laid out is a solid plan. The state's big goals are to ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools are served by highly effective teachers and principals at equal or higher rates than other students. The state also wants to work to ensure that there is a sufficient supply of effective teachers for hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas. To get to these goals, Kentucky plans to require and support equity-focused data reports from LEAs and it plans to identify, recruit and retain effective teachers and principals in classrooms and schools where they are needed most. For particular hard-to-staff positions, the state already has plans in place to partner with organizations like Teach For America and Teach Kentucky to fill those positions. One thing that is concerning about this plan is that the goals that Kentucky has set for

increasing the percentage of teachers and leaders who are effective in high-poverty and/or high-minority do not seem very ambitious. Overall, Kentucky does have some good incentives for ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas but the overarching concern is whether these incentives will be sufficient in tackling all of the state needs.

<b>(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>10</b>
---	-----------	-----------

(D)(4) Reviewer Comments:  
 Kentucky already has a Report Card in place as a mechanism for publicizing the effectiveness of preparation programs. The state plans to work to redesign the indices in this report system to create a single numerical indicator of program quality to enable a publicly released ranking of teacher and principal preparation programs according to the effectiveness of their graduates. Each program will receive a single score, which will take into account multiple measures of student learning. The plan to implement this ranking of preparation programs will not take effect until the end of 2011. Although Kentucky is planning to use the data gathered from this new report card on preparation programs to mostly have it inform prospective teachers and principals about effective programs, it is not clear that the state is planning to use this data to make decisions about which programs to expand. In fact, Kentucky states that it plans to increase the clinical experience that pre-service teachers receive in their programs but this seems premature given that the data on different preparation programs hasn't been gathered yet.

<b>(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>
--	-----------	-----------

(D)(5) Reviewer Comments:  
 Kentucky has a strong plan in place to provide effective support to teachers and principals so that they can implement the RTT reforms. Kentucky's goal is to provide effective supports and learning opportunities through a coordinated professional learning system for teachers and leaders so that they are able to continuously improve their practice and increase student learning based on each of their individual needs and goals. The state plans to continuously evaluate and improve the system to ensure that the supports provided to teachers and leaders truly result in student learning. First, Kentucky plans to revisit the state's approach to professional learning by focusing on providing opportunities for professional development that has evidence of effectiveness in leading to increased student learning. The state also wants to take a network—based approach to professional learning and work to ensure that LEAs have access to one of nine professional learning networks. District leaders and principal leaders will also have their own learning teams. Finally, the state plans to use the CIITS to provide data and resources to teachers and leaders to improve their practice and the state will also pursue legislative changes to support this new professional learning system.

<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>105</b>
--------------	------------	------------

**E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools**

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>
<b>(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>

(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:  
 According to the laws stated in the narrative, Kentucky's Department of Education has the ability to intervene in persistently low-achieving schools by requiring the School Council and principal to relinquish their traditional roles of governance, decision-making, and administration if an audit of the school reveals a lack of capacity to continue in their roles. When this happens, authority is transferred to the LEA or to the state based on recommendations of the audit. Kentucky can intervene in a low-achieving district given statute KRS 158.780.

<b>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>32</b>
---	-----------	-----------

(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	27
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>According to the narrative, Kentucky's will use the federal definition of "persistently lowest-achieving" to identify the schools for turnaround. These schools will be called Educational Recovery Schools and will ultimately include all schools that fail to meet the state's new accountability measures. Students with scores that have been ranked in the bottom 5% of proficiency in math and reading/language arts combined for the ALL students category for three consecutive years. In addition, the state will also identify any high schools that do not meet the before mentioned definition but have a graduation rate of less than 60%. Kentucky's plan to turn around the lowest-achieving schools in the state seems to meet the criterion but given the many entities that will be involved in providing support to these schools, it is not very clear who will ultimately be leading the effort to turnaround these schools and who will be responsible for their success. Moving forward, Kentucky has set a goal of turning around low-achieving schools to have at least 50% combined proficiency in math and reading in all student categories by 2012. To reach this goal, Kentucky plans to use the definition for 'persistently low-achieving' schools to identify those schools that need to turnaround. The state will also create "District 180", a specific office for educational recovery services that will focus only on the schools and districts identified for educational recovery. This office will provide support and assistance to Centers of Learning Excellence (intermediaries between schools, districts and District 180) and educational management organizations contracted to manage recovery schools. This unit will also conduct audits by October 2010 to determine who will make decisions about which turnaround option to employ for each chronically low-achieving school. It is not clear from the plan that Kentucky provides whether or not they have a turnaround model, similar to the four provided in the Race to the Top guidance, in mind for their strategies moving forward.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>42</b>

## F. General

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>In FY 2008, Kentucky used 43.6% of its total revenue for education. In FY 2009, the state used 46.5% of its total revenue for education. Thus, Kentucky has increased its proportional spending on education by nearly 3 percentage points. Kentucky is committed to equitable funding between high-need LEAs and other LEAs and within LEAs, between high-poverty schools and other schools. As per the narrative, the Support Education Excellence in Kentucky funding helps to ensure not only equitable funding across districts but even increased funding for high-need LEAs so they have sufficient resources to serve all students well.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>8</b>
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>According to the narrative, Kentucky does not have any charter school laws in the state and this prevents them from meeting any of the charter school requirements for this section of the application. Kentucky has created an environment where all public schools can become innovative and autonomous through the establishment of a school-based decision making form of school governance.</p>		
<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<p>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

Kentucky has demonstrated other significant reforms in education in the past years. Among some of these reforms is a partnership with the Wallace Foundation to pilot key elements of reforms to increase teacher and principal effectiveness and a universal administration of the ACT that begun in 2008. The state also established the Kentucky Center of School Safety in 1998 that according to the narrative has produced measurable progress in school safety.

Total	55	23
-------	----	----

### Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	15	15

**Competitive Reviewer Comments:**

Kentucky has been working since 2007 to develop a statewide strategic action plan to accelerate Kentucky's performance within the STEM disciplines. Since then, Kentucky has established partnerships and initiatives to further progress in STEM fields. Kentucky has done good job of addressing this STEM priority throughout the RTT application. As a part of the standards and assessments reform effort under RTT, Kentucky has initiatives with Advance Kentucky, Project Lead the Way, Student Technology competitions and Science Centers to address all three of the STEM goals. As a part of the Great Teachers and Leaders reform effort under RTT, Kentucky's initiatives with UTeach, The Mathematics and Science Partnership and Partnership Institute for Mathematics and Science Education Reform address the STEM goal of working with industry experts, museums and other community partners to prepare and assist teachers in integrating STEM content across grade levels and disciplines, in promoting effective and relevant instruction and in offering applied learning opportunities for students. Finally, as for turning around the lowest-achieving schools, Kentucky will address all three STEM goals through their Centers for Learning Excellence that will manage the implementation of programs like Advance Kentucky and Project Lead the Way to ensure that teachers are trained in, and students participate in rigorous STEM courses.

Total	15	15
-------	----	----

### Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		Yes

**Absolute Reviewer Comments:**

Kentucky has done a very good job in laying out a comprehensive and coherent plan that addresses all four of the education reform areas specified in ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria in order to demonstrate that Kentucky and its participating LEAs are taking a systemic approach to education reform. The state has 100% LEA participation and commitment to successfully implement and achieve the goals its plans. Kentucky has also set some clear goals around increasing student achievement overall and by subgroup, decreasing achievement gaps across student subgroups and increasing graduation rates and college enrollment rates.

Total		0
-------	--	---

<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>414</b>
--------------------	------------	------------