

**Race to the Top
Application for Initial Funding
CFDA Number: 84.395A**



U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20202
OMB Number: TBF
Expiration Date: TBF
Paperwork Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is TBD. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average TBF hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Race to the Top, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Room 3E108, Washington, D.C. 20202-3118

OMB Control Number Forthcoming

**I. RACE TO THE TOP APPLICATION ASSURANCES
(CFDA No. 84.395A)**

Legal Name of Applicant (Office of the Governor): Governor Philip N. Bredesen Office of the Governor of the State of Tennessee	Applicant's Mailing Address: Tennessee State Capitol 1 st Floor Nashville, TN 37243
Employer Identification Number: 626001445	Organizational DUNS: 605551126
State Race to the Top Contact Name: (Single point of contact for communication) Erin O'Hara (Please send application confirmation to Erin O'Hara)	Contact Position and Office: Policy Advisor Governor's Office of State Planning and Policy
Contact Telephone: 615-253-8854	Contact E-mail Address: Erin.Ohara@tn.gov
<p>Required Applicant Signatures:</p> <p>To the best of my knowledge and belief, all of the information and data in this application are true and correct.</p> <p>I further certify that I have read the application, am fully committed to it, and will support its implementation:</p>	
Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor (Printed Name): Phil Bredesen	Telephone: 615-741-2001
Signature of Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor: Please see printed copy of signature page	Date: January 18, 2010
Chief State School Officer (Printed Name): Timothy K. Webb	Telephone: 615-741-8457
Signature of the Chief State School Officer: Please see printed copy of signature page	Date: January 18, 2010
President of the State Board of Education (Printed Name): B. Fielding Rolston	Telephone: 615-253-5689

Signature of the President of the State Board of Education: Please see printed copy of signature page	Date: January 18, 2010
<p>State Attorney General Certification</p> <p>I certify that the State’s description of, and statements and conclusions concerning, State law, statute, and regulation in its application are complete, accurate, and constitute a reasonable interpretation of State law, statute, and regulation. <i>(See especially Eligibility Requirement (b), Selection Criteria (B)(1), (D)(1), (E)(1), (F)(2), (F)(3).)</i></p> <p>I certify that the State does not have any legal, statutory, or regulatory barriers at the State level to linking data on student achievement (as defined in this notice) or student growth (as defined in this notice) to teachers and principals for the purpose of teacher and principal evaluation.</p>	
State Attorney General or Authorized Representative (Printed Name): Robert E. Cooper, Jr.	Telephone: 615-741-6474
Signature of the State Attorney General or Authorized Representative: Please see printed copy of signature page	Date: January 18, 2010

II. ACCOUNTABILITY, TRANSPARENCY, REPORTING AND OTHER ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS

Accountability, Transparency and Reporting Assurances

The Governor or his/her authorized representative assures that the State will comply with all of the accountability, transparency, and reporting requirements that apply to the Race to the Top program, including the following:

- For each year of the program, the State will submit a report to the Secretary, at such time and in such manner as the Secretary may require, that describes:
 - the uses of funds within the State;
 - how the State distributed the funds it received;
 - the number of jobs that the Governor estimates were saved or created with the funds;
 - the State's progress in reducing inequities in the distribution of highly qualified teachers, implementing a State longitudinal data system, and developing and implementing valid and reliable assessments for limited English proficient students and students with disabilities; and
 - if applicable, a description of each modernization, renovation, or repair project approved in the State application and funded, including the amounts awarded and project costs (ARRA Division A, Section 14008)
- The State will cooperate with any U.S. Comptroller General evaluation of the uses of funds and the impact of funding on the progress made toward closing achievement gaps (ARRA Division A, Section 14009)
- If the State uses funds for any infrastructure investment, the State will certify that the investment received the full review and vetting required by law and that the chief executive accepts responsibility that the investment is an appropriate use of taxpayer funds. This certification will include a description of the investment, the estimated total cost, and the amount of covered funds to be used. The certification will be posted on the State's website and linked to www.Recovery.gov. A State or local agency may not use funds under the ARRA for infrastructure investment funding unless this certification is made and posted. (ARRA Division A, Section 1511)
- The State will submit reports, within 10 days after the end of each calendar quarter, that contain the information required under section 1512(c) of the ARRA in accordance with any guidance issued by the Office of Management and Budget or the Department. (ARRA Division A, Section 1512(c))
- The State will cooperate with any appropriate Federal Inspector General's examination of records under the program. (ARRA Division A, Section 1515)

Other Assurances and Certifications

The Governor or his/her authorized representative assures or certifies the following:

- The State will comply with all applicable assurances in OMB Standard Forms 424B (Assurances for Non-Construction Programs) and to the extent consistent with the State's application, OMB Standard Form 424D (Assurances for Construction Programs), including the assurances relating to the legal authority to apply for assistance; access to records; conflict of interest; merit systems; nondiscrimination; Hatch Act provisions; labor standards; flood hazards; historic preservation; protection of human subjects; animal welfare; lead-based paint; Single Audit Act; and the general agreement to comply with all applicable Federal laws, executive orders and regulations.
- With respect to the certification regarding lobbying in Department Form 80-0013, no Federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any agency, a Member of Congress, an officer or employee of Congress, or an employee of a Member of Congress in connection with the making or renewal of Federal grants under this program; the State will complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," when required (34 C.F.R. Part 82, Appendix B); and the State will require the full certification, as set forth in 34 C.F.R. Part 82, Appendix A, in the award documents for all subawards at all tiers.
- The State will comply with all of the operational and administrative provisions in Title XV and XIV of the ARRA, including Buy American Requirements (ARRA Division A, Section 1605), Wage Rate Requirements (section 1606), and any applicable environmental impact requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970 (NEPA), as amended, (42 U.S.C. 4371 et seq.) (ARRA Division A, Section 1609). In using ARRA funds for infrastructure investment, recipients will comply with the requirement regarding Preferences for Quick Start Activities (ARRA Division A, Section 1602).
- Any local educational agency (LEA) receiving funding under this program will have on file with the State a set of assurances that meets the requirements of section 442 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) (20 U.S.C. 1232e).
- Any LEA receiving funding under this program will have on file with the State (through either its Stabilization Fiscal Stabilization Fund application or another U.S. Department of Education Federal grant) a description of how the LEA will comply with the requirements of section 427 of GEPA (20 U.S.C. 1228a). The description must include information on the steps the LEA proposes to take to permit students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries to overcome barriers (including barriers based on gender, race, color, national origin, disability, and age) that impede access to, or participation in, the program.
- The State and other entities will comply with the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR), including the following provisions as applicable: 34 CFR Part 74—Administration of Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations; 34 CFR Part 75—Direct Grant Programs; 34 CFR Part 77—Definitions that Apply to Department Regulations; 34 CFR Part

80– Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments, including the procurement provisions; 34 CFR Part 81– General Education Provisions Act–Enforcement; 34 CFR Part 82– New Restrictions on Lobbying; 34 CFR Part 84–Governmentwide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace (Financial Assistance); 34 CFR Part 85–Governmentwide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement).

SIGNATURE BLOCK FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL

Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor (Printed Name): Phil Bredesen	
Signature of Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor: Please see printed copy of signature page	Date: January 18, 2010

III. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS

A State must meet the following requirements in order to be eligible to receive funds under this program.

Eligibility Requirement (a)

The State's applications for funding under Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund program must be approved by the Department prior to the State being awarded a Race to the Top grant.

The Department will determine eligibility under this requirement before making a grant award.

Eligibility Requirement (b)

At the time the State submits its application, there are no legal, statutory, or regulatory barriers at the State level to linking data on student achievement (as defined in this notice) or student growth (as defined in this notice) to teachers and principals for the purpose of teacher and principal evaluation.

The certification of the Attorney General addresses this requirement. The applicant may provide explanatory information, if necessary. The Department will determine eligibility under this requirement.

(Enter text here.)

IV. SELECTION CRITERIA: PROGRESS AND PLANS IN THE FOUR EDUCATION REFORM AREAS

(A) State Success Factors (125 total points)

(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEAs' participation in it (65 points)

The extent to which—

- (i) The State has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that clearly articulates its goals for implementing reforms in the four education areas described in the ARRA and improving student outcomes statewide, establishes a clear and credible path to achieving these goals, and is consistent with the specific reform plans that the State has proposed throughout its application; (5 points)
- (ii) The participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) are strongly committed to the State's plans and to effective implementation of reform in the four education areas, as evidenced by Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) (as set forth in Appendix D) or other binding agreements between the State and its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) that include— (45 points)
 - (a) Terms and conditions that reflect strong commitment by the participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to the State's plans;
 - (b) Scope-of-work descriptions that require participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to implement all or significant portions of the State's Race to the Top plans; and
 - (c) Signatures from as many as possible of the LEA superintendent (or equivalent), the president of the local school board (or equivalent, if applicable), and the local teachers' union leader (if applicable) (one signature of which must be from an authorized LEA representative) demonstrating the extent of leadership support within participating LEAs (as defined in this notice); and
- (iii) The LEAs that are participating in the State's Race to the Top plans (including considerations of the numbers and percentages of participating LEAs, schools, K-12 students, and students in poverty) will translate into broad statewide impact, allowing the State to reach its ambitious yet achievable goals, overall and by student subgroup, for—(15 points)

- (a) Increasing student achievement in (at a minimum) reading/language arts and mathematics, as reported by the NAEP and the assessments required under the ESEA;
- (b) Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, as reported by the NAEP and the assessments required under the ESEA;
- (c) Increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice); and
- (d) Increasing college enrollment (as defined in this notice) and increasing the number of students who complete at least a year's worth of college credit that is applicable to a degree within two years of enrollment in an institution of higher education.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion, as well as projected goals as described in (A)(1)(iii). The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (A)(1)(ii):

- An example of the State's standard Participating LEA MOU, and description of variations used, if any.
- The completed summary table indicating which specific portions of the State's plan each LEA is committed to implementing, and relevant summary statistics (see Summary Table for (A)(1)(ii)(b), below).
- The completed summary table indicating which LEA leadership signatures have been obtained (see Summary Table for (A)(1)(ii)(c), below).

Evidence for (A)(1)(iii):

- The completed summary table indicating the numbers and percentages of participating LEAs, schools, K-12 students, and students in poverty (see Summary Table for (A)(1)(iii), below).
- Tables and graphs that show the State's goals, overall and by subgroup, requested in the criterion, together with the supporting

narrative. In addition, describe what the goals would look like were the State not to receive an award under this program.

Evidence for (A)(1)(ii) and (A)(1)(iii):

- The completed detailed table, by LEA, that includes the information requested in the criterion (see Detailed Table for (A)(1), below).

Recommended maximum response length: Ten pages (excluding tables)

Section A(1)(i):

“I believe with all my heart that the simplicity and focus that is needed in education is to refocus on the individual teacher; a commitment to getting the best possible people to teach in each and every classroom. The problem is not at its core about organization, or technology, or measurement; it’s about human capital and how to maximize it. Once that is in place, everything else will fall in line.”-- Gov. Phil Bredesen, speech to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce’s Institute for a Competitive Workforce Summit, Sept. 25, 2007

Imagine, for a moment, a new day that is coming for Tennessee’s children and families, teachers and principals, and the state’s economic future.

It is a day when struggling schools, from the urban core of Memphis to the foothills of the Great Smoky Mountains, will finally get the human capital — the great teachers and leaders — they need to turn things around. And they will get the support of Tennessee’s finest teachers and leaders, as well as nationally known non-profit groups with track records of success. It is a day when elementary schoolchildren suffering from bad grades, poor attendance, and discipline problems will get the quick intervention they deserve, thanks to new technology that helps teachers and principals flag urgent needs. It is a day when middle school students will get the benefit of formative assessments, with immediate results so their teachers can measure their progress and make adjustments in time for the annual state test. And then principals will use that student achievement data as a significant part of more rigorous teacher evaluations, and work with their teachers to help them succeed.

It is a day when high-schoolers who dream about working with the world’s fastest supercomputer at Oak Ridge National Laboratory, or designing the next great electric car for Tennessee’s own Nissan North America, will get innovative opportunities in new schools focused on science, technology, engineering and math — the STEM disciplines. (STEM items appearing throughout the

proposal are tagged with this superscript^{STEM})

It is a day when more high school graduates will move seamlessly into Tennessee's 13 public community colleges and nine public universities, thanks to early-college plans and increased rigor and course-taking in high school. And of those who begin college, many more will finish on time with an associate's or bachelor's degree.

It is a day when Tennessee will be known as a place with a vision — a desire — for leading the nation in the development of a skilled workforce educated and trained by world-class teachers, leaders, and schools comprising the strongest and most responsive public education system in America.

This day is within reach for the Volunteer State. We believe Race to the Top will dramatically accelerate our current efforts and our push toward excellence.

The conditions are ripe for wholesale education reform. In its modern history, Tennessee's state government has demonstrated a strong commitment to making public education its top funding priority — starting with a landmark law in 1992 establishing the Basic Education Program (BEP), a formula requiring the equitable statewide distribution of funds for public education. For eight consecutive years, Governor Phil Bredesen and the Tennessee General Assembly have each year recommitted to public education as the state's top budget priority. Even during recessionary periods in which other areas of government were cut, the BEP was fully funded and, in healthy times, has enjoyed significant increases.

At the same time, Tennessee has raised academic standards and expectations. Two years ago, the American Diploma Project established the framework in our state for a public education system that is truly focused on college- and career-readiness. Today, because of his powerful commitment and Tennessee's extraordinary progress, Governor Bredesen is the national co-chair of Achieve, which leads the Diploma Project.

In 2009, the legislature made improvements in Tennessee's charter-school law, lifting the cap on new schools and easing restrictions in an effort to attract national charter management organizations to provide additional options for students and families.

Finally, the Volunteer State is recognized for having one of the nation's oldest and most robust databases for tracking "student

growth,” or a child’s improvement in the classroom over time. Our database for tracking growth is known as the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS), and by now has accumulated 18 years of continuous longitudinal data, which we now will use as a significant part of teacher evaluations.

Again, conditions are ripe in Tennessee.

To demonstrate our commitment to the Race to the Top philosophy — and to meet President Obama and Secretary Duncan’s bold challenge for transforming public education in America — Tennessee is responding in a comprehensive and bipartisan manner.

Last week, Governor Bredesen, Democrat and Republican lawmakers, the State Board of Education, the Tennessee Education Association, school districts, business groups, and child advocates joined together in the State Capitol for an extraordinary session of the legislature in order to focus the total energy and will of government on the single task of improving education. The result? Lawmakers enacted the most sweeping set of education reform measures in a generation – the Tennessee First to the Top Act of 2010. We enacted these measures with wide margins of support in the General Assembly and in a consensus-driven, collaborative fashion, which we believe greatly enhances the long-range sustainability of reforms in Tennessee. In fact, this application includes a letter of support from all seven Democrat and Republican candidates for governor – a show of bipartisan support that ensures our application will be carried out no matter who holds the governor’s office.

Among other things, we have created an “Achievement School District” allowing the commissioner of the state Department of Education to intervene in consistently failing schools. We now allow local school systems to create local salary schedules for teachers and principals that permit us to compensate, promote, and terminate teachers as a result of rigorous annual evaluations that are based on student learning.

Most notably, we have fully “unlocked” our TVAAS data by removing statutory barriers to using it in key employment decisions for teachers. We now require annual evaluations for teachers and principals. Not less than 50% of these evaluations will be based on student achievement measures — including at least 35% based on TVAAS data where available. Finally, we are establishing a Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee to develop guidelines in a collaborative manner and recommend criteria to the State Board

of Education.

It is in the wake of our modern history, and on the heels of more recent events, that the State of Tennessee submits — with great pride and hope for our children — its application for federal resources in the U.S. Department of Education’s Race to the Top Fund.

We know that we have a long road ahead of us in Tennessee, which is why we have proposed the reforms outlined in this application. In 2007, our 4th-graders ranked 41st in reading and 46th in math according to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Our 8th-graders ranked 39th in reading and 42nd in math. Yet our state assessments showed close to 90% or better rates of proficiency. This led to Tennessee’s receiving an “F” in “Truth in Advertising about Student Proficiency” from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce “Leaders and Laggards” report in 2007. Rather than ignore it, Governor Bredesen embraced the “F” and used the report as a call to action to raise our standards and make it a priority that we graduate young adults who are ready for college and careers.

How? If there is a single theme running throughout our reform agenda, it is, as Governor Bredesen articulated, the power of human capital: recruiting, developing, evaluating, and compensating the best talent Tennessee can find for its schools; equipping them with the tools they need to succeed, such as standards and data; defining expectations and setting the bar high for student, teacher, and principal success; rethinking old and out-of-date practices that keep great teachers and leaders from succeeding; and harnessing the power of external organizations, foundations, and committed partners to help Tennessee achieve its specific goals and targets. Those targets are reaching 100% proficiency on state assessments; narrowing achievement gaps on the NAEP to single digits; raising the four-year graduation rate to 90%; and raising enrollment rates in colleges and universities (as described later in this section). Underlying all of our human capital reforms is a data system that is second-to-none – the largest student- and teacher-level database ever assembled, permitting value-added analysis and examinations of teacher effectiveness – which we will expand to new frontiers in this application. Please see Appendix A-1-1 for the theory of action behind our application.

Our reform agenda consists of the following:

Tennessee is well down the road of implementing higher and clearer standards: The speed with which Tennessee tackled this issue illustrates our state’s commitment. When Governor Bredesen announced in 2007 that Tennessee was joining the American Diploma Project and pursuing the college- and career-readiness agenda in Tennessee, his rationale was clear: “Something I believe – something I’ve learned as a father – children are very good at responding to expectations. If we set them low, they respond low. If we set them high, they respond in kind.”

Tennessee launched the Diploma Project at a time when state government was making historic new investments in education (a revamped state funding formula, described in Section F(1)). With more resources came added responsibility and accountability. As a matter of public confidence, Tennessee had to address standards simultaneously. Governor Bredesen personally hosted and facilitated six roundtable discussions across Tennessee during the summer of 2007. About 135 business leaders representing 114 companies and organizations participated. Key objectives included: understanding which skills business leaders want in potential employees; identifying gaps between business needs and workforce skills; and taking inventory of suggestions for closing the gaps. The State Board of Education approved the new, more rigorous standards in 2008.

Now we are poised to aim even higher. New standards and aligned assessments are major tools in teachers’ toolboxes, and we are committed to making the standards even stronger through adoption of the Common Core. In this application, we describe the process we will use to adopt the Common Core, the timeline for implementation, and the way in which we will ensure that Tennessee educators receive training on the new standards. **We believe adoption of these higher standards, introduction of aligned assessments, and professional development for both will help us reach higher levels of proficiency on the NAEP and our new state assessments.**

Tennessee has the nation’s richest data system and will expand its use: Tennessee has the most sophisticated value-added assessment system in the United States. For tested grades and subjects, our state can track each child’s achievement, link it back to his or her teachers, and measure not just the absolute performance of a school, but the actual academic growth that school and its teachers are making or not making, as measured by standardized tests. The richness of our data allows Tennessee to perform unique and

statistically significant predictive analyses of every child – predicted trajectories of students all the way up to graduation, ACT scores, and even success in STEM majors. With this information, we can address resource allocation, early intervention, and professional development in a radically different and intensive approach. In this application, we describe the ways in which we will use the data to create a dashboard-style early-warning system for teachers, train teachers and principals on its use, and leverage other federal funds to create a P-20 statewide longitudinal database that encompasses data from education and social service sectors. We seek to organize our efforts and interventions around this data, enabling it to be used from the Capitol to the classroom. **We believe that an expansion from a K-12 data system to a P-20 data system, as well as the creation of an early-warning system, will enable us to reach our graduation rate goal of 90%.**

Tennessee will find and support the best possible talent for its schools: Thinking outside the box when it comes to recruiting and supporting great teachers and leaders is not enough – the box must be smashed and a better model created to enable education to deliver on its promises to students. Over the past two years, while working to improve the quality of its teacher preparation institutions, Tennessee has changed its policies to enable a new set of high-quality alternative licensure providers, enabling these programs to offer licenses directly to talented individuals to teach and lead. Our data systems allow measures of teacher effectiveness that are completely aligned with the Race to the Top guidelines. Indeed, value-added data show that recruits from Teach For America, which exists in Tennessee and plans to expand, are outperforming other teachers. Meanwhile, our higher education providers, through performance-based funding, are realigning their goals to meet the state’s recruiting needs, particularly in mathematics and science. In this application, we describe how Race to the Top funds will be leveraged to bring these themes together as we create a new evaluation system for teachers and principals that will use student growth as one of multiple measures; expand our data use to close the teacher equity gap between high-poverty/high-minority schools and low-poverty/low-minority schools; partner with our higher education institutions to meet our recruitment challenges; and link professional development to teacher effectiveness based on student performance measures. **We believe that a fair, transparent, and data-driven evaluation system, coupled with a transformed way of linking professional development to specific teacher needs, will result in fewer than 10% of Tennessee**

teachers being defined as “ineffective” and unable to move students’ growth by at least one academic year – leading to higher student achievement overall by 2014.

Tennessee will re-engineer its accountability system to focus on low-achieving schools: Tennessee’s accountability system predates the No Child Left Behind Act, and since the act’s passage, has expanded to include a menu of interventions and supports for schools at every level of the accountability spectrum. Although historically half of schools identified for improvement have come off the state’s “High Priority” list, some of our most troubled schools continue to struggle with graduating students or accelerating their achievement. In this application, we describe Tennessee’s new “Achievement School District” consisting of the persistently lowest-achieving schools in the state. We also outline our plan to use the collective human capital and delivery capacity of carefully selected, high-capacity non-profit partners from around the country to dramatically change outcomes for the students in those schools. In addition, we will realign our accountability system so that schools are able to receive interventions more quickly and intensively before they reach advanced stages of low performance. **We believe that expanded authority over low-performing schools and rapid, proven interventions will help us reach higher levels of proficiency on the NAEP and our state assessments, while also giving us a chance to share lessons of school turnaround with others.**

Tennessee’s political and policy environment is conducive to innovation: Tennessee has a history of creative approaches to education, starting from the administration of former Governor Lamar Alexander, who also served as U.S. Secretary of Education and now represents our state in the United States Senate. The stars in Tennessee – the Governor’s Office, the General Assembly, the Department of Education, the State Board of Education, the Tennessee Board of Regents, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, leading business associations, philanthropic foundations, and community groups – are aligned when it comes to the next generation of education innovation. The support ranges from our Congressional delegation in Washington, D.C., to the organization representing our five largest district superintendents, to the statewide Tennessee State Collaborative on Reforming Education (SCORE), chaired by former U.S. Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist, which held 72 town hall meetings across the state to gather Tennesseans’ priorities on education. In this application, we describe how the atmosphere in the state encourages fresh ways of

thinking, opens the education market to charter schools and alternative licensure providers while holding them accountable for results, enables partnerships with respected local and national non-profit organizations, coordinates previously disparate assets such as STEM, and harnesses the power of our individual districts and schools to move achievement in the right direction. We have ambitious and achievable goals, and this application provides a road map to reach them.

Section A(1)(ii): All of Tennessee’s 136 school districts and 4 state special schools have signed Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) committing them to the state’s Race to the Top plan – a unanimous show of support that ranks the state at the forefront of the nation in creating a dynamic and innovative system of public education.

We know creativity in education cannot occur in a top-down manner. That is why the enormous level of support across our state – cities and towns, urban and rural, large and small, high-achieving and low-achieving, rich and poor – is critical. Our districts’ commitment to our application demonstrates both their capacity to embrace change and our state’s ability to fulfill a bold agenda that has broad statewide impact, not just a few pockets here and there. However, while consensus is important, we will be aggressive in only awarding funds to those districts that demonstrate a strong plan of action for implementing all of the reforms in our proposal.

- **Section A(1)(ii)(a):** Tennessee gave its districts a choice: They could either participate in all of our reform agenda as “participating” districts, as defined in the application, or they could decline to participate entirely. There was no middle ground of “involved” status. We gave this choice because we wanted to demonstrate full statewide commitment and because we feel this application should not be thought of as a “buffet.” All parts are woven together to create a coherent plan. We also used the U.S. Department of Education’s sample MOU because our goals were aligned with it and because our districts asked for an MOU as soon as possible so they could have discussions with their unions and school boards. The MOU, reflecting the terms and conditions of our application, is attached as Appendix A-1-2.
- **Section A(1)(ii)(b):** Similarly, we sent the U.S. Department of Education’s sample Scope of Work because we believed our goals were aligned with it. We are pleased that 100% of our 136 participating districts and 4 state special schools committed to

each and every reform criterion, as the summary table demonstrates. We achieved this sign-on rate even though all participating LEAs will have to implement a bold set of policy and practice changes, including using student growth as one of multiple measures in evaluating and compensating teachers and leaders; denying tenure to teachers who are deemed ineffective as gauged partly by student growth; relinquishing control over their persistently lowest-achieving schools; increasing the number of students who are taught by effective teachers; and, in many cases, opening their doors to more charter schools. The sample Scope of Work is attached as Appendix A-1-3.

- **Section A(1)(ii)(c):** As a sign of our statewide approach, 131 of our 136 participating districts and 4 state special schools submitted all three applicable signatures – superintendent, school board president, and union leader. The summary table demonstrates that we had 100% success rates in obtaining the signature of every superintendent and applicable school board president, and a 93% success rate in obtaining the signature of every applicable local teachers’ union leader. (Not all Tennessee school districts have collective bargaining; nonetheless, we asked for the support of local union/association leaders regardless of whether they represented teachers in a collective-bargaining capacity.)

Section A(1)(iii): Tennessee’s goal from the starting line of Race to the Top was to adopt a series of changes that would transform public education for every student, from our urban centers to our rural hamlets, from our growing suburbs to our smallest towns. We believed the only true way to accomplish this was to enlist the support of every district – not to pretend we can have statewide impact by, for example, targeting only our largest school systems or the ones that would be most likely to cooperate. In short, the Tennessee districts that are participating will translate into broad statewide impact, allowing us to achieve our goals, because each and every district has signed on to implement the challenging reforms we have outlined.

While we are delighted that 100% of our districts signed on, we want to be clear that each of them will be held to very high standards measuring teacher effectiveness, turning around schools, and bringing data to teachers’ desktops. We are pleased with the unanimity of our districts; however, we will not sacrifice the strength and innovation of our ideas for the sake of unanimity. We expect

some attrition of districts because we will not waver from our bold plans. Our proposals are strong, but fidelity of implementation matters most and requires courage, sustained leadership, commitment, knowledge of what works, and a willingness to shift course and discard what does not work. Where there is variation in implementation, we will be able to hold districts accountable through withholding funds for activities that are weaker than what we proposed.

The achievement goals in this application are the same we hold as one of the eight states in the College and Career-Ready Policy Institute (CCRPI). CCPRI is the network of five national partners (Achieve, the Data Quality Campaign, Education Counsel, the National Governors Association, and Jobs for the Future) working with eight states that are on accelerated tracks to align their policies to prepare all students for success after high school. As a part of this initiative, the Governor's Office, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), the State Board of Education, and business, community, parent, and education stakeholders collaborated to set achievement and attainment goals from 2007 through 2017. This group set its sights at 125% of the national averages in each category assessed, knowing that our scores may initially slide as a result of forthcoming new, more rigorous assessments. Our aim is to demonstrate that Tennessee is serious about moving students forward in all subgroups and is poised to do so. The achievement goals were set on our state assessment, the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment System program (TCAP), and 8th-grade NAEP.

As shown in Appendix A-1-4, our achievement goals are:

- **A(1)(iii)(a): Increasing proficiency levels in reading and mathematics on TCAP and the NAEP:** Our state assessment is changing to be aligned to the Common Core assessments, so we expect our scores will slide, then recover. However, this change will not take place until new assessments have been created and field-tested, and until we have a baseline, we do not know what TCAP scores will resemble. We believe our ultimate goal of 100% proficiency is still the right one – no matter whether the assessment is old or new. On the NAEP, we know from experience that results are harder to shift, and that we will likely not see real gains until 2013 when students have had several years under the new standards. For detailed goals, please see Appendix A-1-4:

- TCAP: 100% proficiency on reading and mathematics for all students in grades 3-8 and high school.
 - NAEP: 35% proficiency for all students in 8th-grade reading (up from 26%), and 35% proficiency for all students in 8th-grade mathematics (up from 27%).
- **A(1)(iii)(b): Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading and mathematics on TCAP and NAEP:** Again, with our state assessment changing, we expect scores to decrease before rising. On the NAEP, we have charted aggressive gains through 2014 for our subgroups. One reason is that we believe the far-reaching reforms in this application will especially take root in our five largest school systems – Memphis, Nashville, Hamilton County (Chattanooga), Knox County (Knoxville), and Shelby County – whose superintendents and school board chairs have pledged their support to implement these reforms most aggressively. Collectively, they enroll 66% of Tennessee’s students of color and 37% of poor students. With our proposals on teacher evaluation, focused interventions, aligned professional development, persistently lowest-achieving schools, and data taken to scale especially in these districts, we expect to see steady and sustained progress in closing achievement gaps on the NAEP and our state assessments. For detailed goals, please see Appendix A-1-4:
 - TCAP: 100% proficiency on reading and mathematics for all students in grades 3-8 and high school, with no achievement gaps.
 - NAEP: Significantly narrowed achievement gaps in 8th-grade reading and mathematics. Please see Appendix A-1-4 for exact percentages in each subgroup.
 - **A(1)(iii)(c): Increasing high school graduation rates:** Education Week’s 2010 Quality Counts report ranked Tennessee number one in the nation for the growth in its graduation rate between 2000 and 2004, when it rose 14 percentage points. Our graduation rate currently stands at 83%. We expect this to drop for the 2009-10 school year because of a change to the longitudinal cohort method for calculating graduation rates; however, we are not backing away from our goal of a 90% four-year cohort graduation rate. Here again, with every district in the state committed to our application’s reforms – including a focus on preparing all students for college or the world of work through the Tennessee Diploma Project – we believe this rate

is achievable, and more importantly, the right goal to ensure student success. For detailed goals, please see Appendix A-1-4.

- **A(1)(iii)(d): Increasing college enrollment and increasing the number of students who complete at least a year’s worth of college credit applicable to a degree within two years of enrollment:** One of the major accomplishments under the Tennessee Diploma Project was to align public college/university entrance requirements with high school graduation requirements, beginning with the class of 2013. We believe this is a powerful lever not only to encourage more students to attend Tennessee colleges and universities, but also to have them succeed. And we believe this goal is attainable and applicable statewide because of the participation of all of our districts as well as the close involvement in this application of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission. For detailed goals, please see Appendix A-1-4:
 - Increasing enrollment in public postsecondary education to 48,000 students a year, up from 40,000 students.
 - Increasing the number of students who complete a year’s worth of college credit that is applicable to a degree within two years of enrollment to nearly 28,800 students a year, up from 20,000 students.

We also expect broad statewide impact beyond the four years of the grant because we plan to study the reforms we are implementing to determine what works and what does not – findings we plan to share with local, state, and national policymakers to inform practice. This will be especially true in our Achievement School District, where we plan to learn how schools can turn around if barriers are dropped, and what that means for low-performing schools across the state, not just in a single district. Please see Appendix C-3-1 for our evaluation team.

The application asks what our goals would be if we do not receive a Race to the Top award. Our goals remain the same: increased rates of proficiency on state and national assessments, decreased achievement gaps, improved teacher effectiveness, increased graduation rates, and higher rates of college enrollment and success. We set ambitious yet achievable achievement and attainment targets as part of our participation in CCRPI, *before* Race to the Top was included in the Recovery Act. These are Tennessee’s goals because they are the right goals, not because we are submitting a grant application. Not winning Race to the Top funds might slow us down, but we will find other sources of funds, and we will not deviate from implementing the policies that matter

and achieving the results we know are imperative for our state's children. That said, Race to the Top dollars would be a huge boost to our reform efforts.

Summary Table for (A)(1)(ii)(b)

Elements of State Reform Plans	Number of LEAs Participating (#)	Percentage of Total Participating LEAs (%)
B. Standards and Assessments		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	140	100
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction		
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction:		
(i) Use of local instructional improvement systems	140	100
(ii) Professional development on use of data	140	100
(iii) Availability and accessibility of data to researchers	140	100
D. Great Teachers and Leaders		
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance:		
(i) Measure student growth	140	100
(ii) Design and implement evaluation systems	140	100
(iii) Conduct annual evaluations	140	100
(iv)(a) Use evaluations to inform professional development	140	100
(iv)(b) Use evaluations to inform compensation, promotion and retention	140	100
(iv)(c) Use evaluations to inform tenure and/or full certification	140	100
(iv)(d) Use evaluations to inform removal	140	100
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals:		
(i) High-poverty and/or high-minority schools	140	100
(ii) Hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	140	100
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals:		
(i) Quality professional development	140	100
(ii) Measure effectiveness of professional development	140	100

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools	140	100
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	140	100

Tennessee has 136 school districts and four special schools that are counted as LEAs

Summary Table for (A)(1)(ii)(c)

Signatures acquired from participating LEAs:			
Number of Participating LEAs with all applicable signatures	131		
	Number of Signatures Obtained (#)	Number of Signatures Applicable (#)	Percentage (%) (Obtained / Applicable)
LEA Superintendent (or equivalent)	140	140	100
President of Local School Board (or equivalent, if applicable)	136	136	100
Local Teachers' Union Leader (if applicable)	115	124	93

Only about half of Tennessee's 136 LEAs and 4 state special schools have collective bargaining agreements. For the purposes of this application, we counted any LEA with a collective bargaining group OR teachers' association as a union.

Summary Table for (A)(1)(iii)

	Participating LEAs (#)	Statewide (#)	Percentage of Total Statewide (%) (Participating LEAs / Statewide)
LEAs	140	140	100
Schools	1734	1734	100
K-12 Students	931,634	931,634	100

Students in poverty	538,015	538,015	100
----------------------------	---------	---------	-----

[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]

Detailed Table for (A)(1)
 This table provides detailed information on the participation of each participating LEA (as defined in this notice). States should use this table to complete the Summary Tables above. (Note: If the State has a large number of participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), it may move this table to an appendix. States should provide in their narrative a clear reference to the appendix that contains the table.)

Participating LEAs	LEA Demographics			Signatures on MOUs			MOU Terms Uses Standard Terms & Conditions?	Preliminary Scope of Work – Participation in each applicable Plan Criterion															
	# of Schools	# of K-12 Students	# of K-12 Students in Poverty	LEA Suppl. (or equivalent)	President of local school board (if applicable)	President of Local Teachers Union (if applicable)		(B)(3)	(C)(3)(i)	(C)(3)(ii)	(C)(3)(iii)	(D)(2)(i)	(D)(2)(ii)	(D)(2)(iii)	(D)(2)(iv)(a)	(D)(2)(iv)(b)	(D)(2)(iv)(c)	(D)(2)(iv)(d)	(D)(3)(i)	(D)(3)(ii)	(D)(5)(i)	(D)(5)(ii)	(E)(2)
Name of LEA here				Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Yes/ No	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA	Y/ N/ NA
Alamo City	1	581	392	Y	Y	NA	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Alcoa City	3	1632	812	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Alvin C. York Institute	1	689	365	Y	NA	NA	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Anderson County	16	6783	4224	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Athens City	6	1647	927	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bedford County	11	7677	4378	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bells City	1	390	271	Y	Y	N	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Benton County	8	2419	1539	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bledsoe County	6	1790	1341	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Blount County	20	10890	5494	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bradford SSD	2	553	312	Y	Y	NA	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bradley County	17	9960	5817	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Bristol City	8	3855	1881	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Campbell County	13	5635	4159	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cannon County	7	2165	1307	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Carroll County	2	6	4	Y	Y	NA	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Carter County	17	5753	4246	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Cheatham County	13	6766	3026	Y	Y	N	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Chester County	6	2689	1408	Y	Y	N	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Claiborne County	13	4541	3443	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Clay County	5	1044	716	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cleveland City	8	4768	2853	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Clinton City	3	855	463	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cocke County	12	4771	3858	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Coffee County	8	4328	2482	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Crockett County	5	1733	1046	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Cumberland County	12	7213	4934	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dayton City	1	734	465	Y	Y	NA	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Decatur County	4	1612	948	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
DeKalb County	6	2815	1749	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dickson County	15	8287	4483	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dyer County	8	3369	2158	Y	Y	NA	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Dyersburg	4	3245	2242	Y	Y	NA	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

City																							
Elizabethton City	6	2046	1015	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Etowah City	1	350	229	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fayette County	10	3562	2923	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fayetteville City	3	981	500	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Fentress County	6	2343	1811	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Franklin County	11	5758	3509	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Franklin SSD	8	3687	1337	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Gibson County SSD	8	3276	1552	Y	Y	NA	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Giles County	8	4300	2532	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Grainger County	8	3482	2483	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Greene County	16	7203	4762	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Greeneville City	7	2655	1109	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Grundy County	8	2207	1805	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hamblen County	18	9394	5671	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hamilton	75	39247	23157	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

County																							
Hancock County	2	996	850	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hardeman County	9	4057	3366	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hardin County	10	3672	2394	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hawkins County	17	7573	4953	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Haywood County	7	3189	2640	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Henderson County	10	3520	2126	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Henry County	6	3081	2024	Y	Y	N	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hickman County	8	3791	2385	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Hollow Rock-Bruceton SSD	2	690	445	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Houston County	5	1421	863	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Humboldt City	4	1313	1138	Y	Y	N	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Humphreys County	7	3017	1841	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Huntingdon	3	1220	644	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

SSD																							
Jackson County	4	1625	1166	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Jefferson County	11	7330	4440	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Johnson City	10	7249	3350	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Johnson County	7	2177	1532	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Kingsport City	11	6263	2747	Y	Y	NA	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Knox County	87	54109	23861	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lake County	3	894	642	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lauderdale County	7	4401	3513	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lawrence County	13	6584	4000	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lebanon SSD	5	3046	1768	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lenoir City	3	2177	1248	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lewis County	4	1888	1262	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lexington City	2	1045	560	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Lincoln County	8	3995	2176	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Loudon County	9	4982	2666	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Macon County	8	3694	2132	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Madison County	28	12944	9661	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Manchester City	3	1226	773	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Marion County	10	4206	2921	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Marshall County	9	5222	2583	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Maryville City	7	4958	1428	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Maury County	19	11369	5807	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
McKenzie SSD	3	1394	834	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
McMinn County	9	5927	3710	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
McNairy County	8	4259	2497	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Meigs County	4	1758	1238	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Memphis City	199	104829	89985	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Metro-Davidson County	136	70378	53420	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Milan SSD	3	2085	1184	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Monroe County	13	5471	3967	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Montgomery County	34	27827	13150	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Moore County	2	970	483	Y	Y	NA	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Morgan County	8	3223	2014	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Murfreesboro City	12	6805	3460	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Newport City	1	751	418	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Oak Ridge City	8	4387	1828	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Obion County	8	3875	2114	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Oneida SSD	3	1257	804	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Overton County	9	3315	2235	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Paris SSD	3	1571	948	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Perry County	4	1109	759	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Pickett County	2	655	397	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Polk County	6	2632	1858	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Putnam County	18	10137	5440	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rhea County	6	4113	2894	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Richard City	1	286	173	Y	Y	N	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Roane County	18	7216	3826	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Robertson County	18	10655	4888	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rogersville City	1	662	303	Y	Y	NA	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Rutherford County	43	36084	14721	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Scott County	7	2795	2378	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Sequatchie County	3	2137	1400	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Sevier County	25	14077	8389	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Shelby County	51	46284	15371	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Smith County	10	3175	1770	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
South Carroll SSD	1	385	193	Y	Y	N	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Stewart County	5	2200	1233	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Sullivan County	28	11496	5517	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Sumner County	43	26191	9729	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Sweetwater City	4	1483	1024	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

Tipton County	14	11670	6369	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
TN School for the Blind	1	206	131	Y	NA	NA	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
TN School for the Deaf	2	163	87	Y	NA	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Trenton SSD	3	1384	812	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Trousdale County	3	1338	638	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Tullahoma City	7	3318	1506	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Unicoi County	6	2467	1417	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Union City	3	1391	868	Y	Y	NA	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Union County	7	2957	2200	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Van Buren County	2	779	488	Y	Y	NA	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Warren County	11	6273	3855	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Washington County	16	9069	4183	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wayne County	8	2367	1626	Y	Y	N	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Weakley County	11	4722	2592	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
West Carroll SSD	3	1025	708	Y	Y	NA	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

West TN School for the Deaf	1	49	41	Y	NA	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
White County	9	3955	2387	Y	Y	NA	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Williamson County	37	29504	3200	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wilson County	20	14533	4309	Y	Y	Y	Yes	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up and sustain proposed plans (30 points)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality overall plan to—

(i) Ensure that it has the capacity required to implement its proposed plans by— (20 points)

- (a) Providing strong leadership and dedicated teams to implement the statewide education reform plans the State has proposed;
- (b) Supporting participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) in successfully implementing the education reform plans the State has proposed, through such activities as identifying promising practices, evaluating these practices’ effectiveness, ceasing ineffective practices, widely disseminating and replicating the effective practices statewide, holding participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) accountable for progress and performance, and intervening where necessary;
- (c) Providing effective and efficient operations and processes for implementing its Race to the Top grant in such areas as grant administration and oversight, budget reporting and monitoring, performance measure tracking and reporting, and fund disbursement;
- (d) Using the funds for this grant, as described in the State’s budget and accompanying budget narrative, to accomplish the State’s plans and meet its targets, including where feasible, by coordinating, reallocating, or repurposing education funds from other Federal, State, and local sources so that they align with the State’s Race to the Top goals; and

(e) Using the fiscal, political, and human capital resources of the State to continue, after the period of funding has ended, those reforms funded under the grant for which there is evidence of success; and

(ii) Use support from a broad group of stakeholders to better implement its plans, as evidenced by the strength of the statements or actions of support from— (10 points)

- (a) The State’s teachers and principals, which include the State’s teachers’ unions or statewide teacher associations; and
- (b) Other critical stakeholders, such as the State’s legislative leadership; charter school authorizers and State charter school membership associations (if applicable); other State and local leaders (e.g., business, community, civil rights, and education association leaders); Tribal schools; parent, student, and community organizations (e.g., parent-teacher associations, nonprofit organizations, local education foundations, and community-based organizations); and institutions of higher education.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State’s success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. The State’s response to (A)(2)(i)(d) will be addressed in the budget section (Section VIII of the application). Attachments, such as letters of support or commitment, should be summarized in the text box below and organized with a summary table in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (A)(2)(i)(d):

- The State’s budget, as completed in Section VIII of the application. The narrative that accompanies and explains the budget and how it connects to the State’s plan, as completed in Section VIII of the application.

Evidence for (A)(2)(ii):

- A summary in the narrative of the statements or actions and inclusion of key statements or actions in the Appendix.

Recommended maximum response length: Five pages (excluding budget and budget narrative)

Please note that the budget for the Tennessee Race to the Top application can be found on page 164 of this document.

Section A(2)(i): Tennessee is committed to providing the strong leadership and dedicated teams necessary to implement the statewide education reform plans the state has proposed. We have assembled a team of Tennesseans and national experts from the

public and private sectors, as well as committed education stakeholders throughout the state to assist with development and implementation of the bold reforms we have proposed in this plan. Our plan runs throughout the education pipeline (early childhood, K-12, higher education, and the workforce) to prepare students for success. From policy to practice, implementation to evaluation, disseminating to scaling, to a data-driven approach to educational and instructional improvement, we are committed to fully supporting our Race to the Top plan and those tasked with its implementation before, during, and after the grant period.

To oversee our ambitious agenda, Tennessee will assemble a *First to the Top Oversight Team*. This team, which reports to the Governor's Office of State Planning and Policy, is responsible for coordinating reform areas on a regular basis; and serving a liaison role among state agencies, promising regional efforts, and collaborative teams and networks that have been established for implementation support. Members of the First to the Top Oversight Team include staff from the Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE), the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, the Tennessee Department of Finance and Administration, in cooperation with the Comptroller's Office of Education Accountability. National experts in the four assurance areas will also be recruited to assist the Oversight Team in posing critical questions, analyzing data, and determining any necessary mid-course corrections and/or acceleration of reforms. In addition, the committed philanthropic, business and education stakeholders who have served on the committee that oversaw this application will be invited to join the Oversight Team. We believe their continued involvement provides long-term continuity for education reform advocacy and implementation and brings additional sustainability and stability for the effort. Please see Appendix A-2-1 for details of the Oversight Team structure and staffing.

Governor Bredesen, who has been involved deeply in proposal development, believes the chief executive is accountable for the success of this work. The First to the Top Oversight Team will also be a tool for a new Governor who assumes state leadership in January 2011. It is the Bredesen Administration's intent to invite members of the new administration's team to this core group as early as possible to provide a smooth transition of the work from one administration to the next.

The team and staffing will be put in place by April, so that Tennessee is fully poised to accept a Race to the Top award and begin implementation efforts immediately. For example, if Tennessee wins an award in April, the team will work with the

Department of Education and its nine regional Field Service Centers to provide technical assistance to districts in completing the individual Scope of Work proposals within the 90-day window. The center's directors will then bring all Scope of Work proposals to Nashville to be reviewed and approved by a committee of key staff headed by the commissioner.

The Oversight Team will be informed by Tennessee's Consortium on Research, Evaluation and Development (TN CRED, detailed in the Section C of this proposal) tasked with designing the extensive research elements of the state's proposed reforms. By capitalizing on Tennessee's rich data assets, the team will assist in uncovering promising, best, and mature practices to accomplish Tennessee's goals, as well as raise flags when corrections need to be made. This work will occur across the Race to the Top implementation, as well as within ground-level completion at the local level. The work will involve prominent researchers and experts from across the state and beyond. Lessons learned here in Tennessee and across the nation will guide our policymakers on the critical ongoing investment that must be made – or abandoned – to keep the state's education reforms and realities moving in the right direction.

In addition, the TDOE is committed to effective ongoing management of Race to the Top in specific ways that are transformative and sustainable. While elements of the proposal will drive programmatic efforts, implementation will be supported by an agency that is specifically aligned to accomplish the work. The commissioner of education has outlined a TDOE reorganization plan, and specific changes will take place over the next four months. Please see Appendix A-2-2. To achieve success, Tennessee's education agency must build on its existing excellent grants management system that ensures compliance and also embraces the important work of building educational capacity in meaningful and measurable ways. The reorganization plan is constructed in a manner that will support schools and districts and over time will change how the department conducts its work. For long-term sustainability, Race to the Top funds will not be used to add permanent staff to the department, but to solve strategic short-term capacity issues when necessary. Instead, appropriate staff positions will be reassigned, and as needed, individual employees replaced to accomplish the goals. Any needed funding support will be drawn from other state and federal recurring funds. Race to the Top funds will be spent on changing the expectations, culture, and way the TDOE conducts business and builds

critical skill sets and supports educators in the field.

In addition, Tennessee is aligning all of its current and future federal and state resources (such as grants for School Improvement, State Longitudinal Data Systems, and Teacher Incentive Fund) to the core goals and activities expressed in the Race to the Top proposal. There is intentional and significant overlap in the teams working on these projects to assure alignment and leveraging occurs to the greatest extent possible. Furthermore, there are ongoing discussions with the philanthropic and corporate community on this topic and commitments from many of them to align their investments with this work as well. Please see Appendix A-2-3 for support letters expressing this commitment. Combined, these efforts speak well of Tennessee's ability to sustain the work and the commitment to its ongoing vitality and build internal support and capacity across multiple sectors.

For example, as part of this change, the commissioner will create a Delivery Unit and partner with an organization such as the U.S. Education Delivery Institute (USEDI). Such organizations are few and far between, but have demonstrated in work around the world the ability to increase efficiency of policy and practice implementation and assist government agencies in implementing a data-driven method for setting goals and trajectories for achieving them, metrics for measuring progress and regular reporting, and conducting ground-level assessments to inform the process. This work will harness the rich data assets of Tennessee as tools for delivering on the promise of educational reform. Tennessee will contract with such an organization for targeted assistance over a four-year period and participate in a cohort group of states pursuing this approach. In this way, the department will be supported in the transformation from compliance to capacity.

The department will strongly partner with the Tennessee Department of Finance and Administration on grant administration, ARRA compliance, and other matters to ensure grant-making, tracking, and reporting are well-conceived and executed. Key leaders from Finance and Administration, including the commissioner and deputy commissioner, have worked to assist in this proposal's construction and will assist in implementation.

These plans, however, are not the only way that Tennessee will support local districts in their work and build the capacity for educational reform statewide. Tennessee is strategically building relationships with expert organizations and advisors to serve as

long-term partners to assist with building capacity at the TDOE Field Service Centers and at the district and school levels. The SAS Institute will provide increased support for data use. In addition, Tennessee will work with organizations such as Battelle for Kids, a nationally recognized non-profit organization that provides strategic counsel and innovative solutions in the use of value-added data. Success in statewide implementation is a distinguishing characteristic that will provide Tennessee with the confidence that it will meet the needs of educators in the state.

In addition, to maximize the impact of the Achievement School District (ASD), Tennessee will pull together an unprecedented set of non-profit organizations, each with a robust track record of providing highly effective teachers and leaders, creating new charter schools, and revamping dysfunctional human capital systems, and deploying them in the ASD and other schools. These data-focused and results-oriented groups will provide specific technical assistance to educators, and train regional delivery staff and develop Tennessee-specific products and interfaces that will long outlive the Race to the Top grant award period. Battelle Memorial Institute, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and Oak Ridge Associated Universities will mobilize to connect and transform science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) learning through creation and support of the Tennessee STEM Innovation Network ^{STEM}. The state will also continue its long history of engagement with Achieve and other national reform partners.

Tennessee has a long history of working closely with national experts, learning and using lessons well to create change, and partnering for long-term success. We will use that strength to its fullest potential in our Race to the Top award.

Section A(2)(ii): Over the past several years – and certainly under the Tennessee Diploma Project – Tennessee has relied on a number of education, business, foundation, and community partners to carry out its ambitious plans. In this application, we are pleased to submit a number of letters of support from key leaders and organizations across the state. Indeed, some of the groups that supported our application – such as philanthropic foundations – went a step further and said they plan to realign their grant-making activities to support the goals and strategies in the grant.

All letters can be found in Appendix A-2-3. They are from:

- The Tennessee Education Association
- Associations representing principals, administrators, superintendents, urban superintendents, and school boards
- The General Assembly leadership
- The state’s Congressional delegation
- All seven candidates for the 2010 gubernatorial election
- Several leading national non-profit organizations that are dedicated to working in Tennessee
- The state charter school association, representing our 21 charter schools
- The business community, including groups that signed on to support the Tennessee Diploma Project
- Civil rights organizations
- Parents’ groups
- Higher education institutions
- Community-based organizations
- STEM leaders ^{STEM}
- Philanthropic foundations

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps (30 points)

The extent to which the State has demonstrated its ability to—

- (i) Make progress over the past several years in each of the four education reform areas, and used its ARRA and other Federal and State funding to pursue such reforms; (5 points)
- (ii) Improve student outcomes overall and by student subgroup since at least 2003, and explain the connections between the data and the actions that have contributed to — (25 points)

- (a) Increasing student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA;
- (b) Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA; and
- (c) Increasing high school graduation rates.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (A)(3)(ii):

- NAEP and ESEA results since at least 2003. Include in the Appendix all the data requested in the criterion as a resource for peer reviewers for each year in which a test was given or data was collected. Note that this data will be used for reference only and can be in raw format. In the narrative, provide the analysis of this data and any tables or graphs that best support the narrative.

Recommended maximum response length: Six pages

Section A(3)(i): Tennessee enters the Race to the Top competition with considerable strength because of the progress we have made already on the four assurances. As described in Section F(1), education funding has been a priority for Governor Bredesen, with increases in public K-12 education spending as a recognition of the hard work and changes Tennessee educators are undertaking. The General Assembly has also passed laws that call for additional funding in key reform areas. For example:

- **Standards and assessments:** The state planned and implemented revised standards under the Tennessee Diploma Project, described more fully in Section B(3), using \$2 million in state funds since 2007. In addition, the state leveraged \$2.5 million in Title I and Title IIA funds for standards rollout. For assessments, the state realigned assessments to match the new

standards in grades 3-8 and high school, using approximately \$1.5 million in state funds since 2007. Tennessee also used \$3.5 million from a Federal Enhanced Assessment Grant for new assessments.

- **Data systems:** Tennessee is known for its vast value-added data system, built in the 1990s when few states were attempting it. Beginning in 2006, the state built a statewide student management system and launched improvements to the teacher certification system using \$14 million in state funds, as well as \$5.9 million in federal dollars and \$2.7 million in ARRA funds. More recently, the state used \$3 million from an Institute of Education Sciences grant to design and implement a longitudinal data system.
- **Great teachers and leaders:**
 - **Leaders:** As part of its overhaul of instructional leadership standards, the state created new standards that drive preparation programs and state-approved professional development, using \$905,000 in federal funds. Tennessee spent \$285,000 in state funds to create professional development activities for school leaders. We have also used ARRA funds for professional development for all district superintendents (\$190,000) and annual training for all Tennessee school board members (\$247,000), knowing that school and district leaders need professional development as much as their teachers.
 - **Teachers:** Tennessee has used federal funds to accomplish its objectives in the Tennessee Equity Plan at both the state and local levels. The state studied the distribution of effective teachers (detailed in Section D(3)), and then collaborated with LEAs with the biggest gaps to reduce these inequities, using \$100,000 in Title I funds. These districts, such as Memphis City Schools, have used Title I, IIA, and School Improvement funds to provide incentives to attract effective teachers to their neediest schools and performance pay to retain the best teachers in those schools. In addition, many of the state's districts have used No Child Left Behind (NCLB) dollars to attract and retain teachers in high-need subjects such as mathematics, science, and foreign language. These sources have included Title I and IIA funds. Tennessee also expanded Teach Tennessee^{STEM}, aimed at recruiting high-quality mid-career professionals to become teachers, using

used \$5 million in state funds since 2005, and \$5.8 million in federal grants for the Transition to Teach program.

- **Turning around persistently lowest-achieving schools:** As more schools entered our accountability framework, the state set up its support strategy, as described in Section E. Since 2004, the state has hired additional staff (Exemplary Educators, who are contract employees), created an office dedicated to assisting districts with achievement gaps, and set up teams to work with individual districts and schools, using approximately \$29.6 million in state funds. It also leveraged \$1 million in federal funds, as well as \$6.5 million in ARRA dollars and \$700,000 in School Improvement Grant funds for its turnaround supports.

Individually, these reform areas are notable; collectively, we believe they have helped drive the types of changes that have resulted in increased student achievement and educational attainment, as described in the next section.

Section A(3)(ii): Tennessee’s story in terms of student achievement in the core subjects of reading and mathematics consists of the following. Please see Appendix A-3-1 for graphical displays of these scores.

- **A(3)(ii)(a):** Student achievement has increased significantly for grades 3-8 and high school in reading and mathematics on the state assessment, TCAP. Student achievement has been stable for reading in grades 4 and 8 on the NAEP, and has increased in mathematics for grades 4 and 8.
- **A(3)(ii)(b):** Tennessee has seen significant narrowing of its achievement gap between white and Asian students and their black and Hispanic peers on the reading/language arts and mathematics TCAP assessment. On the NAEP, we have seen the gap between Hispanic students and white students narrow in grade 8 mathematics.
- **A(3)(ii)(c):** Tennessee has been nationally recognized for consistent increases in its graduation rates. Please see Appendix A-3-2 for a copy of Professor Robert Balfanz’s and Professor Thomas West’s research, which highlighted Tennessee’s gains. Among subgroups, Hispanic students have shown some narrowing of the graduation rate gaps with their white and Asian peers.

In addition, we have seen stable ACT scores, despite an 18-percentage point gain in the percentage of students tested since 2003.

We are not satisfied with these results. First, we know our state assessment does not measure the level of rigor we know students must experience to succeed, which is why our performance on the NAEP has trailed that of our state assessment. With the introduction of a new test aligned to the tougher Common Core standards, we expect that student proficiency rates will more closely mirror those reported on the NAEP. Likewise, our graduation rate calculation is changing to reflect longitudinal data collection methods, which we anticipate will lead to a decrease in reported graduation rates. As with the tougher state assessment, this is a yardstick we are willing to accept because it is a better measure of where our state stands and reflects the level of achievement our students need to succeed.

But on both counts, our goal is not changing: We are aiming for higher rates of proficiency on the TCAP and the NAEP, and we are maintaining our goal of a 90% graduation rate by 2014.

Tennessee's rise in student achievement rates can be traced back to two key policy strategies: creating an accountability system for all schools that spelled out concrete and measurable student achievement goals; and designing supports for teachers and schools to meet those goals based on the use of data.

In 1992, the TDOE began to implement the state's Education Improvement Act by developing lists of low-performing schools. During the 1998-99 school year, the state made the lists of underperforming schools public, using Tennessee's own form of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) as a yardstick. Tennessee's performance standards were based on each school's scores on state tests in reading, language arts, mathematics, and writing, in addition to a value-added assessment score. When NCLB became law in 2002, Tennessee modified its accountability system to define AYP goals, create targets for subgroups, and incorporate a growth model through TVAAS. Schools that failed to make AYP after two years became known as "High Priority" schools. Please see Appendix E-1-2 for a full explanation of Tennessee's accountability model.

The creation of the accountability continuum is a crucial factor in the state's success. For the first time, schools had measurable targets to reach – not just for some students, but for all. The public naming of schools and where they fell, whether in

good standing or one of the NCLB categories, ushered in a wave of changes at the local level to ensure schools were on a path toward improvement. Most importantly, the state paired its public accountability system with a roster of supports based on schools' individual needs.

Tennessee chose a less-directive route in school accountability in order to build capacity at the district level and help schools improve at a steady pace so that student achievement continues to rise even if supports are removed. The state has deployed the following resources for High Priority schools:

- **Office of Achievement Gap Elimination (AGE):** The Office of Achievement Gap Elimination began service in 2008. Five AGE consultants work with High Priority schools in School Improvement 1 status with demonstrated achievement gaps among subgroups. Of the 28 schools served in 2008-09, 16 made AYP – which, if repeated in 2009-10, means they will come off the High Priority schools list and be in good standing.
- **Exemplary Educators (EEs):** Launched in 1998 and administered by the non-profit Edvantia through a state contract, Exemplary Educators work with High Priority Schools. Exemplary Educators are chosen from a pool of recently retired educators whose experience and expertise can benefit the schools and districts they are assigned to assist. An EE's role may include modeling innovative teaching strategies, serving as mentor to school and district staff, helping staff analyze student performance data, and connecting with professional development providers. There are currently 92 EEs in Tennessee. In 2007, the program won the “Top 50 Innovations in American Government Award” from Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government.
- **System Targeted Assistance Team (STAT):** Starting in 2006, 11 consultants (usually retired district superintendents or administrators) have worked with High Priority districts to align resources, analyze data, work on state-required school/district improvement plans, and ensure that other collaborative improvement efforts such as those described above were targeted and used efficiently. There is evidence of success: Of the five low-achieving districts that had STAT teams, all five either moved off the High Priority LEA list or made AYP in 2008-09.

These supports have had a direct impact on Tennessee's progress on state assessments and the NAEP. For example, an average of 53% of schools named as High Priority schools and received the interventions described above have achieved good standing (i.e., raised their achievement enough to make AYP and come off the High Priority list) since 2001. That has translated into broad impact at the state level, which resulted in increased scores and narrowed achievement gaps on the state assessment as shown in Appendix A-3-1.

Finally, no discussion of Tennessee's data since 2003 is complete without recognizing the strides the state is making in increasing its four-year graduation rate. Among the tactics:

- Setting an ambitious four-year graduation rate of 90%, creating annual benchmarks for schools and districts, and tying those benchmarks to the schools' AYP status.
- Focusing on individual schools' needs to reach the graduation benchmarks, such as funding graduation coaches, creating small learning communities, starting dual-enrollment programs with local colleges, and modifying state policies to allow districts to open alternative high schools for over-age students. About half of Tennessee's approximately 400 high schools also have freshman academies, which provide students with small and more focused learning environments.¹
- Creating Tennessee's *feeder-to-receiver initiative*, launched in 2002 as part of the Tennessee School Improvement Planning Process (TSIPP). It uses adult mentors and academic coaches to help students succeed as they move from to ninth grade.
- Passing a state law that requires students ages 15 to 18 to meet compulsory attendance requirements and make academic progress, or have their driving privileges revoked until they return to school or improve their grades.
- Aligning the district school improvement planning process, Tennessee Comprehensive Strategic Planning Process (TCSPP), with delivery of services that includes career/technical education and special education.

Taken together, these policies of a strong accountability system paired with thoughtful and individualized supports to struggling schools help explain why Tennessee has raised student achievement and narrowed achievement gaps on its state assessments, increased NAEP scores in mathematics, and raised its graduation rate. But there remains a gap between what our state proficiency

scores tell us and what the NAEP assessments show. That is why we are putting in place new, tougher standards and assessments and improving our human capital systems (as described in this application) so our students are better prepared for college or the world of work.

(B) Standards and Assessments (70 total points)

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards (40 points)

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

(i) The State's participation in a consortium of States that— (20 points)

(a) Is working toward jointly developing and adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) that are supported by evidence that they are internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation; and

(b) Includes a significant number of States; and

(ii) — (20 points)

(a) For Phase 1 applications, the State's high-quality plan demonstrating its commitment to and progress toward adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) by August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 specified by the State, and to implementing the standards thereafter in a well-planned way; or

(b) For Phase 2 applications, the State's adoption of a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) by August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 specified by the State in a high-quality plan toward which the State has made

significant progress, and its commitment to implementing the standards thereafter in a well-planned way.¹

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (B)(1)(i):

- A copy of the Memorandum of Agreement, executed by the State, showing that it is part of a standards consortium.
- A copy of the final standards or, if the standards are not yet final, a copy of the draft standards and anticipated date for completing the standards.
- Documentation that the standards are or will be internationally benchmarked and that, when well-implemented, will help to ensure that students are prepared for college and careers.
- The number of States participating in the standards consortium and the list of these States.

Evidence for (B)(1)(ii):

For Phase 1 applicants:

- A description of the legal process in the State for adopting standards, and the State's plan, current progress, and timeframe for adoption.

For Phase 2 applicants:

- Evidence that the State has adopted the standards. Or, if the State has not yet adopted the standards, a description of the legal process in the State for adopting standards and the State's plan, current progress, and timeframe for adoption.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

Section B(1)(i): Tennessee has been a leader in the grassroots push by states to adopt a common set of high-quality, internationally benchmarked standards that prepare students for college- and career-readiness. We will continue to lead by adopting the Common Core standards at a special State Board of Education meeting the last two weeks of July 2010.

Tennessee has arguably moved faster than any state to adopt high-quality standards that prepare students for college and the

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

world of work. Through the Tennessee Diploma Project – in collaboration with Achieve’s American Diploma Project – the state is phasing in new, more rigorous academic standards linked to assessments, more rigorous high school course requirements, aligned college entrance requirements, and student supports. The Tennessee Diploma Project has the unwavering commitment and participation of business leaders, higher education, community groups, educators, and philanthropic foundations to sustain momentum moving forward. Governor Bredesen is also the new co-chair of Achieve, beginning in January 2010.

Governor Bredesen and Education Commissioner Timothy Webb have signed a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to join the Common Core standards initiative led by the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers. The initiative will result in new K-12 grade-by-grade standards in mathematics and English, including a set of college- and career-ready standards, which Tennessee will adopt in July 2010. Forty-eight states are members of the Common Core consortium.

Achieve has notified us that it will conduct a grade-by-grade alignment study between our standards and the Common Core. Based on our previous work with Achieve, we expect our standards to be well-aligned with the Common Core standards, but will make any adjustments as needed. Please see Appendix B-1-1 for a copy of the Common Core MOA, Appendix B-1-2 for a copy of the proposed Common Core standards, Appendix B-1-3 for documentation that they will be internationally benchmarked and prepare students for career-readiness, Appendix B-1-4 for a list of participating states, Appendix B-1-5 for our College and Career-Ready Policy Institute (CCRPI) plan submission, and Appendix B-1-6 for a final feedback letter from our CCRPI partners. (As described in Section A, the College and Career Ready Policy Institute is the network that assists leading states with developing high-quality common standards.)

Section B(1)(ii): Tennessee state law, Tenn. Code Ann. §49-1-302(a)(8), gives the State Board of Education the duty and authority to set policies governing all curricula and courses of study in K-12 public schools, including the adoption of standards. Please see Appendix B-1-7 for the relevant statutory language. The legal process for adopting standards will involve bringing the standards to the Board at the April 16 meeting for a first reading, followed by adoption at a specially-called meeting in July in advance of the August 2, 2010 deadline specified in this application. Please see Appendix B-1-8 for a letter from the State Board of Education

committing to this process.

Based on the strong alignment between Tennessee’s recently adopted college- and career-ready standards and the American Diploma Project (ADP) standards, we fully expect strong alignment between our English and mathematics standards and the Common Core. Achieve will create side-by-side comparisons of the Common Core standards with the standards from Tennessee. It will take 2-3 days to produce each of these analyses, and we expect Tennessee’s analysis during the week of January 18, 2010. We will share the side-by-side analysis with TDOE staff, the State Board of Education, and the Tennessee Higher Education Commission for analysis and discussion. The chart below outlines how we will move to adopt the new Common Core standards before August 2, 2010. Please see Section B(3) for more details of the timeline:

Table 1: Timeline for Adoption of the Common Core Standards

January 2007	Tennessee joins Achieve and launches the Tennessee Diploma Project
Summer 2007	New academic standards developed for grades 9-12
Fall 2007	New academic standards developed for grades K-8
January 2008	State Board of Education adopts new K-12 standards
Summer 2008	Professional development (online sessions, workshops, conferences) occurs statewide on new standards
September 2008	Tennessee joins CCRPI
April 2009	Governor Bredesen, Commissioner Webb sign MOA for Common Core Standards
Summer 2009	Professional development (online sessions, workshops, conferences) occurs statewide on new standards
January 2010	Common Core standards alignment (85% of standards) with Tennessee standards (15% of standards) begins
April 2010	Department of Education will recommend revisions to Tennessee standards and adoption of the Common Core to State Board of Education

July 2010

Board of Education will adopt the Common Core

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

The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to improving the quality of its assessments, evidenced by (as set forth in Appendix B) the State’s participation in a consortium of States that—

- (i) Is working toward jointly developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) aligned with the consortium’s common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice); and
- (ii) Includes a significant number of States.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State’s success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (B)(2):

- A copy of the Memorandum of Agreement, executed by the State, showing that it is part of a consortium that intends to develop high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) aligned with the consortium’s common set of K-12 standards; or documentation that the State’s consortium has applied, or intends to apply, for a grant through the separate Race to the Top Assessment Program (to be described in a subsequent notice); or other evidence of the State’s plan to develop and adopt common, high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice).
- The number of States participating in the assessment consortium and the list of these States.

Recommended maximum response length: One page

Section B(2)(i): Tennessee leads the nation in its commitment to enhanced K-12 standards and high-quality assessments. Governor Bredesen, with consistent support from educators, higher education institutions, businesses, philanthropic foundations, and community groups across the state, has been focused on the need for a clear and rigorous path for students no matter what their background or circumstance.

Our education leadership is keenly interested in the ability to compare assessment results across a large number of states using common college- and career-ready, internationally benchmarked assessments. Given the budget reality of our state, we are also interested in economies of scale that would come with common assessments.

The conversation about how states are coming together around common assessment strategies has led Tennessee to several compelling opportunities: the Achieve/National Governors Association/Council of Chief State School Officers Consortium on a Common Core Assessment; the Florida Race to the Top Common Assessment Consortium; the Maine Balanced Assessment Consortium; SMARTER (Summative Multi-State Assessment Resources for Teachers and Educational Researchers); and MOSAIC (Multiple Options for Student Assessment and Instruction Consortium).

Section B(2)(ii): The Achieve/NGA/CCSSO consortium includes the following 26 states: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Utah, and Wisconsin, as well as the District of Columbia. Please see Appendix B-2-1 for the guidelines.

The Florida Common Assessment Summative Consortium has 14 states including: Arizona, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Jersey, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Tennessee, as well as the District of Columbia. Please see Appendix B-2-2 for the MOU.

The Maine Balanced Assessment Consortium has 35 states including: Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming, as well as the District of Columbia. Please see Appendix B-2-3 for the MOU.

SMARTER has 19 states including: Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Montana, Michigan,

Minnesota, Nebraska, Ohio, Oregon, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming, as well as the District of Columbia. Two additional states, Colorado and New Mexico, intend to sign. Please see Appendix B-2-4 for the MOU.

MOSAIC has 25 states: Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. Please see Appendix B-2-5 for the MOU.

We fully expect additional states to join these multiple consortia in the coming weeks. Tennessee will explore the many options listed above and determine the best path forward for creating a high-quality, innovative system of common summative and formative assessments that fits the needs of our state.

Reform Plan Criteria

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

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan for supporting a statewide transition to and implementation of internationally benchmarked K-12 standards that build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation, and high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) tied to these standards. State or LEA activities might, for example, include: developing a rollout plan for the standards together with all of their supporting components; in cooperation with the State's institutions of higher education, aligning high school exit criteria and college entrance requirements with the new standards and assessments; developing or acquiring, disseminating, and implementing high-quality instructional materials and assessments (including, for example, formative and interim assessments (both as defined in this notice)); developing or acquiring and delivering high-quality professional development to support the transition to new standards and assessments; and engaging in other strategies that translate the standards and information from assessments into classroom practice for all students, including high-need students (as defined in this notice).

The State shall provide its plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Eight pages

Section B(3): Tennessee’s goal for this reform plan criterion is to infuse our schools with world-class standards that are benchmarked internationally, rolled out locally through consistent professional development, and linked to an assessment system that accurately measures student performance against the standards. We will detail Tennessee’s recent actions to improve standards through the Tennessee Diploma Project, our expansion of professional development on the standards for existing teachers, our partnership with higher education to ensure that prospective teachers are equipped with data skills to measure student achievement against those standards, and our timeline for the entire transition.

A need for improvement: Tennessee joined the American Diploma Project (ADP) Network at a time when state government was making historic new investments in education. Governor Bredesen had just made extensive changes to the Basic Education Program funding formula to improve equitable distribution of state education dollars to districts with students most in need of additional resources. With these additional resources came a greater emphasis on responsibility and accountability for improving education for all students, and Tennessee signed onto the ADP as a blueprint for action. The Tennessee Diploma Project represented a true collaboration consisting of K-12, higher education, the business and philanthropic community, Governor’s Office staff, and Achieve. All partners were able to work toward a common goal and crafted aligned standards and course requirements for high school graduation to the college- and career-ready level.

Standards development and rollout in Tennessee: Tennessee has charted a thoughtful and coherent path toward developing standards and introducing them into the state’s classrooms, based on two years of work with Tennessee teachers, administrators, higher education institutions, and the business community. In this section, we concentrate on our mathematics and English/language arts standards:

Overview of the 2009 mathematics curriculum framework revision process: The new mathematics standards for Tennessee are significantly more rigorous than the previous version. In constructing the new standards, teams of math teachers and professors from across the state synthesized national standards from several resources: the ADP standards, National Council of Teachers of

Mathematics, Focal Points, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), ACT standards, and Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning standards. The initial alignment process for college readiness began with a charge to align the standards with ACT standards. The development of these new standards involved three stages: teams of teachers composed necessary content, the standards were reviewed and compared to the national standards by different teams of reviewers, and finally, they were proofed and organized into the final form.

Overview of the 2009 English/language arts curriculum framework revision process: The English/language arts standards bring rigor, breadth, and depth to the curriculum. In establishing the English/Language Arts standards, a committee of teachers, administrators, individuals from institutions of higher education, and personnel from the Tennessee Department of Education drew from the American Diploma Project, the National Council of Teachers of English, NAEP, and ACT. An important addition to the English/Language Arts standards was the inclusion of reading standards, which were integrated at all levels. This inclusion of reading standards ensures that all students have the necessary reading skills to be successful in all content subject areas and in their future careers. The revised standards will help prepare Tennessee students for the workplace, technical schools, and/or college.

The structure of each grade (kindergarten through grade 12) of the English/language arts curriculum consists of the following eight comprehensive content standards: language, communication (listening and speaking), writing, research, logic, informational text, media, and literature. These standards are designed to provide guidance and specificity in planning and implementing curriculum at the state, district, and school levels. The English/language arts curriculum standards are based on two important concepts. First, learning in English/language arts is recursive. Students at every grade level apply the eight English/language arts standards to increasingly complex skills, concepts, and materials. Students build upon and refine their knowledge, gaining sophistication and independence as they learn. Second, although represented separately in the curriculum standards, the content standards are interdependent. Each standard intertwines with and supports the others.

The newly adopted Tennessee standards in English language arts and mathematics present student-learning expectations that are intellectually demanding and well-aligned with the ADP Benchmarks, as well as the Common Core. Tennessee students who

master the state standards will be well-prepared for both workplace and college success.

New assessments: Tennessee will incorporate additional end-of-course assessments at the high school level, including English III, algebra II, chemistry, geometry, and physics. These assessments will focus public attention on the content necessary for college- and career-readiness. THEC and the TDOE agreed in principle that English III and algebra II end-of-course exams will be anchor assessments pending final approval from/and agreement on a common placement score from public colleges and universities in the Tennessee Board of Regents and the University of Tennessee systems. Proficiency on these exams will document student preparedness for college level coursework. There is consensus among the leadership group that the ACT must also be maintained as a benchmark exam because scores are used for lottery scholarship eligibility, institutional scholarships, and university admission. The state's current assessment system, TCAP, will be updated to reflect the new standards for grades 3-8 as well.

New accountability system: Beginning in the 2009-10 school year, the state's accountability system will begin to reflect measures tied to college- and career-ready expectations. The primary indicator in the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determination is the percentage of students who score proficient on state assessments in grades 3-8 and in high school end-of-course assessments. The definition of proficient used on state assessments beginning in 2009-10 will reflect the higher expectation that students have achieved mastery of academic standards and are prepared for college-level study.

Revision of university admissions requirements: Beginning in 2009, Tennessee's high school students will have to take four years of math and three years of science to earn a high school diploma. The Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) has spearheaded the discussion of policy implications between the University of Tennessee system and Tennessee Board of Regents system to revise university admission requirements. These discussions have built the consensus that, effective in fall 2013, admission to public universities and community colleges will require completion of the Ready Core Curriculum of the new Tennessee Diploma Project. Students who do not complete the Ready Core Curriculum will not be admitted and must complete the requirements through additional course work in high school.

Community partnerships: Education in Tennessee continues to enjoy a strong commitment from and involvement by the

business community, the philanthropic community, and the Tennessee PTA. Emerging engagement by newer third-party groups such as SCORE, a statewide collaborative spearheaded by former U.S. Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist focused on ensuring that every child graduates high school prepared for college or a career, has solidified Tennessee's partnership beyond state government.

Professional development: To help our teachers meet new expectations, we plan a thorough rollout plan of in-person, online, and school-specific professional development. Please see Appendix B-3-1 specific goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties for the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments. Please also see Section D(5) for how we plan to link professional development to teacher effect data for evaluation purposes:

- We will design a statewide needs assessment and centralized delivery of professional development, building on what currently exists, and focused on the Common Core standards and assessments. The system will include a dashboard of choices and an Effective Practice Network. Tennessee proposes to use an online approach in assessing professional development needs of teachers and administrators. Surveys, needs assessments, and other tools can be accessed through our Electronic Learning Center (ELC), an online resource for professional development and training.
- Statewide work sessions will be held in our nine regions to “unpack the new Common Core standards and assessments” with a focus on use of the data to inform and improve instruction. Over the course of four years, cohorts of teachers in Summer Institutes (10,000-15,000 educators) will have initial orientation sessions in the first summer, move to implementation tactics the next summer, move to effective practice sessions to review what worked and was ineffective in the next summer session, and finally move to the development of research-based strategies that work for various settings and subgroups in the final summer session. These summer institutes have been effective in the past to deliver this type of professional development on a statewide basis.
- For new teachers and administrators entering the profession, we will conduct a special work session annually and in the following years to orient, help implement, instruct around effective practice, and develop research-based strategies for the Effective Practice Network. Please see below for how we plan to involve our higher education institutions to train pre-

service teachers in data use to measure achievement against the new standards. We will keep cohorts together to build upon prior knowledge and prerequisite skills.

- School-based teams/district-based teams on site will deliver immediate feedback on implementation tactics provided in professional development work sessions. School-based team training will be offered through Reading Institutes, Counselor Institutes, and Data Teams from each school/district with follow-up on site from Field Service Center staff, Exemplary Educators, Achievement Gap Specialists, and Statewide Targeted Assistance Teams who are hired and trained by the state of Tennessee. Please see Appendix E-2-5 for more information on these supports.
- We will expand online delivery of professional development through the ELC. The ELC is a tool that educators currently use if they need podcast delivery of recent training they may have missed. Tennessee will transform this tool into an online delivery of coursework to meet the supply and demand needs of the state. It can be used for in-service and pre-service trainings for prospective teachers, and can be transformed into a dashboard approach for educator choice per needs assessed statewide. In this way, we can offer multiple topics relevant to a greater number of educators with an individualized, just-in-time delivery model to meet individual teachers' needs. We propose to use the ELC as a needs assessment tool for assessing relevant and timely delivery of focused professional development.
- We plan to develop a Network of Effective Practice by Year Four based on implementation of the Common Core standards and assessments that will be delineated by content area per subgroup for rural, urban and suburban settings. These "Lessons Learned" will provide culminating activities with toolkits containing resources for formative and summative assessments, planning and pacing guides, teacher-made and commercial instructional tools, and use of data tips.
- We will launch focused and targeted technical assistance for all High Priority schools/systems – a Train the Trainer concept for statewide system of support. High Priority schools and districts are those that have not made Adequate Yearly Progress after at least two years. Targeted Assistance Teams (provided by the state) of 3-4 team members will be matched to the needs of each school/district based on the benchmarks, content areas, and subgroups that are failing with staff who have

expertise specifically in the areas of need. For example, reading specialists, math specialists, graduation rate specialists, and mentors will act on-site as mentors and facilitators for improvement. To ensure these teams have the expertise to evaluate effective teaching and learning onsite, we will hold “Train the Trainer” sessions focused on Common Core standards and assessments, use of data to improve instruction, school improvement planning for schools/systems, and implementation of effective practice.

We will use these tools and strategies to implement new standards, all focused on the statewide achievement goals we have outlined in Section A(1)(iii).

Balanced assessments in Tennessee: As Tennessee puts its new standards in place, it is simultaneously introducing a balanced assessment developed with multiple consortia of states. Please see Section B(2) for details. Our assessments will be built on the exceptional work of the Common Core standards and the commitment to college- and career-ready curriculum and instruction in mathematics and reading/language arts, which will be easily adapted to science and social studies. The Tennessee system will include formative, adaptive “point of instruction” student assessments available on demand, additional adaptive “benchmark” assessments administered quarterly as “early warning” points of discovery and action, and an adaptive comprehensive (summative) assessment. The balanced assessment model will be aligned to the Common Core standards and provide rich opportunities for sustained assessment for students in grades 3-12. It will have the following characteristics:

- The balanced model, including both formative and summative assessments, will be designed to leverage technology with a single portal design, single platform delivery (learning management system), and single user interface for all applications.
- Comprehensive item banks based on Common Core standards for reading/language arts and mathematics, and state standards for science and social studies, will leverage current and/or future contracts for item writing (including performance-based items) to create teacher- made formative assessments, interim assessments, equated benchmark assessments, and summative assessments that will yield the reporting necessary for accountability and evaluation of students

and staff to inform classroom teachers' work. Because we believe in helping districts integrate their own innovative ideas, a technology-based comprehensive assessment delivery system may be branded at the LEA level to allow for additional items to be locally created and used with students on an ad-hoc basis.

- Formative assessments will be created as check points at the “point of instruction” by teachers at the activity and unit levels aligned to the Common Core standards. Technology-driven, teacher-created short “testlets” will be subject-and grade-specific aligned to learning progression, with five to ten questions available from the item bank with online and adaptive delivery, as well as a paper and pencil option.
- Interim assessments will be created at the multi-unit level and may include adaptive testing organized by Common Core standards within more comprehensive topical learning standards. Interim assessments will be considered “early warning” and provide for immediate intervention at the six- to nine-week range, with results available on the statewide dashboard as described in Section C.
- Benchmark assessments will be created and equated to yield a composite, twice-annual point of reference for immediate student intervention or enrichment opportunities. Technology-driven, pre-instruction/pre-summative “benchmarking” will be standardized for maximum feedback for teachers and leaders.
- All tests will be scored electronically. Comprehensive reporting will be developed for all assessment types based on the Common Core standards. Quick and customizable teacher-friendly reporting will include student-level and teacher recordkeeping for tracking progress over time on the dashboard as described in Section C. Teacher and student usage tracking will be a component of the system and provide reporting at state and district levels. Student, teacher, school, and system-level data such as academic attainment, teacher effectiveness, and value-added growth will be reported from the balanced assessment system for both public and restricted access.
- The adaptive summative system will be designed to complement the formative system and be administered annually as the culminating evaluation of student mastery of the Common Core standards and college- and career-ready benchmarks.

Please see Appendix B-3-1 for the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties for implementation and professional development of our new standards and assessments, as required in Section B(3).

The role of higher education: There is no question about higher education’s commitment to the students, families, and public K-12 schools of Tennessee. Approximately 69% of Tennessee’s graduates enroll in public higher education institutions in the state, and state institutions prepare approximately 70% of K-12 public school teachers. Through pre-service training of prospective teachers as well as professional development for the state’s existing teachers, higher education has agreed to make a substantial contribution in supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments.

There are several areas where pre-service training and in-service professional development can be strengthened to improve educational outcomes. Initial preparation programs equip teachers with various tools in implementing the standards in their classroom and ensuring that all students meet expectations. Through our Race to the Top application, Tennessee proposes that initial preparation programs be responsible for training pre-service teachers in the use of the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS). Through TVAAS, teachers will be trained in using predictive data to modify their classroom instruction and enhance student learning of the state’s new standards. TVAAS is an invaluable resource with the potential to drastically improve educational outcomes.

Tennessee will issue a request for proposals for a training module to be developed that can be disbursed to initial preparation programs. The training module will focus on the use of TVAAS data in modifying and improving classroom instruction. This module will be an 8-hour component of a research methods course in all teacher preparation programs. The process will occur in three stages:

- Request for proposals and award to develop a training module for use in pre-service teaching curriculum. Possible agencies that might receive the contract for this work are the SAS Institute, a non-profit organization with extensive use in TVAAS data, an institution of higher education (in-state or out-of-state), a qualified education-related

organization with a proven record related to training in the use of data for improvement, or a local education agency that has a well-established pattern of demonstrated success using TVAAS data to improve student achievement and the capacity to develop the necessary training model.

- Disseminate the module to appropriate personnel associated with each initial preparation program; and
- Incorporate the training into the pre-service curriculum for all teachers. During the development of the training module, the state policies governing licensure requirements will also be amended. This change will require teachers seeking initial licensure to receive training in the use of TVAAS data to modify and improve classroom instruction.

In addition to training of prospective teachers, professional development of in-service teachers is an integral piece in ensuring adoption and adherence to the enhanced standards. Local education agencies heavily rely on higher education institutions in providing high-quality professional development opportunities to the teacher workforce. Some of the programs that utilize higher education expertise in K-12 professional development are the Improving Teacher Quality grant program, Math and Science Partnership program, and various direct contracts between LEAs and institutions. This network can be utilized in training teachers on new standards, improving classroom outcomes through the use of predictive data, and providing intense, content-specific professional development in failing schools. Under a Race to the Top award, Tennessee's higher education institutions will assist with standards training and professional development specifically for our schools that have entered our accountability continuum. This proposal is detailed in Appendix E-2-8.

Please see Appendix B-3-2 for the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties for higher education's role in training teachers to use data for review of student achievement against our new standards, as required in Section B(3).

(C) Data Systems to Support Instruction (47 total points)

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system (24 points – 2 points per America COMPETES element)

The extent to which the State has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice).

In the text box below, the State shall describe which elements of the America COMPETES Act (as defined in this notice) are currently included in its statewide longitudinal data system.

Evidence:

- Documentation for each of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice) that is included in the State’s statewide longitudinal data system.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

Section C(1): Tennessee’s current longitudinal data system – initiated under a 2006 grant from the Institute of Education Sciences – is a P-12 system that meets the 12 elements of the America COMPETES Act. Table 1 below displays each element and how Tennessee’s current system complies. Tennessee was also one of only 11 states in the nation to have all ten essential elements of statewide data systems as measured by the non-profit Data Quality Campaign – an important external validation of the state’s efforts. Please see Appendix C-1-2 for Tennessee’s report card issued by the Data Quality Campaign.

Table 1: Tennessee’s Fulfillment of the America COMPETES Act Data Elements

Element	Current status	Advancements in the SLDS application
1. A unique student identifier that does not permit a student to be individually identified by users of the system.	Completely meets America COMPETES standards and is available in the P-12 Longitudinal Data System.	Tennessee will improve its unique student identifier by creating a “master person identifier” that will be used to

	Tennessee developed a unique student identifier in 2002.	match individuals across data sets where the unique identifiers do not match.
2. Student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information.	Completely meets America COMPETES standards and is available and reported in the P-12 Longitudinal Data System.	Merging historic value-added assessment data with more recent Tennessee Department of Education data will yield 20 years of retrospective data on student demographics.
3. Student-level information about the points at which students exist, transfer in/out, drop out, or complete public P-16 education programs.	Completely meets America COMPETES standards and is available and reported in the P-12 Longitudinal Data System.	This capability will be enhanced by integrating historic and recurring data within a more advanced student identification system.
4. The capacity to communicate with higher education data systems.	Completely meets America COMPETES standards. The P-12 Longitudinal Data System and data maintained by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) have nodes on the same fiber optics infrastructure, allowing for seamless data sharing.	This capability will be enhanced through collaboration with the University of Tennessee Center for Business and Economic Research and THEC. The P-20 Longitudinal Data System will include student-level data from all two- and four-year higher education institutions in Tennessee.
5. A state data audit system assessing data quality, validity, and reliability.	Completely meets America COMPETES standards. The Department of Education currently performs state data audits via data stewards assigned to specific data areas. These stewards profile the data, assess the impact of poor data quality on	The grant will enhance this capability by implementing a data cleansing tool that will correct data in the source applications. This improves the quality of data at both the state and district levels,

	the LEAs and districts' performance, and work with LEAs to correct errors.	for both current reports and future needs.
6. Yearly test records of individual students with respect to assessments under section 1111(b) of the ESEA.	Completely meets America COMPETES standards and is available and reported in the P-12 Longitudinal Data System.	This information will be integrated into a broader P-20 Longitudinal Data System for greater analysis and linkages.
7. Information on students not tested by grade and subject.	Completely meets America COMPETES standards and is available and reported in the P-12 Longitudinal Data System.	This information will be integrated into a broader P-20 Longitudinal Data System for greater analysis and linkages.
8. A teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students.	Completely meets America COMPETES standards and is available and reported in the P-12 Longitudinal Data System.	This information will be more broadly used in order to capture data on effective teaching and showcase effective teaching techniques statewide.
9. Student-level transcript information, including information on test courses completed and grades earned.	Completely meets America COMPETES standards and is available in THEC's data system, which is linked to the P-12 Longitudinal Data System.	The application eTranscript will enable users to assess where Tennessee high school students apply to college, where they are admitted, and where they actually attend. This system will also simplify transfer of academic records between high schools when students move from school to school, and will allow postsecondary institutions to quickly update academic records for newly admitted students.
10. Student-level college readiness test scores.	Completely meets America COMPETES standards and is available and reported in	This information will be integrated into a broader P-20 Longitudinal Data

	the P-12 Longitudinal Data System	System, in addition to college attainment and other higher education outcomes.
11. Information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to postsecondary education, including enrollment in remedial coursework.	Completely meets America COMPETES standards and is available in THEC’s data system, which is linked to the P-12 Longitudinal Data System.	The creation of a broader P-20 Longitudinal Data System will enhance analysis of this information.
12. Other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary education.	Completely meets America COMPETES standards and is available and reported in the P-12 Longitudinal Data System. Using existing assessment data and the value-added system, the current P-12 Longitudinal Data System enables projections of student performance from elementary to middle, middle to high, and high school to college.	The grant will allow the state to perform these same trajectories from high school through four years of college and from college to four years into the workforce. The state will also have student-level data from other state agencies, such as children’s services, corrections, mental health, etc.

The state’s application to the U.S. Department of Education to expand its statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS) in groundbreaking and thoughtful ways will enable Tennessee to collect and report data using methods that are second to none. Please see Appendix C-1-1 for the abstract and narrative of Tennessee’s recently submitted SLDS grant, which links directly to reforms contained in this application. Please also see Invitational Priority 4 on the expansion and adaptation of our SLDS. Tennessee plans to implement the changes outlined in the SLDS grant proposal with a successful SLDS award and/or a successful Race to the Top award.

Reform Plan Criteria

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data (5 points)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan to ensure that data from the State’s statewide longitudinal data system are accessible to, and used to inform and engage, as appropriate, key stakeholders (*e.g.*, parents, students, teachers, principals, LEA leaders, community members, unions, researchers, and policymakers); and that the data support decision-makers in the continuous improvement of efforts in such areas as policy, instruction, operations, management, resource allocation, and overall effectiveness.²

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

Section (C)(2): Tennessee will use Race to the Top funds to transform the educational experience for children in our state. A comprehensive reform agenda leverages the belief that rigorous standards and assessments, great teaching and educational leadership, and high-quality data systems must work in concert to improve academic achievement. Our goal is to realize the vision of the Tennessee Diploma Project: preparing all students for success in post-secondary education, careers, and citizenship. Two major data tools support this goal: the statewide longitudinal data system (SLDS), which will be expanded; and the state’s nationally recognized value-added assessment system, TVAAS. Our proposal creates a way for all of our teachers and leaders to use the data from both systems through a user-friendly data dashboard.

SLDS: Through its application for a Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems Grant, Tennessee hopes to expand and improve its K-12 data system to a P-20 database that tracks education data as well as information across state social service agencies, as described in Appendix C-1-1. The initiative will significantly increase teacher, school, and district-level use of near-real time student data by employing sophisticated, as yet underused longitudinal data for predictive and retrospective identification of student

² Successful applicants that receive Race to the Top grant awards will need to comply with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), including 34 CFR Part 99, as well as State and local requirements regarding privacy.

achievement growth and academic risk factors.

TVAAS: The Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System is based on the SAS Institute's Education Value-Added Assessment System (EVAAS) and the statistical methodology of Dr. William Sanders. Please see Appendix D-2-1 for additional details. TVAAS is a statistical method used to measure influence of a district, school, or teacher on academic progress or growth rates of individual students or groups of students from year-to-year. It is a statistical analysis of achievement data that reveals academic growth over time for students and groups of students, such as those in a grade level, subject area, or in a school. TVAAS is a tool that gives feedback to school leaders, teachers, and parents on student progress and assesses the influence of schooling on that progress. It provides valuable information for teachers to inform instructional decisions.

Tennessee has used its data system to produce reporting necessary for adhering to requirements of state statutes, including creating Tennessee Department of Education's Annual Report Card and conducting various research projects on program impact, longitudinal outcomes for students, student assessment results, and predictions of future performance. In addition, TVAAS helps us understand effects teachers have on student learning, and in particular, how much academic growth teachers help students achieve in a given year of instruction.

But as rich as the data set is, and as powerful as the current data system has grown to be, Tennessee has only scratched the surface in how we use that data to enhance learning, improve teaching, make policy and investment decisions, and pinpoint best practices for scaling across the state. This rich asset is only as powerful as it is accessible, user-friendly, and put into action by educators on a daily basis. In this proposal, Tennessee commits to the following:

- **Statewide access to TVAAS:** Until this month, only 14% of teachers in Tennessee had their own accounts for directly accessing the TVAAS system. During the week of January 4, 2010, however, all that changed. Every educator now has a TVAAS access account and temporary password. The opportunity for data access is now live and available to every school building. Proper access connections (largely through T1 lines) are in place as are hardware and software necessary for access. In 2010-11, all teachers and principals will be trained on how to access the TVAAS system and how best to

use the data to inform instruction and improve learning. This training will be repeated as new teachers and leaders come into our schools, and as individual teachers and principals ask for refresher or enhancement courses.

- **A data dashboard that integrates SLDS data to further expand the predictive power of TVAAS and create a 360-degree view of a child:** Progressive districts in Tennessee already are working with the SAS Institute (which has an existing contract with the state) to develop a user-friendly data dashboard. Metro Nashville Public Schools and Memphis City Schools use this tool so teachers can see the academic growth pattern of individual students over time and determine whether they are consistently progressing academically. In addition, teachers can use the dashboard to see predictions of how well students will do in the future on state assessments or ACT exams. With these kinds of diagnostic tools, teachers will be able to differentiate instruction and measure its effects. And on the same dashboard, a teacher will have links to information and professional development available to help address the needs of students. We will take this teacher-focused dashboard statewide and make it viewable in every teacher's classroom by 2010, and launch a comprehensive training effort in the 2010-11 school year. Please see Appendix C-2-1 for an explanation of the SAS dashboard.

With this early-warning data in hand, we believe schools and teachers will be able to have better-informed conversations with parents and families about their children's progress, thus making the data more accessible and engaging to parents. It would be of great interest to parents to know, for example, what academic warning signs their children may exhibit and what their predicted performance will be if assistance is not given. Our goal through the dashboard is to make those conversations easier to facilitate. We are committed to refining our system in demonstrable ways as use of the data system spreads for purposes of informing instruction and engaging policymakers and key stakeholders including parents, community members, unions, and others. Our proposal will significantly increase teacher, school, and district-level use of previously inaccessible, underused information.

Please see Appendix C-2-2 for a chart detailing the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties for Sections C(2) and C(3).

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction (18 points)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan to—

- (i) Increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decision-making, and overall effectiveness;
- (ii) Support participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) and schools that are using instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) in providing effective professional development to teachers, principals and administrators on how to use these systems and the resulting data to support continuous instructional improvement; and
- (iii) Make the data from instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice), together with statewide longitudinal data system data, available and accessible to researchers so that they have detailed information with which to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional materials, strategies, and approaches for educating different types of students (*e.g.*, students with disabilities, English language learners, students whose achievement is well below or above grade level).

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII,

Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note the location where the attachment can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Five pages

Section C(3)(i): Tennessee is committed to increasing acquisition, adoption, and use of instructional improvement systems at the local level to inform and improve instructional practice, enhance decision-making, and provide ongoing dialogue about the real successes and challenges realized in our schools. To that end, the state and partners will train every district in Tennessee to use data for instruction, provide direct and user-friendly access to the state’s data assets, and support LEAs in learning how to use data to accomplish educational goals.

Leading the way are districts within the state that have been using these systems for a number of years. Tennessee will showcase these leaders as examples of how systems can work to improve instruction and provide opportunities for others across the state to learn from them. In addition, districts must illustrate within their Race to the Top scope of work how they intend to support instructional improvement systems in concert with state support in this area. The SAS Institute and Tennessee Department of Education will work together to provide a strong tool set, data access, and ongoing support for implementation of instructional improvement systems at the local level, and districts may enhance this work through expenditure of their own resources.

Throughout 2010, districts not only will gain access to the tools and training necessary to begin work in this area, but the recently passed legislation, the First to The Top Act, mandates the development and use of an annual multiple-measure teacher and principal effectiveness evaluation. The First to The Top Act mandates 50% of a teacher’s or principal’s evaluation be based on student achievement data: 35% as represented by TVAAS where available, and 15% based on other measures of student achievement. The legislative mandate of the significant student growth component in evaluations provides an impetus for engaging with the TVAAS system more deeply on a regular basis. Because the new evaluations are meant to inform human capital decision-making – including but not limited to tenure, professional development, retention, and dismissal – understanding how data can be used to both inform, improve, and reflect effectiveness will be of key concern to each and every teacher and leader.

Section C(3)(ii): Supporting educators in using instructional improvement systems is an important and ongoing commitment. To that end, both SAS and non-profits such as Battelle for Kids will provide significant levels of support for this purpose over the four-year course of the Race to the Top award. It is critical to note, however, they will have two distinct roles: 1) supporting districts and schools in implementation; and 2) building the capacity of the Tennessee Department of Education to support this work with districts beyond the four-year term of the grant. This includes specific arrangements for working with nine Field Service Center personnel, coaching and mentoring Department of Education staff, and producing tools and training that will be owned by the State of Tennessee when the grant period is over. Please see Appendix C-3-2 for Tennessee’s approach to supporting districts in using data for instruction.

Specifically, SAS and a non-profit training partner will collaborate to deliver statewide supports in the following areas:

- Building the capacity of teachers and school leaders in the area of balanced assessment.
- Enhancing educators’ capacity to maximize the robust value-added information at their disposal.
- Ensuring quality, transparency, and utility in data systems.
- Providing research and innovation expertise in identifying the impact of specific interventions and determine potential for replication statewide.
- Supporting districts as they research, develop, implement, and enhance systems of differentiated compensation.
- Supporting educators in the Coalition of Large School Systems (CLASS) districts that comprise 34% of the students in our state.
- Supporting a select number of schools in a newly formed Rural School Improvement Collaborative.
- Supporting Tennessee Department of Education in developing long-term capacity to deliver the innovative outcomes outlined in the Race to the Top proposal.

With this work, courses delivered face-to-face will also be available online through the Electronic Learning Center for ongoing

access and reference, Electronic Learning iPod™ sessions will be created and available, and live interactive WebEx™ training will be utilized as well.

This work will also extend to higher education so teacher and principal preparation programs will be supported in integrating specific training modules for TVAAS, data dashboard use, and instructional improvement systems into their required learning experiences and course work. This will help districts hit the ground running with new teachers and principals who already have knowledge of the concepts, systems, and data options they are expected to use on a daily basis in the state.

In addition, the teacher and principal evaluation system will be linked to the instructional data system, allowing for alignment and decision-making in crafting individualized supports for improving practice. Significant investments in all the work described in this section will be made using Race to the Top funding from the state share, and provided to all our districts.

Section (C)(3)(iii): Tennessee is the best state in the nation to serve as a learning laboratory for education reform. The rich data assets, approach to analyses, and significant research questions to be explored present opportunities that simply do not exist elsewhere. Tennessee will make data from the longitudinal data system, TVAAS, and local instructional improvement systems available to researchers to help answer the critical questions in American education. But evaluation of instructional materials, curriculum approaches, and use of different strategies as they relate to outcomes for students are only part of the picture. Understanding variables in teacher effectiveness, determining how well teacher and principal preparation programs help educators to be effective in the early years of their careers, differentiating performance of various preparation programs, and much more can be explored fully.

Tennessee believes it is not just a requirement of this grant to provide access to our data; it is a responsibility regardless of the application. In addition, we know that while our systems provide us the capability to mine this research to improve our own systems, we have not done so. Therefore, we are creating Tennessee's Consortium on Research, Evaluation, and Development (TN CRED) to put in place a series of initiatives to assess the success of Tennessee's innovative reform efforts and identify areas of

greatest opportunity and challenge. Please see Appendix C-3-1 for more information. The goals of the consortium are to:

- Support implementation of state and local reform efforts, and ensure all proposed goals are met.
- Put into action high-quality research, evaluation, and development activities aimed at informing how best to reform education and educate children, capitalizing on new opportunities.
- Synthesize and promote exchanges of high-quality empirical evidence on state-of-the-art initiatives and recent advances in the four assurances of Race to the Top.
- Stimulate meaningful collaboration among educational researchers, practitioners, and policymakers that encourages these stakeholders to take advantage of the most promising educational reform directions and strategies.

Led by Dr. Matthew Springer, Director of the National Center for Performance Incentives at Vanderbilt University, and including a team of respected researchers and practitioners from Tennessee and across the country, TN CRED will be funded within this proposal as well as actively seek outside grants for additional research to support its work. There is no shortage of research questions TN CRED will ask, and among the most crucial are questions about our own proposals and data. For example, if we plan to use student achievement data for 50% of a teacher's evaluation (35% TVAAS and 15% other measures, as specified in the First to the Top Act of 2010), we will research whether there is a correlation between the two. For example, do high TVAAS gains correspond to high gains in other measures? TN CRED's work examining the strategies and proposals in this application will be an invaluable gift to the nation. These unique commitments to data sharing, research, collaboration and dissemination position Tennessee to reform education within the state as well as to be a tremendous asset to educators throughout the country.

Please see Appendix C-2-2 for a chart detailing the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties for Sections C(2) and C(3).

(D) Great Teachers and Leaders (138 total points)

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals (21 points)

The extent to which the State has—

- (i) Legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions that allow alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) for teachers and principals, particularly routes that allow for providers in addition to institutions of higher education;
- (ii) Alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) that are in use; and
- (iii) A process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State’s success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix

, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (D)(1)(i), regarding alternative routes to certification for both teachers and principals:

- A description of the State’s applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents, including information on the elements of the State’s alternative routes (as described in the alternative route to certification definition in this notice).

Evidence for (D)(1)(ii), regarding alternative routes to certification for both teachers and principals:

- A list of the alternative certification programs operating in the State under the State’s alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice), and for each:
 - The elements of the program (as described in the alternative routes to certification definition in this notice).
 - The number of teachers and principals that successfully completed each program in the previous academic year.
 - The total number of teachers and principals certified statewide in the previous academic year.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

Section D(1)(i): Well before Race to the Top, Tennessee made significant progress increasing options for developing talented educators to serve the state’s children. The Volunteer State is committed to supporting the high-quality teacher and principal preparation programs – both traditional and non-traditional – that produce effective teachers and leaders.

State law gives the State Board of Education complete jurisdiction over issuance and administration of licenses for supervisors, principals, and teachers. Under this law, Tenn. Code Ann. §49-5-108(a), the Board of Education has promulgated rules (which have the force of law) for alternative license paths for teacher and principal preparation programs. Please see Appendix D-1-1 for the full language of the state law and Appendix D-1-2 for Board of Education rules on the Transitional Licensure Policy. Under these rules, these programs must be approved and go through future renewals by the Board, and be included in the program report card required of all institutions that prepare teachers. The report card is made public and the data used by the Board to determine program renewal or closure.

To increase our teacher talent pool, the State Board of Education modified its policies in July 2009 to establish criteria for LEAs and education-related organizations such as Teach For America to secure state approval to offer licensure programs on their own, independent of institutions of higher education. In November 2009, the Board took similar action to allow high-quality

organizations such as New Leaders for New Schools to secure state approval to offer licensure programs for school leaders, independent of higher education institutions. Please see Appendix D-1-2 and D-1-3 for the Board of Education rules on these two new policies. The goal of both Board actions was to further streamline the pathway for talented individuals to become teachers or principals, so long as they meet rigorous standards. These policies contain components designed to ensure high quality:

- Identification of standards (particularly those standards directly tied to student achievement growth measures) to which all licensure programs must adhere, whether traditional or alternative.
- Approved programs will be measured on their outcomes – the ability of their teachers or leaders to produce gains with student, rather than on credit hours and seat time.
- All programs must meet the same standards (adapted from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) and demonstrate a track record of fiscal and operational viability. Please see Appendix D-1-7.

Table 1 displays the elements of alternative routes to certification as defined in this application and how Tennessee fulfills them:

Table 1: Elements of Alternative Routes to Certification

Element	Status in Tennessee
Can be provided by various types of qualified providers, including both institutions of higher education and other providers operating independently from institutions of higher education.	Yes. Please see Appendix D-1-4 for a list of providers.
Are selective in accepting candidates.	Yes. Please see Appendix D-1-4 for statistics.
Provide supervised, school-based experiences and ongoing support such as effective	Yes. Please see Appendix D-1-4 for program components of each provider.

mentoring and coaching.	
Significantly limit the amount of coursework required or have options to test out of courses.	Yes. Please see Appendix D-1-4 for program components of each provider.
Upon completion, award the same level of certification that traditional preparation programs award upon completion.	Yes. Individuals in these programs are given an “alternative license” upon entry. Upon successful completion, the employing LEA may recommend candidates for advancement to full licensure.

Section D(1)(ii): Tennessee has five robust and well-established programs for teachers and one program for school leaders that operate as alternative providers across the state. Collectively, they enable between 1,300 and 1,600 people annually to receive licenses as teachers or administrators in Tennessee. Please see Appendix D-1-4 for the list of each alternative licensure program and their elements, along with all the evidence required in the application for this section.

Section D(1)(iii): Tennessee is one of only a handful of states to have commissioned a landmark study to measure supply and demand for its teacher workforce. The Center for Business and Economic Research (CBER) at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville estimates that if current pipelines remain unchanged, Tennessee will face a shortage of 31,431 teachers by 2014. Demand is greatest for high-need areas such as special education, where 3,000 teachers will be needed by 2014, and the STEM fields (science, technology, engineering and math).^{STEM}

This study is the first in a series of reports stemming from the Teacher Education Database housed at CBER. The teacher education database is a longitudinal, unit-level database that tracks all teachers from the colleges and universities where they received their training through employment in any public school district in Tennessee, including charter schools. The supply and demand study provides a baseline of education data related to the teacher workforce in the state. By examining trends in new teacher production, teacher attrition and retirement, and movement among school districts as well as population trends, CBER was able to

predict the demand for teachers through the year 2014.

In addition to examination of the teacher pipeline, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) and the State Board of Education are constructing a School Leader Supply/Demand Study to complement the Teacher Supply/Demand Study, supported by Race to the Top funds. Analysis of existing employment profiles to gauge attrition and to anticipate the hiring of new school leaders who have met new licensure standards will greatly assist districts and school systems in projecting human capital needs.

However, our work does not end with the studies. Governor Bredesen and higher education leaders know that it is not good enough to simply possess this data – the state must act. THEC holds its institutions accountable for producing graduates in high-need fields in education through the following three mechanisms. Please see Appendix D-1-5 for a description of each:

- The statewide Master Plan for Higher Education, which places a premium on production of bachelor's degrees in fields leading to teacher certification, especially in STEM fields.^{STEM}
- The outcomes-based funding formula, through which institutions will receive state funding partially on how many teachers they graduate to fill high-needs areas that the state has identified.
- The performance funding program, which will reward institutions for how well they meet the goals of the Master Plan, such as production of graduates in high need fields.

To meet our teacher shortage, we will grow our existing traditional and alternative programs, hold their growth accountable to our subject-area needs, and measure their effectiveness based on their graduates' ability to produce student outcomes. One strategy for meeting those needs and for improving pre-service training is replication of the nationally recognized UTeach program, begun at the University of Texas, Austin. Middle Tennessee State University and the University of Tennessee-Knoxville are funded through a partnership between the TDOE and THEC to begin UTeach program replication this month. Through Race to the Top funds, two more institutions will join them – University of Tennessee-Chattanooga and the University of Memphis – in the goal of significantly increasing the supply of math and science teachers statewide. Both of these institutions have completed a rigorous evaluation

process and have been approved for the UTeach program pending available funding. Please see Appendix D-1-6 for a full explanation of how Tennessee plans to expand this successful preparation program using Race to the Top support. It is expected to graduate more than 100 math and science teachers annually.^{STEM}

Expanding residency programs for teachers and principals represents another strategy for increasing the educator talent pool. Tennessee already has a number of emerging programs, such as the Memphis Teacher Residency (MTR). Funded by a multi-year private grant, MTR seeks to positively impact student achievement in Memphis's urban schools by recruiting, training, and supporting outstanding teachers. MTR recruits teachers specifically for hard-to-staff schools in Memphis and plans to increase its residency class size from 23 (2009-10) to 100 by 2014. Another example includes Teach/Here, a teacher residency partnership that includes the University of Tennessee-Knoxville, Hamilton County (Chattanooga) Schools and Knox County (Knoxville) Schools. One of only three sites in the nation funded by the National Science Foundation's Robert Noyce Teacher Scholarship Program, it aims to increase the number of effective math and science teachers.

Further, alternative pathways like Teach for America have committed to grow its Tennessee corps from the current 100 to 500 over the next five years. Additionally, The New Teacher Project, which recruits mid-career changers in shortage subject areas, has committed to recruit, select, and prepare an additional 750 teachers over the next five years, in addition to the 150 teachers it currently brings in Memphis and Nashville.

Reform Plan Criteria

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance (58 points)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice)—

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

(ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; (15 points)

(iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools; (10 points) and

(iv) Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding— (28 points)

(a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development;

(b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;

(c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and

(d) Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Ten pages

Section D(2)(i): No other state in the United States has measured student growth through value-added assessment as long as Tennessee. Since 1992, long before value-added analysis became popular elsewhere, the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) has been used to measure the influence of a teacher, school, or district on academic growth rates of individual

students from year-to-year. The state tracks each of Tennessee's students in grades 3-12 in every subject, every grade, and every teacher – resulting in the largest student database ever assembled. Indeed, TVAAS, based on the statistical methodology of Dr. William Sanders, has become a cornerstone of the state's public education system: It is used to measure whether schools have made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), to reward or give support to teachers as part of an evaluation system in the state's most progressive districts, to spot strengths or weaknesses in a grade level or subject, and to inform teachers' classroom instruction to benefit their students.

We will maximize the use of this valuable asset as a major factor in our overall human capital strategy, particularly the induction, development, compensation, and evaluation of our teachers and principals. As we explain in the rest of this section:

- Tennessee will equip every teacher with access to value-added data specific to his/her classroom and/or school. We have increased the percentage of teachers who have access from 14% to 100% this year alone.
- The state will monitor and report access and usage of the system at the teacher, school, and district levels.
- Tennessee will train every teacher and principal in use of value-added data through a partnership with a non-profit training partner, which will focus on using value-added for differentiated instruction, curriculum choices, and more. TVAAS, when fully used, identifies students' specific strengths and weaknesses, helps teachers meet their needs, and assists in accelerating learning. In addition, teachers and their principals can target strengths and weaknesses and determine improvement supports. Such improvement is increasingly important now that value-added data will be a portion of educators' annual evaluations.
- A non-profit training partner also will train districts in use of value-added assessment for compensation and direct links to teachers' and principals' evaluations. This partner will mine that data to determine where breakthrough gains are happening, gain understanding of the practices in use by effective educators, and assist in disseminating these practices statewide.
- Tennessee's public teacher preparation institutions will train their students on use of value-added in their classrooms, as part of a new eight-hour module to an existing methods course starting in 2011. Please see Appendix B-3-2. This means future generations of teachers will have a solid value-added foundation before they ever step foot into a Tennessee classroom.

Tennessee will not rest on its laurels when it comes to use of value-added assessment and analysis. Our state was a pioneer in this methodology, and moving forward, we plan to break new ground by expanding its use. Please see Appendix D-2-1 for an explanation of TVAAS and examples of how the data can be displayed. Please also note that the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties for Reform Plan Criterion D(2) can be found in Appendix D-2-2.

Section D(2)(ii): Having an effective teacher in the classroom and an effective principal leading a school matters more than any other factor when it comes to raising student achievement – more than curriculum, class size, facilities, or education funding. Tennessee views as its responsibility not only to create pathways to attract the most talented professionals to its public education system, but also to differentiate performance and career opportunities, reward high performance, and provide customized support to help educators improve their ability to elevate student achievement levels.

Tennessee believes the foundation for and most important component of a teacher and principal evaluation system is growth in student achievement. Although we are committed to designing an evaluation system that consists of multiple measures, classroom observation, and stakeholder feedback, increasing student achievement will be a significant factor in identifying effective teaching, as well as rewarding, retaining, and strategically utilizing our highest-performing educators. For example, the Benwood Initiative in Hamilton County (Chattanooga) identifies highly effective teachers and has them lead professional learning and take on new roles as classroom coaches. The data are not just being used to sort teachers, but to have the best teachers help increase student achievement by coaching their peers to greater levels of effectiveness.

While using teacher effect data for this purpose may be new in other parts of the country, Tennessee already has experience with it. Our largest districts have begun to leverage the state’s rich database of value-added data to develop higher quality evaluation systems:

- Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) in Knoxville
- Benwood Initiative in Chattanooga

- Teacher Effectiveness Initiative (TEI) recently launched in Memphis (funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the local community)
- Effective Practice Incentive Community in Memphis (led by New Leaders for New Schools)

In each of these initiatives, teacher effect data is being or will be used as a key part of a multiple-measures evaluation system to determine each teacher's strengths; identify areas for improvement; and inform decision-making related to recruitment, compensation, retention, and career paths.

Now is the time for Tennessee to take these practices to scale – and we are in a unique position to do so: The state has the most extensive longitudinal student achievement data system in the nation; forward-thinking teachers and school leaders across the state have embraced and are now using value-added data as a tool for performance measurement; and the state has demonstrated the political will to make bold changes around teacher and principal evaluation, as evidenced the bipartisan, recently passed First to the Top Act.

Tennessee is embarking on an aggressive, collaborative effort to redesign its evaluation systems, with student achievement data as a required significant component. The First to The Top Act calls for the creation of a Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee: a 15-member, multi-stakeholder group that will include the commissioner of education; the executive director of the State Board of Education; chairpersons of the Education Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives; as well as individuals representing the interests of parents, teachers, principals, school boards, superintendents/directors, students, and others deemed appropriate. The group also will reflect the racial and geographic diversity of Tennessee.

The Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee is charged with developing and recommending to the State Board of Education guidelines and criteria for a multiple-measures teacher and principal effectiveness evaluation system, which will be administered annually to all teachers and principals in the state. The commissioner of education will provide professional staff support to the Committee that assists with research, facilitation, written documentation, and summaries needed to inform discussion and advance decision-making. In addition, local, state and national experts will be engaged to further inform the process and provide technical

support for the detailed discussion, options considerations, and exploration of best practices and design of final recommendations.

The Committee shall deliver recommended guidelines and criteria to the State Board. The State Board shall then adopt guidelines and criteria to be effective no later than July 1, 2011, allowing implementation of the new evaluation system prior to the 2011-12 academic year

While the Committee will recommend the design of the full evaluation system for teachers and principals, the First to The Top Act mandates that annual evaluations include at least the following components:

- Objective student achievement data will comprise 50% of the evaluation.
- For teachers and principals, 35% of the evaluation will be based on student growth (TVAAS where it is available, or some other comparable measure of student growth). Please see Appendix D-2-3 for an explanation of teacher effect rating system developed by SAS.
- 15% of the evaluation shall be based on other measures of student achievement selected from a list of such measures developed by the Committee.
- Review of prior evaluations.
- Personal conferences to include discussion of strengths, weaknesses and remediation.
- Relative to teachers, classroom or position observation followed by written assessment.

In addition to the above, Tennessee law mandates principals are also subject to a performance contract that may specify other benchmarks such as graduation rates, ACT scores where applicable, and student attendance. Contracts may provide both for bonuses for meeting or exceeding expectations, as well as for non-renewal of the contract based upon inadequate performance as determined by evaluations.

Four to five summative rating categories will describe teacher and principal effectiveness with clear benchmarks defining each category. Many teachers and leaders in the top category will take on critical roles as coaches and mentors and can be compensated at considerable higher levels than ever before. Teachers or leaders in the lower categories will be provided with

focused support.

In designing an effective and coherent evaluation system, the state will seek alignment among multiple measures. For example, high scores on classroom observations rubrics and content knowledge assessments should be correlated with high value-added scores, so the overall evaluation system provides a valid and reliable tool for measuring effective teaching. The state anticipates the evaluation system will need refinement over time as we learn more about how different measures of the system support high student achievement gains. We will track, analyze, and report on the alignment of these measures annually.

Once the new evaluation system is fully implemented, the First to The Top Act requires it to serve as a factor in employment decisions in our state's education system including, but not limited to: promotion, retention, termination, compensation and the attainment of tenure status. It also will be a useful tool in scheduling professional development.

Section D(2)(iii): All participating LEAs in the state will be required under the First to The Top Act to use the new multiple-measures evaluation system (with some degree of district innovation) to conduct annual reviews of its teachers and principals. The evaluation system may be used to publicly report data that includes, but is not limited to, differentiation of teacher and principal performance (percentage in each rating category), the LEA's ability to increase the percentage of effective teachers and principals, and percentage of compensation based on instructional effectiveness. To ensure accountability on improving performance of teachers and principals, the state will encourage LEAs to set annual improvement goals, with a minimum of 15% improvement in terms of the number of educators moving up in each rating category. The state will also develop reporting mechanisms to disseminate data on performance of LEAs and schools in developing more effective teachers and principals (reflected in the percentage of teachers and principals moving up in the rating categories).

While the state is establishing the evaluation framework, participating LEAs will have the ability to solicit teacher and principal input on the evaluation system. LEAs – with support from the state – will be expected to provide training to their educators on the evaluation tools; ensure timely evaluations occur and feedback loops are created to support teacher and principal

development; and design differentiated professional development to accommodate each educator's skill level.

In addition to being a means for identifying effective or ineffective teachers and principals, the new evaluation system will be a critical tool for helping teachers differentiate instruction to ensure all student groups are making strong achievement gains. It also will provide information to guide allocation of teaching resources and interventions strategically to support struggling students. Tennessee's data also has rich predictive power, providing detailed and reliable projections about the probability of each student's success at important academic milestones (algebra I, ACT and SAT scores, and college readiness in core subject areas).

By making student growth data a cornerstone of our accountability framework at all levels, Tennessee is creating a culture focused squarely on academic achievement. Today, too few of our educators are using Tennessee's data in a way that will accelerate results. The state intends to create a collaborative relationship with its LEAs to help educators across the state have timely access to key student data, understand how to interpret the data effectively, and how to use the data to drive instructional practices.

- Tennessee has ensured 100% of its teachers have access to the TVAAS secure website through the SAS Institute's newly developed data dashboard. The dashboard is a user-friendly interface intended to make powerful student growth, achievement and other critical data available to teachers in a straightforward and helpful manner for decision-making.
- The state has contracted with SAS (whose work in this area has been led by Dr. William Sanders and Dr. June Rivers) to work with LEAs across the state on creating professional development modules for its teacher and principals on how to interpret and use value-added data effectively. This work is already taking place in the state's two largest districts – Memphis and Nashville – and districts across the state will be positioned to implement by the end of 2010.
- The state will incorporate value-added training into the curriculum for teacher candidates, as described in Section B(3).

Section D(2)(iv): When Tennessee's new evaluation system debuts in 2011, it will serve as a platform for making all critical human capital decisions in our state's education system: recruiting, granting tenure, compensating, promoting, retaining, providing professional development, and recognizing exceptional teachers. Please see Appendix D-2-4 for a visual representation of this cycle.

- **Section D(2)(iv)(a):** Currently, professional development offered in the state’s LEAs is not meeting the needs of our teachers and principals. It is often a haphazard menu of generically delivered content to which teachers and principals self-select (“sit and get” model). Moreover, few systems are in place to provide either induction support for new educators or on-going coaching to help drive improvement.

Because the new evaluation system will provide a more comprehensive, nuanced view of each teacher and principal’s strengths and weaknesses, a more frequent, customized approach to coaching and professional development can and will be developed. Teacher and principal professional development will be informed by annual evaluation results. From one evaluation to the next, teacher and principal evaluations will be used to guide the choice and manner of professional development that will best assist in improving effectiveness. The state will provide financial support for significant statewide training that forms the foundation of good practice in Tennessee. This includes training related to TVAAS data and use of data dashboards as well as advanced training on using data to differentiate instruction; support to educators in the Renewal Schools and Achievement School District through Race to the Top (referenced in Section E(2)), Title I and Title IIA funds and other existing resources; and School Improvement Grants, which will require schools to match their own funds as necessary in their Race to the Top scopes of work. For a complete explanation of this approach, please see Section D(5) of this proposal.

Tennessee will use its data system to measure and publicly report on the efficacy of professional development activities, mapping participants’ improvement back to the source of their training and only funding or recommending those activities and programs that demonstrate results. This is similar to the report card released annually on teacher preparation programs, in which the state tracks the effectiveness of its preparation programs in producing high-performing teachers, and similar to the report card on principal preparation programs we propose in this application.

It is Tennessee's overarching goal that funding from Race to the Top will help the state build systems, provide supports, and make decisions that will allow good teachers and leaders to become great; struggling teachers and leaders to dramatically improve their practice and travel the road to effectiveness; and, for those who cannot improve after significant individualized support and opportunity, mechanisms to transition from the profession to make way for others who can serve students more effectively.

- **Section D(2)(iv)(b):** No longer will our teachers and principals be treated as interchangeable parts, because the data clearly tell us that teacher and principal effectiveness varies widely. For Tennessee to increase student achievement dramatically, the state not only has to consistently identify its most talented teachers and principals, but also has to be intentional in finding ways to compensate, promote, and retain them. That means doing things far differently than we have done in the past. As part of the school improvement planning process, districts will be required to differentiate their retention data of top performers, growth of teachers and leaders from lower levels of effectiveness to effective, and attrition of less effective teachers and leaders. Tennessee will track and publicize differential retention rates of our districts, showing the ability of our districts to grow and retain top performers and effectively manage poor performers.

While Tennessee has experimented with career progression programs and differentiated pay plans in the past, we are proposing a bold, comprehensive strategy that builds upon the work already underway in the Memphis Teacher Effectiveness Initiative under a \$90 million grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. This innovative partnership between the district, union, and community is implementing an entirely new teacher effectiveness paradigm that encompasses joint development of differentiated roles for teachers, evaluation that uses data as a significant factor and is used to make critical human capital decisions, and implements a compensation structure that rewards effective performance. Please see Appendix

D-2-5 for a summary of the Memphis initiative.

Informed by the Memphis strategy, Tennessee will work with and provide support for its LEAs to create clear, differentiated career paths for teachers and principals, based on their performance levels using the new evaluation system. These may include categories such as Beginning, Intermediate, Professional, and Master, each of which would have a high bar for entry, as well as expanded roles and higher compensation. The state, with Race to the Top funding, will provide support to participating LEAs to design and implement new career paths.

Coupled with creating differentiated roles, the First to the Top Act permits LEAs to adopt alternative salary schedules to the current state salary schedule, which is based on education credits and experience. Research shows that a salary scale based on credentials and seniority does not necessarily lead to better student outcomes. Alternative salary schedules can be developed to reward teachers and principals for their abilities to increase student achievement levels. Compensation packages will be aligned with the new career paths and take the form of base salaries, as well as performance and retention bonuses. Race to the Top will provide Tennessee with the funding to help LEAs with design and implementation of new compensation structures that reward our highest performing educators. Tennessee will create a competitive Innovation Acceleration Fund to support the adoption and implementation of alternative compensation systems at the local level. With \$12 million from the Race to the Top award, the state and local communities will also aggressively seek private matching funding. Funds will be awarded to districts for the purposes of designing and/or implementing sustainable compensation systems based upon alternative salary schedules. Districts must have the agreement of their local teacher's union where one exists. If there is an ongoing additional funding burden at the local level, the district must have the full agreement of the local municipality in order to apply for an Innovation Acceleration Fund Award.

The state also will create a competitive supplemental fund of \$375,000 per year for innovation in those school districts whose share of funds is within the bottom 20% of the total share of the LEA funds under this application. These districts can apply for supplemental funding within their scopes of work to encourage compensation reform or turning around of low-performing schools.

Along with developing strategies to retain high performers, districts will be encouraged to design clear paths to dismiss those teachers and principals who after receiving ample opportunities to improve, continue to underperform as measured by the new evaluation.

Tennessee is in a great position to accelerate changes in our evaluation, compensation, and promotion practices. In addition to Memphis' Teacher Effectiveness Initiative under the Gates grant, our state consortium of five large urban districts, which collectively educate more than one-third of the state's K-12 population, have signed a letter of intent to adopt new compensation, promotion and career path opportunity models, largely based upon the Memphis model. We will collect, analyze, and disseminate LEA data regarding retention rates (broken out in categories: ineffective, effective, highly effective). The percentage of teacher compensation will be based on demonstrated instructional effectiveness rather than years of experience or academic qualifications. We also will analyze the impact of differential compensation strategies on retention of effective teachers and principals.

The approaches we are taking to human capital provide Tennessee with a more comprehensive, deliberate path to ensuring all of the state's students have access to the most knowledgeable, talented, and dedicated teachers and principals possible.

- **Section D(2)(iv)(c):** Historically, tenure in Tennessee has largely been granted by default. Because past statutes dictated

teacher effect data could only be used if a teacher had a three-year average to examine – and tenure may be granted at 27 months – most teachers were granted tenure without examination of perhaps the most powerful tool available. Once tenure was granted, little attention, except in the most progressive districts, was paid to teacher effect data for the vast majority of teachers. However, districts now have the ability and responsibility to use this data strategically, bringing only those who demonstrate effectiveness into a long-term opportunity to serve our children.

Given Tennessee’s new mandate to redesign the evaluation system using multiple measures, to incorporate a targeted use of data, and to collaborate with teachers and principals to arrive at a fair and transparent set of tools to use, the state is in an unprecedented position to ensure only teachers who have met an established performance threshold are granted tenure. It also will be recommended that local boards only grant tenure to teachers who achieve at least an “effective teacher” rating on the new multiple-measure teacher effectiveness evaluation, of which a significant portion will be based on student achievement data.

With the new evaluation system, districts will be able to, and will be expected to, identify tenured teachers whose performance, as measured by the evaluation system, falls in the bottom tier of teachers. Principals will be able to notify these teachers and provide them with significant, targeted support. If after receiving support, the teacher has not moved into the “effective” category of performance, the evaluation results can provide documentation for the termination to occur. As part of the implementation of Race to the Top, and as part of their scopes of work, districts will be encouraged to examine those teachers who are consistently categorized in the lower levels of effectiveness for the possibility of termination. With the new flexibility afforded districts to submit an alternative salary schedule, they can also choose to reward teachers financially upon attaining tenure status as well as for continuing to maintain and/or grow in effectively helping students gain in their learning.

At the state level, we will collect and publicly disseminate data, by LEA and school, on tenure-granting rates. We will work with the Teacher Evaluation Advisory Committee developed pursuant to the First to The Top Act to include tenure-granting rates in principal evaluations. Additionally, we will annually assess and publish the correlation of tenure-granting rates with student outcomes (e.g., attendance, test scores, on-time graduation rates).

- **Section D(2)(iv)(d):** Tennessee students deserve professional educators and leaders who not only have their best interests at heart, but who have the skills and demonstrate the ability to affect student academic growth. **Our goal is to ensure that in four years, we will have reduced the percentage of teachers and principals who are ineffective to below 10%, and thereafter we will strive to drive that percentage to zero.** Currently, approximately 30% of our teacher and principal workforce is not able to achieve a year's worth of growth for their students. Please see the performance measure chart for D(3)(i) for teachers and Appendix D-3-8 for principals. The state's new evaluation system will serve to assist these teachers and principals, as well as all teachers and principals needing improvement, by providing an array of customized supports that includes coaching and professional development. Teachers and principals who do not engage in this work, or are unable to improve their practice after it has been deemed to be ineffective over a period of time when they have been given opportunity to improve and the supports to do so, should be considered for termination.

Documentation for action will include the evaluation documents themselves and the data used to inform them. In this way, documenting performance – both positive and negative for every teacher and principal – becomes standard operating procedure. District and building leadership should be able to rely on the teacher and principal evaluation system to serve them and their students by supporting effective work as well as by easing pathways to dismissal if that becomes necessary. Please see process above in Section D(2)(iv)(c).

The first priority for increasing teacher effectiveness is to focus attention, resources and supports on what teachers need to improve their practice. It is expected for the vast majority of teachers this strategy will bear fruit for them and the children they teach. However, in the rare instance when poor performers have been unable to improve even after receiving adequate support and professional development, there must be policies and procedures for triggering termination proceedings. Using existing state law, Tenn. Code Ann. §49-5-501, which defines inefficient and/or incompetent, and Tenn. Code Ann. §49-5-511, which determines these reasons as among the causes for dismissal, the new multiple-measure teacher effectiveness evaluation will play a role in such decisions. This determination will be made at the local level and recommended to the board for approval when such an action is necessary.

Until a teacher attains tenure, he or she is only on a one-year contract. However, the teacher evaluation will provide a thoughtful tool for providing targeted coaching and professional development intended to improve teacher effectiveness. When necessary it will also provide useful data, analysis and documentation needed to determine what teachers shall be dismissed during the contract year.

Please see Appendix D-2-2 for the goals, timelines, activities, and responsible parties for all of Section D(2).

Performance Measures Notes: Data should be reported in a manner consistent with the definitions contained in this application package in Section II. Qualifying evaluation systems are those that meet the criteria described in (D)(2)(ii).		Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
Criteria	General goals to be provided at time of application:	Baseline data and annual targets				

(D)(2)(i)	Percentage of participating LEAs that measure student growth (as defined in this notice).	100	100	100	100	100
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for teachers.	0	0	100	100	100
(D)(2)(ii)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for principals.	0	0	100	100	100
(D)(2)(iv)	Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems that are used to inform:					
(D)(2)(iv)(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developing teachers and principals. 	0	0	100	100	100
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compensating teachers and principals. 	0	0	20.0	30.0	<50.0
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promoting teachers and principals. 	0	0	100	100	100
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retaining effective teachers and principals. 	0	0	100	100	100
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Granting tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals. 	0	0	100	100	100
(D)(2)(iv)(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals. 	0	0	100	100	100
[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]						
General data to be provided at time of application:						
Total number of participating LEAs.		140				
Total number of principals in participating LEAs.		1736				
Total number of teachers in participating LEAs.		63,765				
[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]						
Criterion	Data to be requested of grantees in the future:					

(D)(2)(ii)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems.			
(D)(2)(iii) ³	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.			
(D)(2)(iii)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.			
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform compensation decisions in the prior academic year.			
(D)(2)(iv)(b)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better and were retained in the prior academic year.			
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were eligible for tenure in the prior academic year.			
(D)(2)(iv)(c)	Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform tenure decisions in the prior academic year.			
(D)(2)(iv)(d)	Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs who were removed for being ineffective in the prior academic year.			

³ Note that for some data elements there are likely to be data collection activities the State would do in order to provide aggregated data to the Department. For example, in Criteria (D)(2)(iii), States may want to ask each Participating LEA to report, for each rating category in its evaluation system, the definition of that category and the number of teachers and principals in the category. The State could then organize these two categories as effective and ineffective, for Department reporting purposes.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals (25 points)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) Ensure the equitable distribution of teachers and principals by developing a plan, informed by reviews of prior actions and data, to ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools (both as defined in this notice) have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) and are not served by ineffective teachers and principals at higher rates than other students; (15 points) and

(ii) Increase the number and percentage of effective teachers (as defined in this notice) teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas including mathematics, science, and special education; teaching in language instruction educational programs (as defined under Title III of the ESEA); and teaching in other areas as identified by the State or LEA. (10 points)

Plans for (i) and (ii) may include, but are not limited to, the implementation of incentives and strategies in such areas as recruitment, compensation, teaching and learning environments, professional development, and human resources practices and processes.

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State’s success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (D)(3)(i):

- Definitions of high-minority and low-minority schools as defined by the State for the purposes of the State’s Teacher Equity Plan.

Recommended maximum response length: Three pages

Section D(3)(i): Most states will answer this question simply by providing percentages or numbers of “highly qualified” teachers as defined under the No Child Left Behind Act. But with its vast data system and years of value-added assessment data, Tennessee is

able to track the actual effectiveness of teachers and principals as well as their distribution in every corner of the state – not simply their educational credentials and certification. Our definition of effectiveness is the same as the one in the Race to the Top guidelines – at least one year of academic growth, with “highly effective” meaning at least one and a half years of growth, as measured through our TVAAS system. Our state also has the ability to provide a baseline of principal effectiveness based on value added data that will serve as a starting point for work in distribution of these talented professionals as well. Please see Appendix D-3-8.

We realize, however, that simply knowing where the most-effective and least-effective teachers are does not solve equity gaps. Tennessee’s reform plan goal for this criterion is to eliminate the gap in equitable distribution of effective teachers and radically reduce the number of ineffective teachers in high-poverty/high-minority schools and low-poverty/low-minority schools over the four years of this grant.

Our strategy involves these key components:

- Building on the 2010 Teacher Equity Plan, which focuses on working with the six districts with the largest teacher equity gaps.
- Broadening the overall human capital pipeline through teacher preparation institutions and alternative providers to recruit, retain, develop more effective teachers. Please see Section D(1).
- Equipping each principal and district leader with teacher effectiveness data broken out by levels for tested grades and subjects, and holding them accountable for moving more teachers in to the upper levels of effectiveness, as well as improving or removing teachers in the lowest levels of effectiveness.
- Creating a “dashboard” for each teacher’s classroom in the state to determine students’ achievement patterns/trends and weaknesses at a glance, as one tool to help teachers identify students’ needs, adjust instruction, and improve achievement. Ultimately, this will help raise their teacher effect score to move them along the effectiveness continuum. Please see Section C(2). It will also assist the districts in strategic placement of talented teachers.

- Creating and administering a Teacher Working Conditions survey as another tool to gauge principal effectiveness in creating conditions for improving student achievement.
- Re-engineering professional development so that it will be specifically linked back to teacher effect scores and a multiple-measures evaluation to help teachers move into higher levels of performance. Please see Section D(5).
- Using teacher effect scores and school-level effect data as one component of annual multiple-measures evaluations of teachers and principals as well as determining other data-driven measures of effectiveness for teachers in non-tested grades or subjects. Please see Section D(2).

Some of these strategies are found in different sections of this application. In this section, we will address what we know about teacher effectiveness and equitable distribution in Tennessee, our timeline and deliverables for eliminating equity gaps, and our performance goals over time. Please note that the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties for this effort can be found in Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix D-3-5.

Teacher equity in Tennessee: The 2007 study of statewide teacher effect scores for the 2005-06 school year, as well as the subsequent 2009 analysis of the 2007-08 teacher effect scores, found low-income and minority students have less access to the state's most effective teachers and more access to the state's least effective teachers. Please see Appendix D-3-1 and D-3-2 for research briefs showing data from 2007 and 2009 studies on this subject. These data demonstrated a clear equity problem in teacher effectiveness and mapped to an earlier 2006 study that looked at equity gaps in teacher quality characteristics.

Tennessee believes that students who attend high-poverty schools deserve the most support, not the least. Since the first Teacher Equity Plan in 2006, Tennessee has been recognized for its work in the equitable distribution of teachers across high-poverty/low-poverty and high-minority/low-minority schools (Jerald, C.D. "The Value of Value-Added Data," The Education Trust, November, 2009) and has shared its approaches with other state leaders.

Tennessee districts, including the six with the largest equity gaps, have taken bold steps to address the most important

variable in student achievement – the effectiveness of the teacher in the classroom. Examples of this nationally recognized leadership include:

- The recent Memphis Teacher Effectiveness Initiative, funded by a \$90 million grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, to overhaul teacher recruitment, evaluation, development, retention, and dismissal processes.
- The Benwood Initiative in Hamilton County (Chattanooga). Please see Appendix F-3-2 for an explanation.
- Knox County’s Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) at pilot schools with positive results. Please see Appendix F-3-2 for an explanation.
- Metropolitan Nashville Public Schools’ pilot performance pay program on teacher effectiveness as measured by student growth.

The Teacher Equity Plan was updated for the school year 2009-10. Please see Appendix D-3-7. The new plan addresses the progress each of the six districts has made and the Department’s next steps in addressing inequities in distribution.

Equipping districts with tools to increase teacher effectiveness: Our experience with this issue shows the most successful method to create positive change in the distribution of effective teachers is to focus interventions at the local levels in three key stakeholder groups: teachers, principals, and central district staff, including human resource directors. Through Race to the Top funds, we will make progress on all three fronts in a coherent way, using data as the launching pad:

- Tennessee will work with its existing contractor, the SAS Institute, to receive teacher effect data on teachers in all tested grades and subjects in a format that will allow teachers and principals to pinpoint areas of strength and weaknesses, classroom by classroom and school by school. By charting teacher effect data in five levels, principals will be able to tell where their teachers in tested grades and subjects fall on the effectiveness spectrum, as measured by the teacher evaluation system, which will include TVAAS data. Please see Appendix D-3-3 for a sample teacher effect report.
- District leaders will use this data to evaluate principals on their progress in moving more of their teachers from the lower

levels of effectiveness to the middle and upper levels of effectiveness. Please see Appendix D-3-4 for a sample report. Through the new evaluation system, principals will be required to identify teachers who fall in the bottom two levels of effectiveness. Principals will be responsible for providing these low-performing teachers with targeted support. If, after receiving support for no more than two years, these teachers remain in the bottom two levels of effectiveness, districts will be encouraged to recommend that principals be accountable for dismissing them.

- These data reports, along with a new annual multiple-measures effectiveness evaluation instrument, also will be used to inform the professional development that teachers receive.
- Student achievement is not the only barometer of success. Tennessee will develop and administer a statewide Teacher Working Conditions survey to assess, understand, and improve teaching and learning conditions across the state. Tennessee will then analyze results of the Teacher Working Conditions survey and provide technical assistance to improve working and learning conditions to recruit, retain, and develop effective teachers.
- Tennessee will analyze school-level per pupil salary expenditure data to examine the extent to which school-level resources are distributed equally in districts with equity gaps. This ongoing collection and analysis of data will inform strategies in these identified districts.

As shown in the performance measure chart for this section, Tennessee's equity gap will be eliminated in four years through use of the above tools to ensure students in high-poverty, high-minority schools have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals.

The teacher effect data, Working Conditions Survey, and multiple-measures teacher effectiveness evaluation will drive the entire human capital conversation: Principals will use these tools to identify and develop those teachers who need the most assistance and to showcase highly effective teachers who can share best practices with peers; districts can use the tools to hold principals accountable in moving more teachers to higher levels of effectiveness and creating favorable working conditions for teachers; and principals and district leaders can use the tools to tailor professional development needs. The SAS Institute and a non-

profit training partner will serve as resources for user-friendly analysis and reporting as well as specific training on the use of data to support continuous quality improvement at the classroom, school, and district levels.

Please see Table 1, Appendix D-3-5 for the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties for Section D(3)(i).

Section D(3)(ii): The shortages described above are especially acute in subjects such as mathematics, science, special education, and English as a second language (ESL). With new graduation requirements on the horizon and the aligned college entrance requirements to follow that, Tennessee students will be taking more math and science classes than ever before. Increasing teacher effectiveness and the number of effective teachers in these areas is critical to meeting the new standards and assessments outlined in Sections A and B. As a result, Tennessee’s reform plan goal for this criterion is to dramatically increase the numbers and percentages of effective teachers statewide – and particularly in struggling schools – in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas such as math, science, special education, and ESL.

Our strategy involves these key components:

- Analyzing data from the Teacher Supply/Demand study described in Section D(1)(iii) and developing plans with higher education institutions in the state that will increase their production of teachers in these areas through outcomes- and performance-based funding.
- Encouraging local compensation incentives to attract and retain highly effective teachers. The Benwood Initiative, for example, pays bonuses to highly effective teachers who teach and stay in high-poverty middle schools. The National Science Foundation-funded Teach/Here Residency Program will compensate new math and science teachers at higher levels through stipends, as well as compensate the mentor teachers. Please see Competitive Priority 2 – STEM.^{STEM}

Some of these strategies are described in other parts of this application. In this section, we will describe what we know about the shortage of effective teachers in high-needs areas in Tennessee and detail our strategies to address the shortages, including integrating other methods described elsewhere in this application.

Subject-area shortages in Tennessee: As described in Section D(1)(iii), the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) and the University of Tennessee’s Center for Business and Economic Research (CBER) collaborated on a Teacher Supply/Demand study that indicated the increased demand for new teachers to fill vacancies from 2010 through 2014.

For educators of disabled students and English language learners, the percentage increase in the gap between projected supply and demand is significant: For example, the gap for special education teachers rises from 394 in 2010 to 3,023 in 2014, almost an eight-fold increase, and the gap for ESL teachers rises from 104 in 2010 to 500 in 2014, over a five-fold increase. The demand for ESL teachers has increased because student demographics across Tennessee have changed. Limited English proficient (LEP) students increased almost 300% from 1995-96 to 2005-06, with a total of almost 36,000 LEP students reported for school year 2008-09.

In addition, Tennessee also needs more science and math teachers as a result of new graduation requirements. In physics, for example, the state only graduated 14 teachers with endorsements in recent years. A review of students seeking initial teacher licensure in the state of Tennessee from 2000 to 2006 shows moderate growth in completers of teacher education growth but declines in those seeking math and science endorsements.

Increasing numbers and percentages of effective teachers in shortage areas: The State has bold plans to increase the number of math and science teachers and ensure that they are highly effective:

- As discussed in D(1)(iii), TDOE will partner with THEC to implement the UTeach program to recruit undergraduate math and science majors into teaching.
- The STEM^{STEM} Centers located at institutions of higher education will increase the effectiveness of current math and science teachers through use of targeted professional development, action research projects with teachers, and

introduction of new curricular approaches and program models. They will also recruit and prepare new teachers in STEM fields. Please see Competitive Priority 2 – STEM.

- The Tennessee STEM Innovation Network^{STEM} will link together all STEM efforts in the state to accelerate shared learning experiences and encourage formal and informal professional development to increase teacher effectiveness in STEM fields. Please see Competitive Priority 2 – STEM.
- The State has taken bold steps in its alternative education programs, such as Teach Tennessee, that target mid-career professionals, especially those in math and science, to become teachers. Teach For America and The New Teacher Project, combined with locally developed teacher residency programs such as the one in Memphis and the NSF-funded Teach/Here program partnering the University of Tennessee-Knoxville with schools in Chattanooga and Knoxville and the Distinguished Professionals program for STEM professionals also represent an aggressive and coordinated approach to teacher talent development.^{STEM}
- Expansion of alternate providers detailed in Sections D(1)(ii) and Section E will produce greater number of effective teachers in shortage areas such as math and science.^{STEM}

Special education and ESL are more challenging. Teachers who are not endorsed in the area in which they are teaching must enroll in the appropriate coursework and request a waiver from the State. Table 2 indicates the large number of waivers and the shortage of qualified teachers in these fields.

Table 2: Licensure Waivers in Shortage Areas in Tennessee

Subject Area	2009 Teachers	2009 Waivers Approved	% of Teachers on Waiver
Special Education	7782	141	2%
ESL	808	39	5%
Math	15,879	9	Not detectable

Science	14,025	5	Not detectable
---------	--------	---	----------------

Although waivers for special education teachers and the supply and demand report document the need for new special education teachers, the state has determined that its supply of special education teachers would be more adequate if all of the already endorsed special education teachers in Tennessee actually remained in the field of special education instead of transferring to regular education classes. As a result, the state has these goals to increase the number of special education teachers:

- Tennessee will continue to use its BASE-TN, a special recruitment initiative for special educators and other outreach activities to increase the number of teachers prepared and endorsed in special education. Please see Appendix D-3-6 for a description.
- Tennessee will study the causes of trained special education teachers leaving their assignments to teach in regular classrooms through a four-year, \$3.4 million federal grant from the federal Office of Special Education.

Unlike many states, Tennessee can measure the effectiveness for each teacher in tested grades and subjects using value-added assessment data in the TVAAS system. But TVAAS does not measure special education or ESL teachers in an easy format. The first step in increasing the effectiveness of special education and ESL teachers is to determine a valid method to measure their students' achievement and credit it to the special educators and ESL instructors. Through Race to the Top, Tennessee will do the following:

- Work with stakeholders to design a baseline for effectiveness and interventions, such as training and better teacher preparation. The TDOE's special education division has many current resources that can be leveraged to provide training for special education teachers that will increase the percent identified as effective or above.
- Train teachers and district leaders on measuring effectiveness for these teachers.
- Focus on new ESL teachers with specific training to orient them to their new roles and responsibilities and additional training for more experienced ESL teachers to help them to better understand how to improve the achievement of LEP students on the regular standards.

As shown in the performance measure chart in this section, Tennessee will increase the number of effective teachers in shortage areas such as math, science, special education, and ESL so that 90% of the state’s teachers in these areas are deemed “effective” by 2013-14.

Please see Table 2 in Appendix D-3-5 for the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties for Section D(3)(ii).

Performance Measures for (D)(3)(i) -	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or	End of SY 2010- 2011	End of SY 2011- 2012	End of SY 2012- 2013	End of SY 2013- 2014
<i>Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.</i>					
General goals to be provided at time of application:	Baseline data and annual targets				
Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	23	25	35	45	60
Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	34	34.5	40	50	60
Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	32	25	19	13	<10
Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	24	21	17	12	<10
Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	26	28	36	48	60
Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).	41	42	46	52	60
Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	42	40	33	22	<10
Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.	28	27	21	16	<10

These data are based on high-poverty/ low-poverty schools rather than high-minority/low-minority schools or high-poverty/high-minority vs. low-poverty/low-minority schools to include poverty differences in Tennessee’s rural and urban schools.

The percentage of highly effective and of ineffective teachers in high-poverty/low-poverty schools is based on composite effectiveness scores for reading/language arts, math, and science. Tables of the percentage of highly effective and of ineffective teachers in high-poverty/low-poverty schools based on effectiveness scores for each subject are found in Appendix D-3-9.

The percentage of highly effective and of ineffective principals in high-poverty/low-poverty schools is based on school-level gain scores for reading/language arts. Tables of the percentage of highly effective and of ineffective principals in high-poverty/low-poverty schools based on gain scores for math and science are found in the Appendix D-3-8.

General data to be provided at time of application:

Total number of schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	395		
Total number of schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	414		
Total number of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	2618		
Total number of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	4979		
Total number of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	395		
Total number of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice).	414		

The total number of teachers in schools that are high-poverty and the total number of teachers in schools that are low-poverty include only teachers in the following subjects for which TN has test score data: reading and language arts, math, science, and social studies.

The total number of principals in schools that are high-poverty and the total number of principals in schools that are low-poverty include only principals in schools for which TN has test score data in the following subjects: reading and language arts, math, and science.

Performance Measures for (D)(3)(ii) -	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
<i>Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.</i>					
General goals to be provided at time of application:	Baseline data and annual targets				
Percentage of mathematics teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	68	70	76	84	>90
Percentage of science teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	68	69	75	83	>90
Percentage of special education teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	>90
Percentage of teachers in language instruction educational programs who were evaluated as effective or better.	N/A	N/A	N/A	80	>90
Currently, no teacher effectiveness data generated by TVAAS are available for ESL or special education teachers. However, by 2012-13, data from the newly implemented teacher evaluation system will be available.					
Data for teacher effectiveness were generated by TVAAS and are based on composite teacher effect scores for reading/language arts, math, and science. Data for teacher effectiveness based on teacher effect scores for each subject are found in the Appendix D-3-9.					
Data for principal effectiveness were generated by TVAAS and are based on school-level gain scores for reading/language arts. Data for principal effectiveness based on school-level gain scores for math and science are found in the Appendix D-3-8. By 2012-13, the State will use data from the newly implemented teacher evaluation system.					
General data to be provided at time of application:					
Total number of mathematics teachers.	15,879				
Total number of science teachers.	14,025				
Total number of special education teachers.	7782				

Total number of teachers in language instruction educational programs.	808		
[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]			
Data to be requested of grantees in the future:			
Number of mathematics teachers in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.			
Number of science teachers in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.			
Number of special education teachers in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.			
Number of teachers in language instruction educational programs in participating LEAs who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.			

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs (14 points)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

- (i) Link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in this notice) data to the students’ teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State; and
- (ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice).

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: One page

Section D(4)(i): Tennessee has a well-established plan and strategies for improving the effectiveness of our teacher and principal preparation programs. The cornerstones are competition and accountability. Our State Board of Education (SBE) has broken the monopoly on teacher preparation held by institutions of higher education to allow independent education organizations to certify teachers. Creating this competitive atmosphere to spur improvements is made all the more likely to succeed in that goal when coupled with our accountability framework.

Unlike most states, which likely are setting up their data systems in order to know which teacher preparation programs prepare the highest-achieving graduates, Tennessee can – and does already – perform this analysis considering teacher effect data, placement and retention, and Praxis scores. Our LEAs can, and do, optimize our new teacher supply by using these data to increase recruitment, selection and hiring from preparation programs whose teachers consistently achieve better outcomes. Tennessee already publicly reports this data for each credentialing program in the state.

Section D(4)(ii): A group including leadership from the SBE, Tennessee Higher Education Commission, Department of Education, Tennessee Education Association, Tennessee Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, and other stakeholders will convene in 2010 to:

- Examine the three variables studied (noted above) and determine what other measurements accurately reflect effectiveness.
- Study report card redesign options, if any, so the data are clear and easily understood.
- Study and design report card options for principal preparation programs.
- Work on issues of report card usage, such as the renewal or non-renewal of state approval for teacher and principal preparation institutions that are shown to be ineffective. Issues to be discussed include using at least three years' worth of data to assess effectiveness.

Combined with other measures, the report card will inform program adjustments, policy changes, and funding for teacher education

programs such that they will be rewarded not only for producing teachers, but for the quality of the teachers they produce. Successful programs will be expanded, while unsuccessful programs will be provided an opportunity to improve over a specified period of time. The SBE will use that data to reward programs that are successful and support or decertify those that fail to produce effective teachers.

The panel outlined above will create a work plan by 2011 for these tasks. A key function of the panel will be to determine how to hold principal preparation programs to similar standards, including creating a report card. For programs whose graduates disproportionately fall into the bottom level of the state distribution of teacher or principal effectiveness as measured by the teacher/principal effectiveness evaluation, the SBE may consider this in program renewal decisions. Tennessee will scale quality programs to the needs of the state while limiting support for those programs that produce less-effective results.

Please see Appendix D-4-1 for the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties for Section D(4).

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline (Current)	End of SY 2010-2011	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
General goals to be provided at time of application:	Baseline data and annual targets				
Percentage of teacher preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates' students.	100	100	100	100	100
Percentage of principal preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates' students.	0	0	100	100	100
[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]					
General data to be provided at time of application:					

Total number of teacher credentialing programs in the State.	39		
Total number of principal credentialing programs in the State.	20		
Total number of teachers in the State.	49,827		
Total number of principals in the State.	1723		
Data provided are from 2008-2009. The number of teachers reflects the number of classroom teachers.			
Data to be requested of grantees in the future:			
Number of teacher credentialing programs in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.			
Number of teachers prepared by each credentialing program in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.			
Number of principal credentialing programs in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.			
Number of principals prepared by each credentialing program in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.			
Number of teachers in the State whose data are aggregated to produce publicly available reports on the State's credentialing programs.			
Number of principals in the State whose data are aggregated to produce publicly available reports on the State's credentialing programs.			

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

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan for its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to—

- (i) Provide effective, data-informed professional development, coaching, induction, and common planning and collaboration time to teachers and principals that are, where appropriate, ongoing and job-embedded. Such support might focus on, for example, gathering, analyzing, and using data; designing instructional strategies for improvement; differentiating instruction; creating school environments supportive of data-informed decisions; designing instruction to meet the specific needs of high need students (as defined in this notice); and aligning systems and removing barriers to effective implementation of practices designed to improve

student learning outcomes; and

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

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: Five pages

Section D(5)(i): Tennessee will demand high levels of performance from our educators. Our robust and highly developed data sets, which contain nearly 20 years' worth of data on teacher effectiveness – tell us how teachers are performing so that we will know by how much they need to improve to help their students exceed our new higher standards. To assist teachers in improving their practice, we will use our teacher effect data to provide targeted and individualized support. We also will be able to measure the value of our investment in professional development by mapping the various approaches back to specific teacher improvements.

Teacher effect data and the new annual teacher and principal evaluation data will drive all professional development investments made in the state of Tennessee, leading to unprecedented and targeted support for our teachers.

About 30% of Tennessee teachers and leaders fail to produce a year's growth with their students. We will move a set percentage of practicing teachers and leaders each year over four years to the level of producing at least one year's growth with our students to ensure less than 10% of our educator force is ineffective four years from now. Practically, this will entail annual targets that provide sufficient time for our new evaluation system and professional development to take effect such that the percentage of teachers or leaders in the lowest category will move from 30% in Year One, to 25% in Year Two, to 19% in Year Three, and 10% in Year Four.

Tennessee's new multiple-measures teacher and principal effectiveness evaluation system will enhance our current ability to

identify performance levels of educators and be a much more strategic tool for supporting them. As we fundamentally shift how we measure and hold teachers and principals accountable for performance, we must increase our support for their success. The state will invest significant Race to the Top funding as well as funding from other recurring sources such as the Teacher Incentive Fund. In addition, the scopes of work submitted by the participating LEAs must demonstrate their use of funding in this manner. Annually, the Department of Education will use the teacher and principal evaluation data to determine the amount and focus of investments to drive toward meeting our teacher workforce improvement goal. Beyond our commitment to realigning investments and supporting teacher and principal effectiveness, however, the state and local districts must change *how* they are approaching this task:

- With the backing of the new evaluation system in 2011-12, developed pursuant to the First to the Top Act, professional development will no longer be menu-driven. The act gives districts the flexibility to no longer pay for meaningless education or professional development credits that do not demonstrate a link to improved teacher and student performance.
- Improved performance now will have a direct bearing on status, evaluation, pay and retention of our educator workforce, as described in Section D(2). Schools – particularly those that fall into the Renewal Schools category as explained in Section E(2) – will have additional resources provided by the state to fund a variety of approaches to professional development aligned to their strategy for school reform. These include but are not limited to coaching, induction, common planning time, and extended learning time opportunities.
- LEAs also will be required to demonstrate how they will use the tools available to them through the data dashboard and training provided by the SAS Institute and a non-profit training partner to be responsive to the needs of educators in their districts. LEAs participating in Race to the Top will be required to show the alignment of local funding to improving teacher and principal effectiveness.
- For those LEAs who have Renewal Schools and schools eligible for the Achievement School District, they will also be required to demonstrate how their approach to this alignment serves both the individual educator and the school reform efforts in a consistent and cohesive manner. An explanation of the Renewal School and Achievement School District

requirements and choice options is discussed in Section E(2) of this document.

Using the data system as a tool for performance improvement: The SAS Institute is helping Tennessee craft a 360-degree view of the child as described in Section C(2) of this proposal. Additionally, SAS will continue to provide support for districts through the newly developed data dashboard. Already in use in a small number of progressive school districts, the dashboard is being rolled out in January to schools throughout the state. All educators have received accounts and passwords for the TVAAS system, and over the next six months, they will receive training in the functionality and use of the dashboard. Once training has been completed, the training modules will be available online and for all to access as they have additional needs. A non-profit training partner also will provide significant additional training in the use of this in concert with balance assessment approaches, differentiating instruction, curricular choices and more for classroom use. In addition, this partner will train districts in use of this tool for linking teacher and principal evaluations directly to the student data, as well as how the data can support the district's differentiated compensation system in a transparent and accessible manner.

Strategies to ensure intentional analysis & planning to support teacher performance will include:

- Use of Tennessee's Exemplary Educators Program (a "Top 50 Innovations in American Government Award" recipient in 2007) to mobilize experienced educators to assist schools in strategic planning, school improvement and building staff capacity.
- Use of Field Service Centers to help schools analyze their data, create a professional development plan, and choose among effective professional development providers.
- Access to high-quality content and course delivery providers identified through a DOE Request for Information (RFI) and mapped to the areas where current teacher effect data already indicates a significant need. Providers may include Tennessee's college and university system, outside providers chosen by districts, SAS, and a non-profit training partner.

- Access to the Tennessee Electronic Learning Center for online professional development, to make learning accessible to educators in all parts of our state at their convenience.
- Induction and support of traditionally prepared teacher candidates. Tennessee is working with higher education to determine the potential for schools and higher education to co-own students for the first few years to fully support the new teacher in their initial practice.

There are a number of important investments that are apparent from the data now. Our STEM data is troubling. Although 79% of students who take the assessment are proficient or advanced, just 65% of African-American students are proficient or advanced on the state's algebra I end-of-course assessment. The level of proficiency on this assessment is significantly lower than that on the NAEP assessment. For example, on the 2009 NAEP assessment in mathematics, the average score for Tennessee 8th-graders was lower than that in 36 states and not significantly different from the average in nine states. Tennessee 8th-graders scored higher than only five other states' 8th-graders on the math NAEP. Additionally, the state did not see statistically significant gains in math achievement in the 8th grade since the 2007 NAEP. NAEP science results are not much better.

Strategies to address STEM learning will include:

- Amplification of funding for existing programs with a proven track-record including:
 - The SAS Institute and a non-profit training partner to support the use of data for instructional and professional development purposes (as discussed in Section C).^{STEM}
 - PBS online content that can be accessed through the Electronic Learning Center to amplify the professional development and curricular options with embedded assessments in a variety of disciplines, but particularly science-related content.^{STEM}
 - STEM Center Math & Science Teacher Training through identified programming at the designated STEM Centers at East Tennessee State University/Center of Excellence in Math & Science, Tennessee Technological University/Millard Oakley STEM Center, Middle Tennessee State University/Tennessee Mathematics, Science and Technology Education

Center and the University of Memphis.^{STEM}

- Strengthening Instruction in Tennessee Elementary Schools: Focus on Mathematics^{STEM} (SITES-M): This program partners higher education institutions and elementary/middle schools to strengthen teaching and learning in mathematics.
- Oak Ridge Associated Universities (ORAU) STEM Training Academy.^{STEM}
- Support for two innovations, including:
 - Leadership Action Tank: a principal effectiveness laboratory with a learning agenda, which will capture the evidence of practices that have been demonstrated to improve student achievement using TVAAS data and other factors and place an emphasis on high-poverty, high-performing schools statewide, particularly in rural schools.
 - Tennessee STEM Innovation Network^{STEM}: a network of innovative teachers, schools, and districts to support and learn from each other in effecting student outcomes in the STEM disciplines, particularly for underrepresented students. It will be managed by the state of Tennessee in partnership with Battelle Memorial Institute in its role as the co-operator of Oak Ridge National Laboratory and modeled on the successful Ohio STEM Learning Network.

Districts will have information on how to secure the high-quality choices from the state's RFI list, but not be limited to those options. If an LEA chooses to pursue other assistance, it may do so as long as the provider meets the quality expectations of the criteria. In the case of Renewal Schools and Achievement School District schools, the state also will subsidize funding for these choices through the state share of Race to the Top funds (described in Section E(2)) and Title I School Improvement Funds.

Districts performing at higher levels in the accountability system may purchase these services using their local funds.

We also will encourage districts to spread best practices using their highest-gaining teachers, as measured by TVAAS, to assist struggling teachers. Our Electronic Learning Center can facilitate the broadcast of sample lessons and videotapes of classroom instruction by highly effective teachers.

In addition, over the course of the first three years of Race to the Top, Tennessee will grant up to total of \$12 million in competitive funds for districts who commit to making the transition to fully realized compensation models for teachers and

principals in the district. These districts, along with the new state evaluation system will be studied for the first three years of Race to the Top implementation to determine what policies need to be in place to provide transition for all districts to move to this sort of funding. These competitive funds should be used to study and reward the efforts of teachers who participate and/or as a bridge financing strategy in moving to this type of system.

Section (D)(5)(ii): Measuring, evaluating and continuously improving the effectiveness of the supports above is important to improving student achievement. That is why Tennessee is investing in development of Tennessee’s Consortium on Research, Evaluation, and Development (TN CRED). The group consists of expert researchers and practitioners from throughout Tennessee and beyond whose task is to identify the full research needs of our proposal based upon the assurance areas and assist in creating the learning agenda for our state. Relative to the items above, TN CRED will work to identify the research projects, engage with partners as necessary to accomplish the work, and link this back through distribution of the system support good practice. It also will recommend refinements to programming where beneficial, delve deeper into questions as necessary, and work with partners as they implement research programs that advance our knowledge of what education reform works and what investments should be abandoned. TN CRED will also engage with the First to the Top Oversight Team to fully inform policy makers of research findings and engage in a dialogue that supports thoughtful policy making. Please see Appendix C-3-1.

Please see Appendix D-5-1 for the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties for Section D(5).

(E) Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools (50 total points)

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs (10 points)

The extent to which the State has the legal, statutory, or regulatory authority to intervene directly in the State’s persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and in LEAs that are in improvement or corrective action status.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State’s success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (E)(1):

- A description of the State’s applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.

Recommended maximum response length: One page

Section E(1): The General Assembly passed the Tennessee First to The Top Act of 2010, giving the commissioner unprecedented authority, including the authority to create an “Achievement School District” of the state’s persistently lowest-achieving schools that will be removed from their home district and placed under state oversight. In addition, Tenn. Code Ann. §49-1-602 outlines the accountability tools available to the Department of Education and the State Board of Education for intervention, in addition to the authority granted under No Child Left Behind. For schools, this includes:

- Authority to oversee the district’s financial allocation to the school.
- Presentation of options for alternative governance, which can mean removing the school from the LEA’s jurisdiction, restructuring the school as a public charter school, and replacing the school staff and principal.
- Management reorganization, including reduction of management authority.

For districts, this includes:

- Assumption of governance powers over the LEA – i.e., a state takeover.
- Recommendation of replacement of the Superintendent or members of the local Board of Education.
- Replacement of LEA staff relevant to a school or district’s failure.

Please see Appendix E-1-1 for the full statutory language of the state’s accountability law, Appendix E-1-2 for a chart of the law’s application, as well as examples of the state’s accountability continuum, and Appendix E-1-3 for a copy of the First to The Top Act.

These laws have provided Tennessee with many valuable lessons on school turnaround, as we explain in Section E(2).

However, the problem of persistently low-achieving schools remains.

Reform Plan Criteria

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools *(40 points)*

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) Identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and, at its discretion, any non-Title I eligible secondary schools that would be considered persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) if they were eligible to receive Title I funds; and *(5 points)*

(ii) Support its LEAs in turning around these schools by implementing one of the four school intervention models (as described in Appendix C): turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model (provided that an LEA with more than nine persistently lowest-achieving schools may not use the transformation model for more than 50 percent of its schools). *(35 points)*

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State’s success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (E)(2) (please fill in table below):

- The State’s historic performance on school turnaround, as evidenced by the total number of persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) that States or LEAs attempted to turn around in the last five years, the approach used, and the results and lessons learned to date.

Recommended maximum response length: Eight pages

Section E(2)(i): Tennessee has established a process for identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools, referred to as Tier 1 and Tier 2 schools:

- **Tier 1 schools** are the persistently lowest-achieving 5% of Title I schools, which is based upon the highest numerical final rank, and those Title I high schools with a graduation rate less than 60% for any two of the last three years. **In 2009-10, Tennessee has 10 schools in this category.**
- **Tier 2 schools** are Title I-eligible high schools that are the persistently lowest-achieving 5% of non-Title I high schools with the highest numerical final rank and non-Title I high schools with a graduation rate less than 60% for any two of the last three years. **In 2009-10, Tennessee has five schools in this category.**

A third tier of schools – not required to be identified under the Race to the Top (RTTT) guidelines – are Tennessee “High Priority” schools in other stages of accountability (School Improvement, Corrective Action, Restructuring) that do not fit the above definition of persistently lowest-achieving. Section E(2)(ii) also describes our approaches to them.

The Department of Education’s Office of Accountability will identify the state’s persistently lowest-achieving schools by completing a sequence of steps listed in Appendix E-2-1. In addition, please see Appendix E-2-2 for a description of how we calculate numerical rank to determine these two lists of schools.

Please also see Appendix E-2-3 for the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties for the identification of persistently lowest-achieving schools, as required in Section E(2)(i).

Section E(2)(ii): Tennessee will transform its lowest-achieving schools into schools of accelerated academic excellence through three key strategies:

- First, we will evaluate 13 of our most struggling schools – 10 of our persistently lowest-achieving schools and our three schools in Restructuring 2 and beyond under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) – that are eligible for possible inclusion in a state-run Achievement School District (ASD). The ASD will give them the conditions they need to turn around successfully, and partnering with a small number of high-capacity non-profit organizations chosen from around the country to provide an outstanding supply of teachers, leaders, and charter school operators for schools in the ASD.
- Second, we will target the 18 schools in Corrective Action or Restructuring 1 with serious interventions before they reach the ASD, such as requiring that they adopt a proven reform model while remaining in their home school district. These will be known as Renewal Schools.
- Third, we will ensure that any school whose absolute achievement places it under the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving” will implement one of the four turnaround models as outlined in the RTTT guidelines, no matter what their level of NCLB accountability or whether they become part of the Achievement School District.

This approach provides the foundation to reach the Tennessee Diploma Project goal of helping every student reach college- and career-readiness with all schools on a path to excellence. In addition, we will be able to learn through the ASD how LEAs can intervene successfully in struggling schools (e.g. implement key changes in human capital, funding, school operating conditions, etc.). Please see Appendix E-2-4 for a graphical representation of these supports.

The performance measure chart in Appendix E-2-5 outlines lessons learned from our years of experience with school accountability. As the chart demonstrates, Tennessee has adopted a multi-faceted approach to accountability with a number of different supports, ranging from incentive pay to deployment of Exemplary Educators. Because of this, we cannot trace back a school’s turnaround to a single strategy. Like the Race to the Top application, the different supports are intended to work together. This may be the most important lesson of all, as we have seen more than half of our High Priority schools achieve good standing

after interventions.

But one lesson stands out: *Historically, Tennessee has not been bold enough.* Although we have seen success in moving schools off the High Priority list, the reality is that far too many of our students continue to fall through the cracks. They continue to be enrolled in high schools that do not graduate a majority of their students. They continue to score at levels that are lower than many of their more privileged or non-minority peers. They continue to lack access to rigorous courses, talented teachers, and pathways to higher education. And the state continues to lack the capacity to assist these students comprehensively. The volume of schools in the accountability system prevents a laser-like focus on the most critically low-performing schools. That is why, in this application, Tennessee is proposing to turn around its persistently lowest-achieving schools through the creation of the ASD and a partnership with best-in-class non-profit organizations with strong approaches to human capital and new school formation. The ASD is designed to provide the structure and remove the barriers for more schools to reach much higher levels of performance.

Achievement School District. Tennessee will establish a groundbreaking approach that will capitalize on newly created authority of the commissioner, best practice research on successful school turnaround, and an unprecedented partnership with non-profit groups. First, Tennessee will remove designated schools from their home LEA and place them under the direction of the commissioner of Education. These schools will form a new statewide district that will empower a new set of leaders to carry out dramatic strategies to enact powerful change in these schools. The ASD could consist of the 10 schools identified as persistently lowest-achieving in Tier 1, as well as three schools that are in the second year of Restructuring and beyond according to Tennessee's accountability rules.

To enable the best possible reform conditions, the state will create a collaborative for the ASD, an unprecedented partnership with carefully selected non-profit organizations that can demonstrate a track record of reform in recruiting highly effective teachers or principals, working with districts and states on revamping human capital systems, creating and expanding high-quality charter schools, and paving the way for dramatic improvement in student outcomes. Given the historical poor performance of the schools in its charge, the ASD will need a massive influx of talent and capacity on all of those fronts. Instead of reinventing the wheel,

Tennessee will seek out leading non-profits that already have proven they can do this work and enlist them in the ASD effort. Working individually and as a collaborative, the selected partners will commit resources, expertise, and assistance so that students and schools in Tennessee’s ASD will see rapid achievement growth. In addition, the state is committed to using other strategies described in sections D(1) and D(3) to build a pipeline of highly effective leaders and teachers for schools not served by the partners. Tennessee has embraced the idea of working closely with high-capacity non-profit education reform organizations, including the types of groups that have submitted letters of general support as seen in Appendix E-2-6.

How a school enters the ASD: Initially, a school will be a candidate to enter the ASD if it: 1) meets the definition of “persistently lowest-achieving school”; or 2) is in Restructuring 2 or beyond under the state’s accountability model. Once a part of the ASD, a school will remain for at least five years. According to current AYP calculations, 13 schools in five Tennessee districts — Madison County (Jackson), Hamilton County (Chattanooga), Knox County (Knoxville), Memphis, and Metro Nashville — are eligible to become part of the ASD under this application.

The role of the state and the LEA: The commissioner of education will have complete decision-making authority for the schools in the ASD. Beginning immediately, Tennessee will conduct a national search to find a proven change leader to run the ASD, as shown in Appendix A-2-2. This person will have full authority to enact change in schools, or confer authority on school leaders or operators, while reporting directly to the commissioner. Administrative tasks – transportation, food services, utilities – may continue to be provided by the LEA at the discretion of the school leader or operator via contract.

Teachers and staff who choose to accept the offer to work at the ASD will also, as part of that choice, relinquish their rights and obligations under their previous contract with the LEA, and assume new rights and obligations under the terms of a new contract with the ASD. If teachers are chosen to continue serving in those schools, they will do so through a new staffing arrangement that is negotiated with that school under the auspices of the ASD. Because our own research (Appendix D-3-2) shows that students in our High Priority schools have, on average, less access to our most effective teachers as measured through our value-added system, turning around these schools depends on ensuring the best teachers work or continue to work there.

Tennessee already has secured commitments from five leading superintendents from across the state – the Coalition of Large School Systems, or CLASS – to serve as a unique association ready to partner with the state for bold reforms, including the ASD. These leaders, who are committed to dramatic reform and capacity-building in their home districts, will play an important role in ensuring local support, collaboration, and local buy-in for transformational education improvement. Indeed, 12 of the 13 schools in the ASD are in CLASS districts, and their superintendents have endorsed this idea. CLASS and the commissioner will purposefully structure opportunities to benefit from each others’ thinking and identify areas for potential synergy, replication, collaboration, economies of scale and alignment. Please see Appendix A-2-3 for a letter of support from CLASS.

The role of the partners: All academic activities will be overseen by the TDOE with the assistance of the non-profit human capital and charter school partners selected to assist the ASD. For example, Tennessee will enlist:

- Leader pipeline organizations committed to recruiting, training, and placing 12-15 new principals in existing districts and/or the ASD.
- Teacher pipeline organizations to recruit over 600 new teachers for high-priority sites, including for the ASD and rural schools, and to create new pathways for teachers to teacher licenses under new rules described in Section D(1).
- A charter school investment fund to incubate and scale-up 2-3 charter management organizations in Tennessee that will have the capacity to create 14-15 new high-performing charter schools across the state, including within the ASD.
- Charter management organizations or networks with the capacity to open five or more new charter schools in Memphis and Nashville within the ASD.

The planning year: Work will begin immediately on reinventing the schools in the ASD. Successful transformation and new school development strategies call for thoughtful and thorough planning for implementation, which will be the focus of activities in 2010-11. During the one-year planning phase, the ASD superintendent and the home district team will work throughout the planning year to reach out to parents, community leaders, and the community at large to fully understand the context and needs of the community. This work will begin with an examination of the school’s capacity and include specific facilitated meetings using

“learning maps.” The learning maps – created in consultation with both rural and urban educators in Tennessee – will focus on the relationship between the community vitality, student supports and opportunity, and the pending education reform changes Tennessee is undertaking. This interactive dialogue will inform the ASD superintendent’s planning and help guide the choice as to whether the students in this school are best served within the ASD or in their home district. It will also serve to inform the choice of school model and student social-emotional supports that will have the greatest opportunity for success.

The Department of Education will work with the schools and the partners to determine which one of the four intervention models outlined in the RTTT application – turnaround, restart, closure, or transformation – will be applied to every ASD school in 2011-12, with the process repeating itself in subsequent years. We see this happening in several ways:

- **Turnaround:** This model can apply to an ASD school with a newly recruited principal leader who selects new staff, seeks resources for extended days, uses his/her financial autonomy to create financial incentives or more flexible working conditions, and adopts a new instructional program (as examples of reforms that are allowed).
- **Restart:** This model can apply to an ASD school that re-opens as a charter school incubated by the state’s partnership with a non-profit charter school investment fund.
- **Closure:** This model can apply to a school that the state decides to close.
- **Transformation:** This model can apply to a school with a new principal who uses Tennessee’s new evaluation system as described in Section D(2) to retain highly effective teachers, implements more rigorous courses such as Advanced Placement or STEM-themed partnerships^{STEM}, or works with one of the non-profit partners for ongoing support (as examples of reforms that are allowed). In fact, this model already has a history in Tennessee with the Benwood Initiative in Hamilton County.

Please see Appendix F-3-2.

Tennessee and its partners will spend the planning year working with the district leadership, schools, staffs, and families of the prospective ASD school communities to select the model that best fits each school’s needs and history of achievement, and begin implementation activities.

Accountability in the ASD: We have set an aggressive timeline for launching the ASD, as detailed in Appendix E-2-7. We will set individual academic goals for each of these schools in collaboration with the partners; collectively, we expect them to reach the statewide metrics we have set for all schools in Section A(1)(iii).

After the second year of operation in the ASD, the commissioner will assess the school's progress and begin a process of planning for transitioning that school that will include either transitioning it back to the district at the five-year mark, chartering (or continuing a charter), or closing it. The transition plan will guide Years 3-5 of the school's life in the ASD.

During the initial five-year period of the ASD, the Department of Education will use existing resources to work closely with each school's home LEA to build capacity so that achievement gains are not reversed when the school returns. As a result, a "dotted line" association will be maintained between the school and its current central office, although the ASD will have ultimate oversight.

We realize the work is challenging, and we are committed to gathering leading indicators that will tell us whether our efforts are on track. If not, the commissioner will act swiftly to get the school on a new path to success or close it if better options can be created.

The ASD is the most intensive of the state's accountability structure under RTTT. The second-most intensive, Renewal Schools, will allow schools to remain within their home district but require them to adopt a model with evidence of success of capacity-building and school achievement. This can include any number of providers, partnerships with higher education, collaborations with non-profits, etc. These schools (18 in 2009-10) are in Corrective Action or Restructuring 1 – a critical point in the accountability spectrum, since continued failure to make progress means they will be on track to join the ASD. Tennessee will issue a Request for Information that will detail what quality expectations the state has for possible providers for schools in this level, identify providers to assist schools in this work, and engage the schools and providers.

Some schools, although they are in the persistently lowest-achieving category (by the federal definition of the lowest 5% in reading/mathematics achievement or a graduation rate of less than 60%) and therefore are eligible to enter the ASD, may remain in

the Renewal Schools category at the discretion of the commissioner. If after a full assessment by the commissioner and interaction with the home superintendent, the school demonstrates some critical capacity necessary for turnaround, the commissioner may choose to allow it to remain in the Renewal Schools category. If that is the case, the school will be subject to the requirements of that designation, will have to implement one of the four required turnaround models in the RTTT application (because it is a persistently low-achieving school), and may be placed in the ASD at the commissioner's discretion.

Schools that have just entered the accountability continuum will be Focus Schools. In 2009-10, Tennessee has 114 of these schools. They will receive the types of support described in Appendix E-2-5 from the Exemplary Educators, Achievement Gap consultants, and System Targeted Assistance Teams – but in a more concentrated manner since these teams only will work with schools and districts in the first two levels of AYP status of NCLB (i.e., below Corrective Action). We also plan to involve our institutions of higher education, which will concentrate professional development on these schools – all aimed at making sure that interventions happen quickly so that a school does not have to experience years of failure. Please see Appendix E-2-8 for an explanation of higher education's involvement in Focus Schools. Again, if these schools' absolute achievement places them in the federal definition of persistently lowest-achieving (lowest 5% on reading/math achievement or graduation rate of less than 60%), we will require them to adopt one of the four turnaround models required in the RTTT guidelines.

In subsequent years, if their AYP status changes to Corrective Action, they will move to the Renewal Schools category and work with a turnaround specialist to choose one of the renewal models to implement in conjunction with one of the four required RTTT school interventions models.

Finally, communities with persistently failing schools tend to lack a college-going culture. To support those communities in their turnaround work, Tennessee will establish a statewide college access network. To make quick and significant progress in the areas of education attainment, participation, and affordability, this will be a systemic effort in college access and success. As part of the Lumina Foundation KnowHow2Go grant, Tennessee will invest about \$100,000 in the start-up work. With Race to the Top, we propose to expand this proposed college access network and incubator. The state also will provide significant investment in a

promising initiative that has demonstrated success, and is positioned to expand to a focus on early grades. This program also will provide consultation to other communities in their work.

We believe that Tennessee’s approach to turning around persistently lowest-performing schools breaks ground on a number of fronts: It creates an intervention model, the Achievement School District, in which long-term failure no longer will be tolerated. It creates an unprecedented partnership between a state and the collective energy, experience, and human capital of carefully selected, high-capacity non-profit reform groups that will concentrate and coordinate their efforts in a single state. It allows a clear turnaround focus from a team of leaders outside of the school district on the schools that most need attention, thus allowing district leadership to focus on moving the remainder of their schools out of the accountability system. It pulls together other leverage points in this application – data systems, a new evaluation model, STEM^{STEM}, an expanded charter school law – to showcase what the resources of an entire state can accomplish for schools that long have struggled. It allows the state to discover through an evaluation led by our evaluation team (referenced in Section C(3)(iii)) how turnaround can be accomplished if certain barriers are removed and resources are concentrated – lessons that can inform the state’s entire approach for human capital and school design. Please see Appendix E-2-7 for the goals, timelines, activities, and responsible parties for Section E(2)(ii).

We acknowledge that school turnaround can take time to take hold and put schools on a trajectory toward excellence. But we also acknowledge that time is running out, which is why we believe our aggressive turnaround models will produce the greatest results for our state and our children.

Evidence: Please see Appendix E-2-5 for the evidence on school turnaround dating back to 2004-05.

(Enter text here.)

Performance Measures	Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)	End of SY 2010-2011 initiating one of the	End of SY 2011-2012	End of SY 2012-2013	End of SY 2013-2014
The number of schools for which one of the four school intervention models (described in Appendix C) will be initiated each year.	13 schools in the ASD.	10 new Tier 1 and Tier 2 schools in Renewal or Focus categories.	8 new Tier 1 and Tier 2 schools in Renewal or Focus categories initiating one	8 new Tier 1 and Tier 2 in Renewal or Focus categories initiating one of the four	6 new Tier 1 and Tier 2 schools in Renewal or Focus categories initiating one

			of the four school intervention models.	school intervention models.	of the four school intervention models.
--	--	--	---	-----------------------------	---

NOTE: Schools in Corrective Action or Restructuring 1 will be candidates for the ASD if they do not make AYP eventually. But because we are requiring that those schools remain in the renewal model under our continuum for at least three years, we do not want to place them in the ASD until they have shown that the renewal model has not achieved results. Because that process will take at least three years, we anticipate that the number of schools in the ASD will grow beginning in 2014-15.

(F) General (55 total points)

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(F)(1) Making education funding a priority (10 points)

The extent to which—

- (i) The percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2009 was greater than or equal to the percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2008; and
- (ii) The State’s policies lead to equitable funding (a) between high-need LEAs (as defined in this notice) and other LEAs, and (b) within LEAs, between high-poverty schools (as defined in this notice) and other schools.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (F)(1)(i):

- Financial data to show whether and to what extent expenditures, as a percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice), increased, decreased, or remained the same.

Evidence for (F)(1)(ii):

- Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.

Recommended maximum response length: Three pages

Section F(1)(i): Like every state in the union, Tennessee has faced unprecedented financial challenges in the past decade that have required careful attention to planning and a sharpened focus on maintaining priorities that will lead to healthy and stable futures for the state's 6.2 million residents – especially its children. Governor Bredesen has shielded K-12 from the brunt of cutbacks, knowing that the state's economic vitality depends on the progress of its public elementary and secondary schools.

As a result of this progressive thinking, Tennessee has seen its percentage of total revenues available to the state for public K-12 and higher education increase between FY 2008 and FY 2009 from 43% to 48%. Please see Appendix F-1-1 for a numerical breakdown.

In FY 2008, Tennessee's state budget totaled \$26,780,173,400, including state and federal revenues:

- Of that amount, \$12,422,839,700 in state revenues was available for all general fund expenditures, including education. The rest, approximately \$14 billion, was dedicated to non-general fund spending such as transportation, debt service, and capital outlay. These funds cannot be dedicated to education.
 - Of amount available for all general fund expenditures, approximately \$3,756,810,400 – or 30% – went to K-12 public education.

- About \$1,637,820,200 – or 13% – went to public higher education.
- This means that 43% of the total revenues available to the state in FY 2008 was used to support public K-12 and higher education.

In FY 2009, Tennessee's state budget rose to \$29,774,201,000, including state and federal revenuesⁱⁱ:

- Of that amount, \$11,091,830,000 in state revenues was available for general fund expenditures, including education. The rest, approximately \$18 billion, was dedicated to non-general fund spending such as transportation, debt service, and capital outlay. These funds cannot be dedicated to education.
 - In FY 2009, K-12 education appropriations rose to \$3,839,827,800, or 35% of the amount available for all general fund expenditures.
 - Higher education appropriations declined slightly to \$1,568,620,700, although the percentage rose to 14% of revenues available for general fund expenditures.

This means that 48% of the total revenues available to the state in FY 2009 for general fund expenditures was used to support public K-12 and higher education – an increase from the previous year. These figures prove that even in disastrous economic times, Governor Bredesen and the General Assembly stood firm and did not cut K-12 public education. Indeed, as other states reduced their K-12 public education budgets, our leaders increased spending on public elementary and secondary schools.

Section (F)(1)(ii): Tennessee's progressive policies on equitable funding between high-need LEAs and other LEAs, as well as within high-poverty and low-poverty schools, have resulted in a school funding formula that boosted average expenditures per student from \$3,732 in 1991-92 to \$8,345 in 2007-08, an increase of 124%, according to the Department of Education's 21st Century Schools Report Card. The latest revamping of the formula, as described below, reduced inequities by steering more funds for targeted spending to high-need school districts.

In 1992, the state made a significant commitment to improve K-12 public education by establishing a funding formula called the Basic Education Program (BEP). There are 45 components to the formula that are divided into three categories: instructional (teachers' salaries and related benefits), classroom (instructional equipment, supplies, textbooks, materials), and non-classroom (transportation, superintendents' salaries, maintenance). On average, the state funds 70% of the instructional category; 75% of the classroom category; and 50% of the non-classroom category. Student enrollment drives the BEP formula, with the state picking up a greater share of these three categories in high-need districts and a smaller share in higher-wealth districts.

In 2004-05, Tennessee changed the BEP formula to address funding for instructional positions by directing additional dollars to high-need systems in an attempt to equalize teaching salaries. The commissioner of education prepared a revised state minimum salary schedule to complement the distribution of these additional instructional salary funds. The process includes an annual review to provide an early warning of salary disparity among school districts and to review the cost-driven salary component. An estimated 122 systems with 48,600 teachers received new instructional salary dollars through the BEP funding formula – a key strategy in ensuring equitable funding between high-need and low-need LEAs. After implementation, Tennessee's average instructional salary increased above the Southeast average.

In 2007, the state made another significant change to the BEP formula by enacting what became known as BEP 2.0. The redesigned formula was a major step in supporting high-needs districts. For example, the state used to fund districts for just 33% of their high-needs students (those receiving free- or reduced-price lunches) in grades K-3. BEP 2.0 boosted that share to 100% of a district's high-needs students from K to 12 – a crucial infusion of dollars that will help districts target their resources.

The changes are scheduled to be enacted over a three- to four-year period as funds permit. So far, the new formula is about 60% implemented. Fully implemented, BEP 2.0 will:

- Increase the state share of the instructional component from 70% to 75%.
- Increase the instructional salary unit cost.
- Install a new methodology of calculating fiscal capacity.

- Begin funding English Language Learners at 1:20 teachers to students and 1:200 translators to students.
- Set a minimum state share of the non-classroom component at 25%.
- Provide 50% of funding for medical insurance premiums for instructional positions.

The changes made since 2007 have infused \$290 million new recurring dollars into K-12 education.

Over the past several years – and especially in the recent fiscal crisis – Tennessee has made funding K-12 public education its top priority. The budget for K-12 education actually increased between FY 2008 and FY 2009 as described above (both in actual dollars and in the percentage of available revenues for education). Changes in the BEP, including new additions for at-risk students and English language learners, resulted in greater numbers of high-need students receiving adequate funding in high-need schools and districts. The state is on sound financial footing to receive and leverage Race to the Top dollars.

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

The extent to which—

- The State has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State, measured (as set forth in Appendix B) by the percentage of total schools in the State that are allowed to be charter schools or otherwise restrict student enrollment in charter schools;
- The State has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools; in particular, whether authorizers require that student achievement (as defined in this notice) be one significant factor, among others, in authorization or renewal; encourage charter schools that serve student populations that are similar to local district student populations, especially relative to high-need students (as defined in this notice); and have closed or not renewed ineffective charter schools;
- The State’s charter schools receive (as set forth in Appendix B) equitable funding compared to traditional public schools, and a commensurate share of local, State, and Federal revenues;

(iv) The State provides charter schools with funding for facilities (for leasing facilities, purchasing facilities, or making tenant improvements), assistance with facilities acquisition, access to public facilities, the ability to share in bonds and mill levies, or other supports; and the extent to which the State does not impose any facility-related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than those applied to traditional public schools; and

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

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (F)(2)(i):

- A description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- The number of charter schools allowed under State law and the percentage this represents of the total number of schools in the State.
- The number and types of charter schools currently operating in the State.

Evidence for (F)(2)(ii):

- A description of the State's approach to charter school accountability and authorization, and a description of the State's applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- For each of the last five years:
 - The number of charter school applications made in the State.
 - The number of charter school applications approved.
 - The number of charter school applications denied and reasons for the denials (academic, financial, low enrollment, other).
 - The number of charter schools closed (including charter schools that were not reauthorized to operate).

Evidence for (F)(2)(iii):

- A description of the State's applicable statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- A description of the State's approach to charter school funding, the amount of funding passed through to charter schools per student, and how those amounts compare with traditional public school per-student funding allocations.

Evidence for (F)(2)(iv):

- A description of the State’s applicable statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- A description of the statewide facilities supports provided to charter schools, if any.

Evidence for (F)(2)(v):

- A description of how the State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools (as defined in this notice) other than charter schools.

Recommended maximum response length: Six pages

Section F(2)(i): Tennessee views its charter schools as key partners in giving families, students, and educators additional options for high-quality schools. Because of a strong emphasis on quality and accountability, the state’s charters have established a successful track record over the past seven years: Two schools have received a Title I Distinguished School Award for closing the achievement gap from the Tennessee Department of Education; one received an award from the Education Consumers Foundation for its outstanding value-added gains, and a majority of the state’s charters continue to outperform district and statewide averages on the annual state assessments in math and reading/language arts.

We believe we have much to learn from the innovation, autonomy, and accountability that are cornerstones of the charter school movement: innovation to allow the creation of new, promising practices and strategies that can then be transferred to and flourish in other parts of our K-12 system; autonomy to enable educators at the school level to optimize the allocation of resources; and accountability to ensure that progress in student achievement is being made in order for a school to continue serving our students.

In 2002, Tennessee passed charter legislation. Please see Appendix F-2-1 for a description of relevant charter school laws. However, it became clear that the law needed to be strengthened to broaden student eligibility for charters, thereby giving more families and students educational choices. It also became clear that the state needed to raise the cap to enable more high-quality charter schools to operate in Tennessee. In 2009, Governor Bredesen signed changes to the law:

- It expanded charter school eligibility in qualifying school districts to include all students who are eligible for free- and

reduced-lunch. (The previous law restricted charter schools to serve students zoned to a school on the No Child Left Behind “High Priority List”; students who have failed to pass the state standardized tests in grades 3-12; or students who were previously enrolled in a charter school.)

- Under the law, qualifying districts must:
 - Have a minimum enrollment of 14,000 students
 - Have had at least three schools that missed AYP for two consecutive years (High Priority List)
- Five districts currently qualify under these provisions: Memphis, Metro Nashville, Hamilton County (Chattanooga), Knox County (Knoxville), and Sumner County.
- Districts not qualifying can, by a two-thirds vote of the local school board, open up eligibility to all free- and reduced-lunch students. Therefore, any district in Tennessee can authorize charter schools to serve students who qualify for free- and reduced-price lunches by virtue of the district’s demographics or through a vote of the local school board (and, as explained above, students in any district meeting the academic or previous charter school enrollment criteria are eligible to attend a charter school).
- The new law also raised the charter cap from 50 schools to 90 schools statewide, with a cap of 35 in Memphis, 20 in Nashville, and 4 in Shelby County. Conversion schools – existing public schools that convert themselves into charter schools under an approved process by their local board of education – do not count toward the cap.
- The renewal period was extended from five years to 10 years, although there will be a school review conducted at the five-year mark to ensure the school is meeting the goals to which it has committed.
 - To maintain quality and accountability, the law allows authorizers to close a charter school after two years of not making Adequate Yearly Progress – perhaps one of the toughest charter school accountability laws in the nation. The Memphis City Schools acted on this provision in 2007 by closing a charter high school, indicating that the district is committed to ensuring the quality of its charter schools.

- The law also set a per-pupil allocation for facilities funding, which allows Tennessee to qualify for U.S. Department of Education facilities grants.

Tennessee has created the conditions to enable the expansion of best-performing innovative schools, including charters, through its recent changes. These elements are important complements to the human capital strategy to create the conditions in which high-quality educators can succeed. These changes are important to the overall success by creating a set of proof points throughout the state.

We recognize that beyond improving its charter statute to create the necessary conditions for great charters to flourish, the state must be – and will be – proactive in developing strategies to identify and help talented entrepreneurs start and run high-performing charter schools and charter networks. A fundamental part of that strategy is establishing collaborative partnerships among education entrepreneurs, philanthropic organizations, community development corporations, the business community, LEAs, and state education agencies. In our largest urban districts, this type of collaboration has already begun and has started to bear fruit. Please see Appendix F-2-3 for examples.

Tennessee not only is looking to grow outstanding charter schools internally. It also is aggressively seeking to attract the highest-performing charter operators from around the country to work in Tennessee (as evidenced by recent policy changes to make the education environment more friendly for charter operators; the launch of the Nashville mayor’s incubator described in Section F(3); and the many years of work by education reform-focused foundations to bring nationally recognized models to Tennessee — including Knowledge is Power Program (KIPP), and Building Excellent Schools, a highly regarded charter leader fellowship program.. In addition, the Achievement School District, as described in Section E(2)(ii), also will assist high-quality charter operators in locating facilities for them to expand and serve students in low-performing schools.

Tennessee has 1,734 public K-12 schools, including 22 public charter schoolsⁱⁱⁱ. If the statewide cap of 90 charter schools were reached, that would equal 5.1% of all public schools in the state. However, it is crucial to keep in mind that conversions of existing schools do not count toward the cap. Currently, one out of the 22 existing charter schools is a conversion school. This

means that the state can open another 69 new charter schools – and convert an unlimited number of existing traditional schools into charter schools – before reaching the cap of 90.

Tennessee is strongly committed to growing the number of charter schools, but doing so in a way that ensures all approved schools are capable of delivering a rigorous education that equips students for college and career success. As we thoughtfully approve new schools that can deliver powerful results and those schools continue to perform at a high level, we believe there will be overwhelming community and political support to raise and/or lift the cap to provide quality options for our students and families.

Section F(2)(ii): Tennessee’s charter school laws encourage the development of high-quality charter school applications and makes clear that not making progress on student achievement can be sole grounds for closure. For the exact statutory language and reporting requirements, please see Appendix F-2-1. Following are highlights of Tennessee’s state laws governing how charter schools are approved, monitored, held accountable, reauthorized, or closed:

- The law requires that charter applicants apply to their LEA for approval, and if denied, they can appeal to the State Board of Education. The application process conducted by the LEA includes the submission of a charter application by a sponsoring entity. The application consists of 21 sections, detailing the mission, vision, instructional strategies, goals, financial operations, and governance of the school. The LEA scores each proposal and provides specific written feedback to each applicant, with a recommendation for approval or denial.
- Operating charter schools are required to submit annual reports to the LEA and commissioner of education detailing, among other things, progress toward their academic goals contained in their charter and their financial stability. In practice, LEAs also engage in periodic visits to each charter school to help provide support and monitor compliance.
- Charters are granted for 10-year periods. In the fifth year of initial operation, and the fifth year following a renewal, the Department of Education conducts an audit to determine whether the charter’s goals are being met.
- A charter school can be closed for three reasons: committing a material violation of the conditions or provisions of a charter,

failing to make Adequate Yearly Progress over two consecutive years, or mismanaging funds. The AYP requirement makes student achievement a significant factor in renewal or revocation of a charter and ensures that only high-quality charter schools continue to exist in the state.

- As explained in Section F(2)(i), Tennessee’s charter law encourages the creation and maintenance of charter schools that serve populations that are similar to local district student populations. Tennessee law assures that charter schools serve high-need students with the following requirements
 - If any charter school class or grade is oversubscribed, enrollment is determined by lottery.
 - First priority is given to students who are eligible because they failed to reach proficiency, or are zoned to or are attending a school that failed to make AYP.
 - Second priority is given to students who qualify because of free or reduced-price lunch eligibility.

The tables below illustrate the history of charter approval, appeals to the State Board of Education, renewal, or closure in Tennessee since 2004-05, as well as the reasons for denial at the local level:

Table 1: Charter School Approval/Denial/Closure in Tennessee since 2004-05

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
# charter applications	26	3	5	10	12
# approved	7	0	1	4	6
# denied locally (see Table #2 for reasons)	19	3	4	6	6
# appealed: # successful in appeal to State Board of Education	8:1	2:1	1:0	1:0	1:1
# closed	0	0	0	1	0

Table #2: Reasons for Charter Application Denial by LEAs since 2004-05

	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
# incomplete	4	0	1	0	0
# ineligible	2	0	0	0	1
# fiscal/academic weakness	13	2	3	5	5
# fiscal, academic, or organizational weakness	0	1	0	0	0
# withdrawn	0	0	0	1	0

Section F(2)(iii): Tennessee requires equitable funding for charter schools. State law requires that charter school students receive the same per-pupil funding that would have followed them to a school district if the students had enrolled in a non-charter public school. The law states that these per-pupil allocations will be based on “one hundred percent of state and local funds received by the LEA, including current funds allocated for capital outlay purposes, excluding the proceeds of debt obligations and associated debt service.” The per-pupil amount passes through the LEA to the charter schools, and the LEA cannot deduct a portion of the per-pupil allocation for administrative costs. For the exact statutory language, please see Appendix F-2-1.

As with its non-charter public schools, Tennessee encourages charter schools to seek local, state, and federal grants to help them advance their mission. Tennessee has participated in the federal public Charter Schools Program (CSP) since 2003 and has been able to award start-up funding to each charter school in the state, ranging from \$500,000 to \$700,000. In July, Tennessee was one of five states to receive a CSP grant from the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Innovation and Improvement to support new and developing charter schools. The CSP grant, totaling over \$22 million, will be distributed over a five-year period. The scope

of this grant is designed to expand the number of high-quality charter schools, support successful charter schools through state and local involvement, encourage dissemination of best practices within charter schools to the broader public, and improve academic achievement of charter school students.

Section F(2)(iv): Tennessee law requires that charter school students receive per-pupil funding for capital expenses. The law states that the Department of Education will calculate the amount of capital funding due to an LEA, reserve the charter schools' share based on the charter schools' enrollment, and send that amount directly to the charter schools (as opposed to the 100% pass-through funding for per-pupil expenditures outlined above). The charter schools' capital dollars may be used for rent for school facilities, construction, renovation of an existing school facility, leasehold improvements, debt service on a school facility or purchase of a building or land, as long as no funds will be spent to buy land when the charter school does not have immediate plans to construct a building on the land. For the exact statutory language, please see Appendix F-2-1.

State law also allows LEAs to submit bond applications on behalf of charter schools, or include charter schools in their own applications. For the exact statutory language, please see Appendix F-2-1.

Tennessee imposes no facility-related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than those applied to traditional public schools.

Section F(2)(v): Tennessee believes that while charter schools are one source of educational innovation, they are not the only source. Three state laws in particular enable additional innovations. For the exact statutory language, please see Appendix F-2-2:

- Tenn. Code Ann. §49-15-101 et seq., allows LEAs to partner with post-secondary institutions to establish innovative high schools. These schools are specifically given the same statutory and regulatory waiver option as charter schools. In effect, these laws give LEAs all the authority and options with non-charter high schools that public charter high schools have. As detailed elsewhere in this application, Tennessee plans to apply this law to create STEM-focused high schools as well as

RAMP-UP high schools.^{STEM} This law also has been used to create five middle- and early-college high schools in the state.

- Tenn. Code Ann. §49-1-207 gives LEAs authority to develop innovative educational programs, and allows the commissioner to waive any state rule to facilitate such programs. In essence, this law allows district seeking new models of public schools other than charter schools to seek a waiver of any state guideline that may hinder such programs. Metro Nashville Public Schools has requested waivers to enable high school students to receive appropriate credit for courses taken at Vanderbilt University and to establish innovative non-traditional high schools.
- Tenn. Code Ann. §49-13-134 encourages LEAs with charter schools to establish non-charter public schools of innovation using federal funds. These schools can function as a control group to enable the effectiveness of charter schools to be better assessed through comparative evaluations or studies.

Tennessee believes that innovation can be found in both non-charter and charter schools. The key is creating high-quality schools that can incorporate innovation within a variety of structures. Tennessee's charter school act and its statutes permitting districts to open schools of innovation allow both traditional school districts and charter authorizers to advance creative ideas to serve Tennessee's children.

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

The extent to which the State, in addition to information provided under other State Reform Conditions Criteria, has created, through law, regulation, or policy, other conditions favorable to education reform or innovation that have increased student achievement or graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps, or resulted in other important outcomes.

In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion. The narrative or attachments shall also include, at a minimum, the evidence listed below, and how each piece of evidence demonstrates the State's success in meeting the criterion. The narrative and attachments may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Evidence for (F)(3):

- A description of the State's other applicable key education laws, statutes, regulations, or relevant legal documents.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

Section F(3): The innovations outlined in this application are numerous, and we believe they will be the launching pad for improved schools and accelerated student achievement across Tennessee. From STEM to collaboration with non-profits to the implementation of Common Core standards, the stage is set for building upon Tennessee’s strengths to ensure bright and economically viable futures for Tennessee’s children.

We believe there are other conditions that are favorable to education reform in Tennessee. First, even as the debate over differentiated pay for teachers rages across the United States, it has always had a home in Tennessee. Tenn. Code Ann. §49-3-306, passed in 2007, requires districts to submit differentiated pay plans to the state Department of Education, paving the way for experimentation in this area. LEAs are required to submit differentiated compensation plans for recruiting teachers in hard-to-staff schools and in retaining qualified educators. Knox County, through its Teacher Advancement Program, and Hamilton County, through the Benwood Initiative, have implemented differentiated pay programs in an effort to raise student achievement. Please see Appendix F-3-2 for a description of these two innovative programs.

Second, Metro Nashville Public Schools attracted Matt Candler – the former CEO of New Schools for New Orleans, which led the dramatic expansion of high-quality charter schools in that city – to lead a charter school “incubator” in Nashville. Please see Appendix F-3-1 for a press release announcing the incubator. The organization will recruit, develop, and train charter school leaders who want to open high-quality schools in Nashville. It is Tennessee’s hope that through outside funding, the incubator concept will be expanded statewide so that charter school operators inside Tennessee and those who are eager to open schools here will receive appropriate training and skills to spread high-quality charter schools across the state.

Third, the Tennessee Race to the Top Act passed in the January 2010 session of the Tennessee General Assembly will usher in the next generation of reforms for the Volunteer State. The legislation establishes a committee to create a new annual teacher and

principal evaluation instrument that uses student achievement growth as one of multiple measures (described in Section D(2)), establishes an Achievement School District and other new accountability rules for the state's lowest-performing schools (described in Section E), and enables individual, non-identifiable teacher effect data to be sent to institutions of higher education for analysis of the institutions' effectiveness (described in Section D(4)).

V. COMPETITION PRIORITIES

Priority 1: Absolute Priority -- Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

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

The absolute priority cuts across the entire application and should not be addressed separately. It is assessed, after the proposal has been fully reviewed and evaluated, to ensure that the application has met the priority.

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

To meet this priority, the State's application must have a high-quality plan to address the need to (i) offer a rigorous course of study in mathematics, the sciences, technology, and engineering; (ii) cooperate with industry experts, museums, universities, research centers, or other STEM-capable community partners to prepare and assist teachers in integrating STEM content across grades and disciplines, in promoting effective and relevant instruction, and in offering applied learning opportunities for students; and (iii) prepare more students for advanced study and careers in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including by addressing the needs of underrepresented groups and of women and girls in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

The competitive preference priority will be evaluated in the context of the State's entire application. Therefore, a State that is responding to this priority should address it throughout the application, as appropriate, and provide a summary of its approach to addressing the priority in the text box below. The reviewers will assess the priority as part of their review of a State's application and determine whether it has been met.

Recommended maximum response length, if any: One page

Priority 2: STEM: Tennessee is launching a groundbreaking new public education partnership with the global research and development enterprise Battelle Memorial Institute. Under the partnership, Battelle, which co-manages Tennessee's own Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) in a joint venture with the University of Tennessee, will work with the state Department

of Education and local school systems to establish a statewide network of programs and schools designed to promote and expand the teaching and learning of science, technology, engineering, and math—the STEM disciplines. The “Tennessee STEM Innovation Network” will be modeled in part on previous STEM efforts led by Battelle in other states, including its home state of Ohio. But like the rest of Tennessee’s Race to the Top Plan, our STEM approach will be uniquely Tennessean. We view our agreement with Battelle as not just a partnership with a major R&D concern, but, in fact, also a partnership with the entire state of Ohio. In that regard, Governor Bredesen, who majored in physics in college, has spoken with his counterpart, Governor Ted Strickland of Ohio, about establishing opportunities for sharing best practices between the Buckeye and Volunteer States — including creating teacher exchanges to improve professional development in STEM teaching and student exchanges to widen young adults’ views of STEM learning.

At its core, our STEM approach is designed to bolster the philosophy underpinning President Obama’s “Educate to Innovate” campaign to move American students from the middle to the top of the pack in science and math achievement over the next decade. Battelle is a “core partner” in the national campaign. As a state that is rich in STEM assets, Tennessee strongly believes that America’s future hinges on our ability to improve teaching and learning in the STEM disciplines. The Volunteer State stands ready to help lead the nation in this effort.

Battelle has strong roots in STEM education. In August 2006, Battelle helped launch Ohio’s first STEM-based school, Metro Early College High School, on the campus of the Ohio State University in Columbus. For the past two years, Battelle has managed the Ohio STEM Learning Network, a public-private partnership designed to foster and spread meaningful and sustainable innovations that change the way education looks and works. It has mobilized the support of 47 institutions of higher education, 81 public school districts, and more than 300 unique business and community partners. In 2009, Battelle applied lessons learned from Metro High School to launch Delta High School in Richland, Wash. Headquartered in Columbus, Battelle is one of the nation’s leading charitable trusts focusing on societal and economic impact and actively supporting and promoting science and math education.

Through its partnership with Battelle, Tennessee is actively pursuing a strategy that produces and supports talented STEM educators; develops engaging, cross-disciplinary and project-based curriculum linked to Tennessee’s growing STEM industries; creates new school

models that employ cutting-edge approaches to learning and pathways to STEM careers; and harnesses the power of multi-sector regional partners working with communities and schools to realize increased student achievement in STEM.

Tennessee has substantial STEM education assets, unique STEM research assets, and a growing STEM industry base. Through Race to the Top, Tennessee intends to dramatically accelerate STEM education through the development of the Tennessee STEM Innovation Network (please see Appendix Priority 2 – STEM-1), strategic investments in STEM (please see Appendix Priority 2 – STEM-2) programming and a dramatic partnership with some of the nation's most impressive STEM partners (please see Appendix Priority 2 – STEM-3 & STEM-4): Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL), Battelle Memorial Institute, Oak Ridge Associated Universities (ORAU), and the Ohio STEM Learning Network (OSLN).

A primary strategic goal of the Tennessee STEM Innovation Network is to support a significant expansion of STEM educational opportunities. Battelle manages the Ohio STEM Learning Network, as well as substantial STEM education activities throughout the country. Working in concert with ORAU, Battelle will manage the network and assist in leveraging and connect existing Tennessee programs to:

- Significantly increase the number of Tennessee students who graduate from high school successfully completing the expectations of the Tennessee Diploma Project and go on to complete college degrees in STEM fields.
- Increase the number of students who make the successful transition from school to careers in STEM fields.
- Tap the underutilized talent of women, minority and economically disadvantaged students by motivating them to participate in STEM fields at rates that match the rate for white males.
- Reduce achievement gaps and enhance overall student performance in STEM disciplines, particularly in higher level science and mathematics courses.
- Create a self-sustaining STEM education network that engages Tennessee's public and private resources in improving the STEM curriculum, instruction, assessment, teacher content knowledge, classroom delivery, leadership and community involvement.
- Capture and manage knowledge across the Tennessee network to help identify,

communicate, connect, develop, and spread innovation through professional contacts and personal relationships.

- Spread knowledge of innovations in STEM education so that the state improves by sharing and working jointly toward common ends.

The specific aspects of this plan are fully integrated into the fabric of the Race to the Top proposal. Some of the more exciting features include UTeach expansion, the Teach/Here NSF-funded teacher residency program in Knoxville and Chattanooga, and development of a project focused specifically on rural communities.

STEM items appearing throughout the proposal are tagged with this superscript^{STEM}.

Priority 3: Invitational Priority – Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes
(not scored)

The Secretary is particularly interested in applications that include practices, strategies, or programs to improve educational outcomes for high-need students who are young children (prekindergarten through third grade) by enhancing the quality of preschool programs. Of particular interest are proposals that support practices that (i) improve school readiness (including social, emotional, and cognitive); and (ii) improve the transition between preschool and kindergarten.

The State is invited to provide a discussion of this priority in the text box below, but such description is optional. Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length, if any: Two pages

In 2005, Governor Bredesen developed and helped pass the Voluntary Pre-K for Tennessee Act, increasing the state’s investment in early childhood education and access for students. Since that time, Tennessee has spent \$83 million annually to fund 934 Pre-K classes that serve approximately 18,000 young children. Tennessee’s program is recognized as a national leader in Pre-K quality, achieving nine out of ten quality standard benchmarks by the National Institute for Early Education Research (NIEER) for the past three years.

Tennessee’s Early Learning program is based on high-quality comprehensive developmental learning standards that span birth to age 5. All child-care providers and educators are required to use these standards. Local school systems and the education consultants with the Tennessee Department of Education’s Office of Early Learning provide professional development

for the teachers in the Tennessee Pre-K program. The Department of Human Services contracted with the Tennessee Early Childhood Training Alliance (TECTA) to develop online training modules for child care providers to improve their knowledge and skill in delivery of instruction to meet the standards. To date, 4,262 child-care providers have registered to participate in this online training, with 2,859 participants completing the training.

In order to improve school readiness, a primary goal of the Department of Education and the Department of Human Services is to increase accessibility to the TN-ELDS training for all child care providers and Pre-K teachers. Therefore, we plan to increase accessibility to online training for child care providers through collaborative agreements between the local school systems and the child care agencies to allow for usage of school system owned computers and connectivity at the local schools by child care providers for the purpose of such high-quality training. These training modules will also be added to the Tennessee Electronic Learning Center for use by Pre-K teachers in the school systems and community providers.

Pre-K-2nd Formative Assessment

Currently Tennessee does not have a systematic process by which to measure and gather assessment data on students in grades Pre-K-2nd grade. Each school system has the option of using the summative standardized Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) for grades K-2 at a cost to the school system. Very few school systems choose to test students in kindergarten and first grade for a variety of reasons, one being the cost of such assessments and the other being the appropriateness of summative assessments for young children. Assessment data for young children should be developmentally appropriate and used primarily to inform instruction based on the identified needs of the individual student. This type of assessment is formative, not summative, in nature. Formative assessment is on-going throughout the school year in order for the teacher to gather information on the progress of each student and design instruction to promote their progress. Tennessee will work to expand the use of these formative assessments in order to be able to gauge the effectiveness of the state Pre-K program of improving transitions between pre-K and kindergarten and beyond.

Program Quality - Improvement/Evaluation

The Tennessee Voluntary Pre-K program uses several instruments by which to gauge program quality, such as the Early Childhood Environmental Rating Scale (ECERS) and the Early Language and Literacy Classroom Observation instrument. These instruments allow us to

determine that the Tennessee Voluntary Pre-K program improves student readiness. However, there are no such instruments currently being used systematically in grades K-2 in the state. A variety of instruments to measure program quality is available and will be encouraged to be used by local school districts. These include: (1) Instructional Quality Assessment-Math, (2) Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), (3) Classroom Practices Inventory (CPI), (4) Ready School Assessment (RSA), (5) Program Administration Scale (PAS), and (6) Assessment of Practices in Early Elementary Classrooms (APEEC).

Building Capacity of the Early Childhood Workforce

Classroom teachers: The Office of Early Learning of the state Department of Education has been proactive in efforts to build the capacity of the early childhood workforce. Such efforts include working with institutes of higher education to offer summer institutes for kindergarten-certified teachers to add the Pre-K add-on endorsement to their current teaching certification. After attending the summer institutes, these teachers must pass the early childhood version of Praxis in order to be recommended for the pre-k add-on endorsement. Approximately 300 teachers have gained such endorsement over the past three years.

Teacher assistants: Another effort to grow the early childhood workforce is through Career/Technical Education class offerings in Tennessee's high schools, such as Early Childhood Education Careers I, II and III. This is a recent endeavor but shows promise in high school students completing their 30 hours needed to receive the CDA scholarship offered by the Tennessee Early Childhood Training Alliance. Some community colleges also are offering dual credit for students taking the early childhood career classes. The CDA is recommended for all teacher assistants in early childhood classrooms. This certification is the first step in achieving an AA degree in early childhood.

CDA Certification for TN Voluntary Pre-K Teacher Assistants

The only quality standard measure not achieved by Tennessee on the National Institute of Early Education Research (NIEER) quality standards checklist is the requirement that all teacher assistants hold a CDA certification. While this was a minimum requirement in the pilot Pre-K program it was not statutorily required of the Tennessee Voluntary Pre-K for Tennessee Act of 2005. However, currently 62% of all teacher assistants in state funded Pre-K classroom possess a BS, BA, AA, CDA, or are currently working on their CDA certification. The remaining 38% have a high school diploma. It is highly desirable for teacher assistants to obtain their CDA

certification. Tennessee will work to change statutory requirements to require a CDA of all teacher assistants in the state funded Pre-K program by the school year.

Center for Social Emotional Foundations on Early Learning (CSEFEL) Professional Development

Social skills in young children are more closely associated with school readiness and success in kindergarten and first grade than cognitive and academic skills. (Raver & Knitzer, 2002; Smith, 2004). Tennessee will begin implementing the CSEFEL Pyramid model as a conceptual framework of evidence-based practices to equip teachers to deal with these issues more effectively. The earlier these issues are addressed the greater chance of affecting change in the students' behavior. The promotion of social and emotional development in young children is critically important for their future success. The program would be rolled out in a "train the trainer" model. All early childhood teachers can benefit from this training in order to address current classroom management issues and prevent future issues. This also would accomplish the goal of improving school readiness and transitions to kindergarten.

Priority 4: Invitational Priority – Expansion and Adaptation of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems *(not scored)*

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

The Secretary is also particularly interested in applications in which States propose working together to adapt one State's statewide longitudinal data system so that it may be used, in whole or in part, by one or more other States, rather than having each State build or continue building such systems independently.

The State is invited to provide a discussion of this priority in the text box below, but such description is optional. Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length, if any: Two pages

The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) and the State of Tennessee propose to build a longitudinal data system (LDS) that will push the frontier in collection and utilization of P-20 data and promote improvements in program administration and educational outcomes. The initiative will significantly increase teacher, school, and district-level use of near real time student data by employing sophisticated, as yet underutilized longitudinal data for predictive and retrospective identification of student achievement growth and academic risk factors. The project, supported by the previously submitted application for State Longitudinal Data Systems funds, will complete the LDS P-20 database.

TDOE's P-12 LDS, supported by a 2006 Institute for Education Sciences grant, is well-developed. However, the current LDS falls short of a complete, efficacious P-20 information system. TDOE and its partner, the University of Tennessee Center for Business and Economic Research (CBER), will collaborate with the Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) and the Department of Labor and Workforce Development (L&WD) to expand the P-12 LDS to a P-20 system. Tennessee's current P-12 LDS and business intelligence functions satisfy basic expectations for interoperability and data delivery to local, district and state educators. Proposed improvements to existing business intelligence systems will dramatically expand the scope and depth of accessible data while maintaining stringent security standards. The project will develop a secure and adaptive database architecture that will integrate academic data on teacher/student relationships, attainment, course completion, and test scores, as well as data on health, children's services, mental health, and delinquency. This project envisions and plans to execute what is coined as *TLDS 360: Tennessee Longitudinal Data System 360 Degree View of the Student*. TLDS will incorporate data elements from other child-serving departments, specifically the Departments of Children's Services, Health, Human Services, Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities, Correction, TennCare Bureau, and Commission on Children and Youth, that will facilitate more robust characterizations of health, social welfare and behavioral conditions that influence students' progress from earliest child care, through P-12 and higher education, and into the workforce.

TDOE, as the lead agency, has partnered with CBER, an external academic research organization, which will serve as the conduit for receiving, aligning and coordinating data for reporting and research protocols to achieve project outcomes. As an established third party contractor, CBER is prepared to integrate data from SAS Inc. (the provider for Tennessee Value-

Added Assessment System) with data from TDOE, THEC, L&WD, as well as other child-serving departments and agencies. This coordinated approach will permit near- and long-term educational, administrative and research issues to be addressed, including the development of Early Warning Indicators and analyses of teacher effectiveness.

LDS governance will be a high-level organization representing all of the partner agencies committed to the success of the project. Initial project charters from relevant departments reflect commitments to negotiate data sharing agreements, though much of the data from TDOE, CBER, SAS, THEC, L&WD, and the Department of Human Services already are available for inclusion in the P-20. The project proposal capitalizes on the current LDS foundation and positions it for expansion as a nationwide model for multidisciplinary support of student achievement. It corresponds to data system requirements for potential projects funded by Race To The Top grants. Please see Appendix C-1-1 for the abstract and narrative of the SLDS application.

Priority 5: Invitational Priority -- P-20 Coordination, Vertical and Horizontal Alignment
(not scored)

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

The State is invited to provide a discussion of this priority in the text box below, but such description is optional. Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length, if any: Two pages

Tennessee is engaged in unprecedented coordination between K-12 and higher education resulting in a variety of key initiatives both within the state and working with national partners to improve student readiness for college and careers and creating an expectation that higher education

will be involved in all critical decisions for K-12 and vice versa.

Higher Education Reform

At the same time Tennessee is applying for Race to the Top, Governor Bredesen and a bipartisan group of lawmakers have completed nearly year-long talks on how to improve higher education in Tennessee — consisting of colleges and universities in the Tennessee Board of Regents (TBR) and University of Tennessee (UT) systems. The challenge is clear: The Volunteer State lags the nation in completion of bachelor's degrees (40th) and associate degrees (45th). On average, only 46% of full-time students at four-year schools graduate within six years, and only 12% of full-time community college students attain associate degrees within three years.

In fall 2009, the non-profit Complete College America — funded by the Carnegie Corporation, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Ford Foundation, W.K. Kellogg Foundation, and Lumina Foundation — provided technical assistance to the governor and lawmakers in reviewing Tennessee's colleges and universities. In January 2010, Complete College America delivered comprehensive recommendations that serve as the basis for comprehensive higher education reform legislation that was expected to be enacted into law in January 2010. To improve college completion rates in Tennessee, key measures include:

- Funding higher education based in part on success and outcomes, including higher rates of degree completion.
- Making community colleges the centerpiece in Tennessee's strategy by expanding common programs and common courses to promote consistency and quality across the two-year system.
- Creating a statewide transfer policy so that any student who earns a two-year degree at a community college can move on to a four-year university as a junior.
- Requiring TBR and UT to establish dual-admission and dual-enrollment policies at all two- and four-year colleges and universities.

We believe Tennessee's college-completion strategies are a natural extension of K-12 education reform measures. We further agree with the Race to the Top philosophy that places a premium on states that aren't simply focused on getting students through high school but also are looking at college enrollment and success.

Tennessee's Longitudinal Data System

The Tennessee Longitudinal Data System will incorporate data elements from the

Department of Education (TDOE) and all other departments to facilitate more robust characterizations of health, social welfare and behavioral conditions that influence students' progress from earliest child care, through P-12 and higher education, and into the workforce. Please also see Appendix C-1-1.

Early Childhood Advisory Council

Tennessee's Early Childhood Advisory Council will connect all aspects of the state's continuum of services for children ages birth to 5 years. The Council consists of leadership from all of the relevant agencies serving young children.

State P-16 Council

The nine-member P-16 Council, set in motion by Governor Bredesen, serves as the oversight body for dual-credit programs and GEAR UP TN, supports the Tennessee Diploma Project, and initiates other college-ready programs. The Council includes representatives from all of the key K-12 and post-secondary education governing bodies.

Local College Access Programs

Tennessee enjoys the support of several private/locally funded college access initiatives including the work of philanthropist Jim Ayers funding college scholarships for all high school graduates in Decatur, Henderson, and Perry counties and Knox County's replica of the Ayers model called "Knox Achieves" for 500 low-income and first-generation college students. Shelby County (Memphis) is planning to replicate the Knox Achieves program and a group of Southwest Tennessee mayors is exploring a free community college proposal to attract new businesses to their communities by ensuring that citizens have access to job-ready training programs.

Teacher Supply and Demand Study

The Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC), the State Board of Education, the Tennessee Department of Education, the University of Tennessee Center for Business and Economic Research, and the Governor's Office have partnered to create a teacher education data warehouse – a unit level, longitudinal database that will track teachers from their entrance into the higher education system, public K-12 sector, and beyond. The first teacher supply and demand study was published in 2009 and provides a projection of the need for teachers in specific disciplines and geographic regions. Please also see Section D(3)(i).

State Board of Education Report Card

The State Board of Education and THEC work collaboratively to produce this report on

the quality of teacher preparation programs in the state to identify teacher preparedness and will focus in the future on the relationship between teacher effect and teacher training programs.

Lottery Scholarship

Beginning in 2004, the Tennessee Education Lottery Scholarship program provided more than 76,000 students with college scholarships.

Dual Enrollment Grant

The Dual Enrollment grant was added to the Lottery Scholarship program for the 2005-06 academic year to fund one college course per semester for high school juniors and seniors. 10,786 students utilized the grant in 2007-08 with an expenditure of \$4.8 million.

After-school Programs

The Department of Education and the Department of Human Services have partnered with Communities In Schools, a national non-profit organization that works with at-risk students in grades Pre-K through 12, in the design of a statewide “After-school Network” to assess, promote and expand proven afterschool programs using \$4 million from TANF.

UTeach^{STEM}

THEC and the TDOE have a joint RFP currently to award UTeach replication grants in the amount of \$1.825 million over five years to two Tennessee institutions. The consortium is organized through the National Math and Science Initiative and the UTeach institute and will be applying for funding through the Teacher Quality grants in the stimulus package.

Priority 6: Invitational Priority -- School-Level Conditions for Reform, Innovation, and Learning *(not scored)*

The Secretary is particularly interested in applications in which the State’s participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) seek to create the conditions for reform and innovation as well as the conditions for learning by providing schools with flexibility and autonomy in such areas as—

- (i) Selecting staff;
- (ii) Implementing new structures and formats for the school day or year that result in increased learning time (as defined in this notice);
- (iii) Controlling the school’s budget;
- (iv) Awarding credit to students based on student performance instead of instructional time;
- (v) Providing comprehensive services to high-need students (as defined in this notice) (*e.g.*, by mentors and other caring adults; through local partnerships with community-based organizations, nonprofit organizations, and other providers);

(vi) Creating school climates and cultures that remove obstacles to, and actively support, student engagement and achievement; and

(vii) Implementing strategies to effectively engage families and communities in supporting the academic success of their students.

The State is invited to provide a discussion of this priority in the text box below, but such description is optional. Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length, if any: Two pages

(i) Selecting staff

Distinguished Professionals Education Initiative, Knox County

Founded in 2005, the Distinguished Professionals Education Initiative (DPEI) addresses the need for highly qualified math, science, and foreign language teachers by recruiting professionals from these fields to teach courses as “adjunct” high school teachers. DPEI teachers must have a master’s or bachelor’s degree in the subject in which they will teach and complete 50 hours of training. DPEI teachers currently serve as instructors for 31 courses in Knox County. Please also see Appendix D-1-4.

The Effective Practice Incentive Community, Memphis

Funded by a federal Teacher Incentive Fund grant and operated by New Leaders for New Schools, the Effective Practice Incentive Community (EPIC) was launched in Memphis schools in 2006 to improve teaching with bonuses of up to \$7,500 a year for principals and \$2,500 for teachers if their students excel. Participants are required to share the practices that led to their school's achievement growth. In the 2007-08 school year, 650 educators in Memphis received rewards totaling more than \$900,000. New Leaders for New Schools is now expanding EPIC in Washington, D.C., and Denver Public Schools.

Fresh Starts, Memphis and Metro Nashville

In an effort to turn around failing schools, Memphis and Metro Nashville schools give select schools “Fresh Starts” with a new principal and require every teacher in each school to reapply for their job. Staff at these schools are offered performance incentives and have recorded significant gains in student achievement.

The New Teacher Project (TNTP), Memphis and Metro Nashville

TNTP is a national non-profit dedicated to providing poor and minority students with high-quality teachers. TNTP partners with both Memphis City Schools and Metro Nashville Public Schools to staff their schools with top talent. In 2006, TNTP launched the Memphis Teaching Fellows program with a \$1.6 million, five-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education. The Memphis program aggressively recruits and trains accomplished career changers and recent graduates to teach in shortage subject areas. As a result of TNTP, Memphis' lowest-performing schools opened fully staffed in 2008 compared to the 31 vacancies in 2007. The new teachers have strong academic credentials: Their average GPA is 3.25, and nearly a quarter have advanced degrees. TNTP Nashville launched its inaugural class of 75 career-changers in 2009. TNTP Nashville, along with Teach for America and Vanderbilt University, partner to recruit top candidates for math, science, and literacy at the middle school level while offering free master's degrees in a program developed by the university focused on content and urban education. Candidates must fulfill a five-year commitment to teach in the district and will be placed in hard-to-staff schools.

(ii) Implementing new structures and formats for the school day or year that result in increased learning time (as defined in this notice)

5th Block, Fulton High School, Knox County

Fulton High School was reconstituted in 2008, and uses Title I funds to extend the school day by 30 minutes. Struggling students take recovery credit courses or receive tutoring while others take enrichment courses. The school climate has improved with dramatic student gains.

(iii). Controlling the school's budget

Knox County Data Dashboard and School Budgeting

In partnership with the Knoxville Area Chamber Partnership, Knox County developed an impressive data dashboard for teachers and school leaders that will both inform budgeting decisions and support student academics by aligning with instructional needs, and will allow the system to better identify and provide for the unique needs of each school.

(iv). Awarding credit to students based on student performance instead of instructional time

Non-Traditional High School Academies, Metro Nashville Public Schools

Metro Nashville Public Schools created two new high schools to address students who have the desire to obtain a diploma but have significant barriers (e.g. teen pregnancy, family wage earner responsibilities). After the first semester of operations, 120 students graduated. One school is in partnership with the Simon Youth Foundation of Indianapolis.

Niswonger Foundation, E-Learning Program with Bristol City Schools

In 2005, the Niswonger Foundation began partnering with the Bristol City Schools to create an e-learning center at a Tennessee High School and produced 20 state-approved courses for credit recovery utilized by students in six school districts in Northeast Tennessee.

(v). Providing comprehensive services to high-need students (as defined in this notice) (e.g., by mentors and other caring adults; through local partnerships with community-based organizations, nonprofit organizations, and other providers

The Benwood Initiative, Hamilton County Schools

In 2001, the Benwood Foundation and the Public Education Foundation (PEF) formed a partnership with Hamilton County to address the disproportionate share of the state's low performing schools found in Chattanooga. Almost all students in these schools qualified for FRPL. With a focus on literacy and teacher effectiveness, the effort was originally funded by a \$5 million grant to PEF from the Benwood Foundation and \$2.5 million from PEF and later \$7 million in 2007. In the eight phase 1 "Benwood schools," the percentage of third graders passing the state reading exam jumped from 53% in 2003 to 78% in 2008. In 2008, 72% of Benwood (phase 1) third graders scored proficient or advanced in mathematics, up from 50% in 2003. Funds are continuing to support the work of the eight original Benwood Schools while also providing direct support for eight additional schools. The successes of the initiative received national attention from The NewsHour on PBS, Readers' Digest, and Education Week. Please also see Appendix F-3-2.

Full Service School Model, Knox County Public Schools

Inskip Elementary is a Title I school that has embraced the full-service model, giving kids access to health and other social services within the school. The approach ranges from English

language learner classes for parents to having washers/dryers in the school and extra clothes for students. The school has partnered with the University of Tennessee's nursing students as well as many other volunteers for support. Inskip has some of the highest value-added scores in the state.

(vi). Creating school climates and cultures that remove obstacles to, and actively support, student engagement and achievement

Oasis Center for Youth, Metro Nashville Public Schools

Oasis Center focuses its efforts on students in greatest need and has partnered with research faculty from Vanderbilt University and Meharry Medical College targeting Nashville middle schools most in need of support.

(vii). Implementing strategies to effectively engage families and communities in supporting the academic success of their students.

Parent University Committee, Metro Nashville Public Schools

The non-profit organization Alignment Nashville and Metro Nashville Public Schools have created a task force to develop a comprehensive parent education program in collaboration with Nashville's non-profit community and to serve as a central repository for existing programs.

CIELO, Lebanon Special School District

The Lebanon Special School District has sponsored the Community Involvement through Education and Literacy Organization (CIELO) since 2005. The comprehensive literacy program aims to increase parental involvement of non-native English-speaking families by holding English classes. Free materials and child care is offered. School staff receive in-service credits for learning basic conversational Spanish, cultural awareness, and diversity training, which helps facilitate communication with the families. Homework Help assists the ELL students with homework and extra tutoring while their parents study.

Knoxville's Project GRAD, Knox County Schools

Project GRAD is a partnership between the public and private sector that is serving over 7,500 students in Knoxville with the goal of helping more at-risk students enroll in college. Project GRAD has several key components, including reading interventions in elementary schools, consultants to help individual teachers with their classroom management skills, social services and counseling resources for students in all participating schools, and a college

scholarship coordinator in each high school.

“Plant the Seed” Program, Fentress County Public Schools

Starting in Pre-K, rural Fentress County Public Schools’ “Plant the Seed” program emphasizes the importance of attending post-secondary education. Middle and high school students visit local colleges, vocational schools, and technical schools to experience a collegiate atmosphere. Students are encouraged to take dual enrollment classes, and a program is being created to invite alumni enrolled in post-secondary education institutions back to Fentress schools to discuss their experiences and answer students' questions about college.

Ayers Foundation College Access Program, Decatur, Henderson, and Perry County Schools

The Ayers Foundation is aimed at increasing college access for students in Decatur, Henderson, and Perry counties. The program provides a \$4,000 annual scholarship for all high school graduates in the counties to pursue two-year or four-year degrees, with 1,558 students having received scholarships since 2000 for a total of \$4.8 million. The program also places college counselors in each of the counties’ high schools to help students navigate the college application and financial aid process.

Nashville College Connection/Oasis Center for Youth

Nashville College Connection’s (NCC) mission is to provide comprehensive and individualized admissions and financial aid expertise to support and increase students’ college going rates, retention, and successful degree completion.

BUDGET PART I: BUDGET SUMMARY NARRATIVE

Evidence for Section A(2)(i)(d)

Tennessee's First to the Top budget structure mirrors the state's overall approach to the challenge issued in the Race to the Top application. As articulated in the introduction of this application, Tennessee will utilize these funds to create an intensive focus on the power of human capital: recruiting, developing, evaluating, and compensating the best talent Tennessee can find for its schools; equipping them with the tools they need to succeed, such as standards and data; defining expectations and setting the bar high for student, teacher, and principal success; rethinking old and out-of-date practices that keep great teachers and leaders from succeeding; and harnessing the power of external organizations, foundations, and committed partners to help Tennessee achieve its specific goals and targets. Approximately 87% of the total funding requested is directed towards developing teachers and leaders and turning around the state's lowest performing schools. Of that, 52% is related to professional development and the expansion of human capital for education within the state, including human capital within the Achievement School District and 35% will go toward specific interventions within the state's lowest performing schools. The remaining 13% of the total funding will be utilized for implementation and continuous improvement through research and evaluation.

- **Human Capital** projects include the expansion of teachers trained by alternative licensure programs such as The New Teacher Project and Teach for America, specifically \$30.6 million within the Achievement School District; pre-service training on standards, TVAAS, and STEM disciplines; training of principals and teachers in residency programs; rethinking teacher and school leader preparation programs through the Teacher Preparation Program Effectiveness Report Card and UTeach replication; the administration of the Teacher Working Conditions survey; and an Innovation Acceleration Fund that will allow districts to realize more fully their differentiated compensation plans. The total budget for Human Capital projects is approximately \$61.3 million.

Tennessee currently leverages \$3.6 million in federal funds from the Improving Teacher Quality grant program and Math Science Partnership grant program for UTeach replication sites at Middle Tennessee State University and the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. If successful in the anticipated Teacher Incentive Fund grant application, Tennessee will leverage those funds to increase the Innovation Acceleration Fund and assist districts in realizing their differentiated compensation plans.

- **Professional Development** projects include expansion of content for teachers on the Electronic Learning Center; training on the Common Core Standards and assessments, a newly developed evaluation, and the usage of TVAAS; content area training in STEM disciplines; and usage of data for instruction. The total budget for Professional Development projects is approximately \$68.1 million.
- **Interventions** in the state's lowest performing schools will target an estimated total of 196 schools in the first year and an estimated 226 schools by Year 4. Through legislation passed during the January 2010 session of the Tennessee General Assembly, the commissioner of education was granted the authority to move schools defined as persistently lowest achieving (Restructuring 2) into an Achievement School District. That district would be run by the state and would include up to 13 schools. Management of the district would lie with the Tennessee Department of Education which would contract services for the schools to nationally recognized non-profits with a demonstrated track record of reform in recruiting highly effective teachers or principals, working with districts and states on revamping human capital systems, creating and expanding high-quality charter schools, and paving the way for dramatic improvement in student outcomes. Tennessee will seek out leading non-profits that have already have proven they can do this work and enlist them in the ASD effort. Working individually and as a collaborative, the selected partners will commit resources, expertise, and assistance so that students and schools in Tennessee's ASD will see rapid achievement growth. Schools categorized in Tennessee's reconfigured accountability system as Renewal Schools (Corrective Action and Restructuring 1) would receive approximately \$300,000

per school to purchase school turnaround services from a list of providers established through a Request for Information process. An estimated 30 schools would be categorized as Renewal Schools in the first year and an estimated 75 schools in Year 4. Schools categorized as Focus Schools (School Improvement 1 and 2) would receive approximately \$6,000 per school to purchase similar turnaround services. An estimated 154 schools would be categorized as Renewal Schools in the first year and an estimated 149 schools in Year 4. Interventions will also include the start-up and expansion of a statewide college access network. The total budget for Interventions is approximately \$88.6 million.

The Tennessee Department of Education will leverage \$19,500,000 in School Improvement Grant funds for the Achievement School District and approximately \$8.4 million for the Renewal Schools.

- **Implementation** funds will go towards coordination and oversight of all projects outlined within this application as part of the First to the Top Oversight Team; development of a Delivery Unit within TDOE that will increase the department's ability to design policy based on the rich data collected by the state; and creation of a STEM Innovation Network. The total budget for Implementation is approximately \$10 million.
- **Research** efforts will inform the continuous improvement of Tennessee's Race to the Top programs. Tennessee's Consortium on Research, Evaluation and Development will lead these efforts in coordination with the non-profits that will work to integrate data for improving instruction, conduct a School Leader Supply and Demand study and develop a Leadership Action tank. The total budget for Research is approximately \$22.8 million.

If successful in the previously submitted application for the State Longitudinal Data System, the Tennessee Department of Education will leverage approximately \$19.4 million in federal funds for research purposes.

Note: Included in the above numbers are Tennessee's commitments to various **STEM-related activities**.

Tennessee First to the Top Budget - Overall					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (2010-11)	Project Year 2 (2011-12)	Project Year 3 (2012-13)	Project Year 4 (2013-14)	Total
1. Personnel	\$ 1,527,726	\$ 1,663,576	\$ 1,712,089	\$ 450,785	\$ 5,354,177
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ 153,849	\$ 578,795	\$ 595,812	\$ 124,781	\$ 1,453,237
3. Travel	\$ 176,000	\$ 186,000	\$ 162,000	\$ 106,000	\$ 630,000
4. Equipment	\$ 702,029	\$ 75,750	\$ 77,037	\$ -	\$ 854,816
5. Supplies	\$ 161,000	\$ 161,000	\$ 101,000	\$ 101,000	\$ 524,000
6. Contractual	\$ 33,202,509	\$ 35,507,303	\$ 32,514,303	\$ 33,114,980	\$ 134,339,095
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ 2,534,896	\$ 2,527,895	\$ 2,470,494	\$ 1,718,152	\$ 9,251,436
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 38,458,009	\$ 40,700,319	\$ 37,632,735	\$ 35,615,698	\$ 152,406,761
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 2,485,307	\$ 2,516,561	\$ 2,293,601	\$ 2,699,126	\$ 9,994,595
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ 16,449,840	\$ 19,664,222	\$ 21,710,705	\$ 30,670,322	\$ 88,495,090
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 57,393,156	\$ 62,881,103	\$ 61,637,041	\$ 68,985,146	\$ 250,896,446
14. Funding Subgranted to Participating LEAs (50% of Total Grant)	\$ 62,724,111	\$ 62,724,111	\$ 62,724,111	\$ 62,724,111	\$ 250,896,446
15. Total Budget (lines 13-14)	\$ 120,117,268	\$ 125,605,214	\$ 124,361,152	\$ 131,709,257	\$ 501,792,892
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

Overall Tennessee First to the Top Budget by Assurance and Type of Project

Project	Primary Assurance	STEM	Type	Recommended Budget	Year 1 Budget	Year 2 Budget	Year 3 Budget	Year 4 Budget
First to Top Oversight	A - State Success Factors		Implementation	\$ 2,362,605	\$ 6,750,000	\$ 9,900,000	\$ 13,500,000	\$ 22,500,000
Tennessee Department of Education Delivery Unit	A - State Success Factors		Implementation	\$ 538,000	\$ 8,954,762	\$ 9,498,554	\$ 11,119,446	\$ 19,596,108
Common Core Standards Professional Development	B - Standards		PD	\$ 1,614,000	\$ 9,275,394	\$ 6,603,000	\$ 6,638,541	\$ 3,870,748
Integrating Common Core Standards into Pre-Service	B - Standards		PD	\$ 1,350,000	\$ 5,084,698	\$ 7,228,006	\$ 7,157,787	\$ -
Integrating TVAAS into Pre-Service	D - Teachers and Leaders		Human Capital	\$ 1,350,000	\$ 375,000	\$ 375,000	\$ 375,000	\$ 375,000
Electronic Learning Center (ELC)	C - Data		PD	\$ 4,734,400	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000
Tennessee Consortium on Research, Evaluation, and Development (TNCRED)	C - Data		Research	\$ 3,240,000	\$ 2,152,000	\$ 2,152,000	\$ 2,152,000	\$ 2,152,000
State Longitudinal Data System	C - Data		Research	\$ 19,470,491	\$ 2,764,496	\$ 2,928,747	\$ 2,285,786	\$ 2,425,904
Integrating Data to Improve Instruction	C - Data		PD	\$ 26,387,683	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000
Data Dashboard	C - Data		PD	\$ 645,600	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000
School Leaders Supply and Demand Study	D - Teachers and Leaders		Research	\$ 172,800	\$ 161,400	\$ 161,400	\$ 161,400	\$ 161,400
U Teach Program Replication	D - Teachers and Leaders	STEM	Human Capital	\$ 4,104,000	\$ 883,600	\$ 688,208	\$ 492,954	\$ 297,843
Teacher Preparation Program Effectiveness Report Card	D - Teachers and Leaders		Human Capital	\$ 432,000	\$ 335,712	\$ 228,112	\$ 335,712	\$ 228,112
Teacher Working Conditions Survey	D - Teachers and Leaders		Human Capital	\$ 1,127,648	\$ -	\$ 1,350,000	\$ -	\$ -
SITES M	D - Teachers and Leaders	STEM	PD	\$ 8,608,000	\$ 810,084	\$ 810,084	\$ 810,084	\$ 810,084
Leadership Action Tank	D - Teachers and Leaders		PD	\$ 10,404,932	\$ 924,840	\$ 989,222	\$ 935,705	\$ 895,322
Innovation Acceleration Fund	D - Teachers and Leaders		Human Capital	\$ 12,000,000	\$ 1,188,000	\$ 972,000	\$ 972,000	\$ 972,000
Teach Tennessee	D - Teachers and Leaders	STEM	Human Capital	\$ 645,600	\$ -	\$ 1,350,000	\$ -	\$ -
Distinguished Professionals	D - Teachers and Leaders		Human Capital	\$ 400,000	\$ 161,400	\$ 161,400	\$ 161,400	\$ 161,400
Teacher and Principal Residencies	D - Teachers and Leaders		Human Capital	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 810,000	\$ 810,000	\$ 810,000	\$ 810,000
Teacher and Principal Evaluation Development	D - Teachers and Leaders		Human Capital	\$ 2,569,488	\$ 418,459	\$ 418,459	\$ 418,459	\$ 418,459
Focus Schools	E - Turnaround		Intervention	\$ 3,745,090	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000
Renewal Schools	E - Turnaround		Intervention	\$ 52,650,000	\$ 215,200	\$ 215,200	\$ 53,800	\$ 53,800
Achievement School District	E - Turnaround		Intervention/Human Capital	\$ 49,168,869	\$ 108,000	\$ 108,000	\$ 108,000	\$ 108,000
Competitive Supplemental Fund	D - Teachers and Leaders		Intervention	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 401,079	\$ 401,079	\$ 401,079	\$ 401,079
STEM Platform Schools	Competitive Priority	STEM	Intervention	\$ 9,000,000	\$ 1,620,000	\$ 1,620,000	\$ 1,620,000	\$ 1,620,000
Regional STEM Hubs	Competitive Priority	STEM	Implementation	\$ 5,380,000	\$ 1,183,600	\$ 1,183,600	\$ 1,183,600	\$ 1,183,600
STEM Innovation Network Infrastructure	Competitive Priority	STEM	Implementation	\$ 1,667,800	\$ 1,157,238	\$ 1,157,238	\$ 1,157,238	\$ 1,157,238
College Access Network	E - Turnaround		Intervention	\$ 3,240,336	\$ 108,000	\$ 21,600	\$ 21,600	\$ 21,600
Oak Ridge Associated Universities STEM Teacher Training Academy	D - Teachers and Leaders	STEM	PD	\$ 1,604,316	\$ 403,500	\$ 403,500	\$ 403,500	\$ 403,500
Rural Literacy Programs	D - Teachers and Leaders		PD	\$ 1,673,835	\$ 416,950	\$ 416,950	\$ 416,950	\$ 416,950
Integrating PBS into Electronic Learning Center	D - Teachers and Leaders		PD	\$ 4,628,952	\$ 1,284,744	\$ 1,284,744	\$ -	\$ -
STEM Professional Development	Competitive Priority	STEM	PD	\$ 6,480,000	\$ 1,345,000	\$ 1,345,000	\$ 1,345,000	\$ 1,345,000
Total Budget				\$ 501,792,892	\$ 114,786,313	\$ 125,762,205	\$ 123,274,082	\$ 137,970,292
State Innovation Fund Total				\$ 250,896,446	\$ 57,393,156	\$ 62,881,103	\$ 61,637,041	\$ 68,985,146
LEA Funding				\$ 250,896,446	\$ 62,724,111	\$ 62,724,111	\$ 62,724,111	\$ 62,724,111

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: First to Top Oversight					
Associated with Criteria: A(2)(i)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ 120,000	\$ 123,600	\$ 127,308	\$ 131,127	\$ 502,035
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ 33,600	\$ 34,608	\$ 35,646	\$ 36,716	\$ 140,570
3. Travel	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 200,000
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 80,000
6. Contractual	\$ 600,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 200,000	\$ -	\$ 1,200,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 240,000
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 883,600	\$ 688,208	\$ 492,954	\$ 297,843	\$ 2,362,605
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 883,600	\$ 688,208	\$ 492,954	\$ 297,843	\$ 2,362,605
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: First to the Top Oversight Team

Associated with Criteria: A(2)(i)

1) Personnel:

The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
First to the Top Team Leader - The First to the Top Team will be lead by a senior level executive with experience in education, management and state government who serves at the will of the governor.	100%	\$120,000	\$120,000

2) Fringe Benefits:

Fringe benefits are calculated at 28%.

3) Travel:

Twelve meetings per year at \$2,000 per meeting. Additional statewide travel for staff and out of state travel to relevant national conferences and meetings.

4) Equipment

5) Supplies:

Document production, general resource expenditures.

6) Contractual:

The First to the Top Implementation Oversight Team will include key members of the Race to the Top Leadership Team that developed the proposal. The Oversight Team will provide consistency from proposal to initial implementation as well as follow through during gubernatorial transition. Through the Governor’s Office of State Planning and Policy, the Oversight Team will contract with two full-time employees for the first two years of the grant to assist with start-up activities. The Office will also contract to provide oversight and management consulting services to both the Oversight Team and the Tennessee Department of Education.

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs:

The sum of all direct costs is \$2,362,605. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs:

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs:

Total Cost over 4 years:	\$2,362,605
---------------------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Tennessee Department of Education Delivery Unit					
Associated with Criteria: A(2)(i)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel					\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 300,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 200,000
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 200,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 500,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 15,200	\$ 15,200	\$ 3,800	\$ 3,800	\$ 38,000
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 215,200	\$ 215,200	\$ 53,800	\$ 53,800	\$ 538,000
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Tennessee Department of Education Delivery Unit
Associated with Criteria: Section A(2)(i)(c)

- 1) Personnel**
- 2) Fringe Benefits**
- 3) Travel**
- 4) Equipment**
- 5) Supplies**
- 6) Contractual:**

The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) will create a “Delivery Unit” and partner with an organization such as the U.S. Education Delivery Institute (USEDI) to increase departmental efficiency. The commissioner will implement a data-driven method for setting goals and trajectories for achieving them, metrics for measuring progress and regular reporting, and conducting ground-level assessments to inform the process. Tennessee will contract with such an organization for targeted assistance over a four-year period and participate in a cohort group of states pursuing this approach. In this way, the department will be supported in the transformation from compliance to capacity.

- 7) Training Stipends**
- 8) Other:**

The Delivery Unit work will take root faster — and spread farther — if the leaders involved regularly join together for dialogue, discussion, and support with other states implementing delivery units. It is anticipated that it will cost \$50,000 per year to participate in a network of states implementing delivery units (this includes activities such as 4 conferences per year for 7-8 staff members).

9) Total Direct Costs:

The sum of all direct costs is \$500,000 (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs:

TDOE’s indirect cost rate is 7.6%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$38,000.

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs:

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$538,000
---------------------	------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Common Core Standards Professional Development					
Associated with Criteria: A(1)(i); B(3)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 30,000	\$ 120,000
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 240,000
6. Contractual	\$ 285,000	\$ 285,000	\$ 285,000	\$ 285,000	\$ 1,140,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 375,000	\$ 375,000	\$ 375,000	\$ 375,000	\$ 1,500,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 28,500	\$ 28,500	\$ 28,500	\$ 28,500	\$ 114,000
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 403,500	\$ 403,500	\$ 403,500	\$ 403,500	\$ 1,614,000
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Common Core Standards Professional Development

Associated with Criteria: A(1)(i); B(3)

- 1) Personnel
- 2) Fringe Benefits
- 3) Travel:

Staff and Trainer Travel = \$50,000/Yr for 4 years	Total: \$120,000
--	------------------

- 4) Equipment
- 5) Supplies:

Estimated supplies for professional development based on previous training per year (Unpacking the Standards in training 10,000 – 15,000 educators per year) \$60,000 per yr for 4 years	Total: \$240,000
--	------------------

6) Contractual

The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) will contract to conduct a thorough rollout plan of in-person, online, and school-specific professional development. TDOE has specific goals, activities, and timeline for transition to the common core standards.

Contractual Costs based on experience of Unpacking the Standards (Tennessee Diploma Project) 10,000 – 15,000 total educators per year = \$285,000 per year for 4 years	Total: \$1,140,000
--	--------------------

- 7) Training Stipends
- 8) Other
- 9) Total Direct Costs:

The sum of all direct costs is \$1,500,000. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs:

TDOE's indirect cost rate is 7.6%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$114,000.

- 11) Funding for Involved LEAs
- 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs
- 13) Total Costs:

Total Cost over 4 years	\$1,614,000
--------------------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Integrating Common Core Standards into Preservice					
Associated with Criteria: B(3)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual		\$ 1,250,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,250,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ -	\$ 1,250,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,250,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ -	\$ 1,350,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,350,000
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Integrating Common Core Standards into Pre-Service
Associated with Criteria: B(3)

- 1) Personnel
- 2) Fringe Benefits
- 3) Travel
- 4) Equipment
- 5) Supplies
- 6) Contractual:

The Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) will contract to provide training on Common Core standards and assessments and the newly developed teacher evaluation and professional development cycle to faculty in teacher and school leader preparation programs. The estimated cost is \$5,000 per faculty member for 250 faculty members in Year 2 of the grant after the new evaluation system has been developed and Common Core standards are adopted.

- 7) Training Stipends
- 8) Other
- 9) Total Direct Costs

The sum of all direct costs is \$1,250,000. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs:

THEC's indirect cost rate is 8%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$100,000.

- 11) Funding for Involved LEAs
- 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs
- 13) Total Costs:

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$1,350,000
---------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Oak Ridge Associated Universities STEM Teacher Training Academy					
Associated with Criteria: D(5)(i); A(2)(i)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 372,750	\$ 372,750	\$ 372,750	\$ 372,750	\$ 1,491,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 372,750	\$ 372,750	\$ 372,750	\$ 372,750	\$ 1,491,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 28,329	\$ 28,329	\$ 28,329	\$ 28,329	\$ 113,316
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 401,079	\$ 401,079	\$ 401,079	\$ 401,079	\$ 1,604,316
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Oak Ridge Associated Universities STEM Teacher Training Academy

Associated with Criteria: D(5)(i); A(2)(i)

- 1) Personnel
- 2) Fringe Benefits
- 3) Travel
- 4) Equipment
- 5) Supplies
- 6) Contractual:

The Tennessee Department of Education will contract with Oak Ridge Associated Universities to provide training for teachers on STEM learning. The budgeted costs assume 150 Lead STEM Teachers from across the state (assumes multiple Lead teachers from large districts).

Fringe:

ORAU Staff Costs:

Salaries 2 senior STEM staff @ 525 hrs ea IT & Communications Support @ 450 hrs Program Specialist @ 900 hrs	\$100,598
Staff Benefits (Paid Leave and Fringe)	\$49,896

Travel:

Lead teacher travel costs to Oak Ridge: Center for Science Education Training (seven or eight week-long sessions, each lead teacher attends 1 session)

Lodging and Per Diem (\$136(90+46)/day *5 days*150 teachers)	\$102,000
Travel by Auto (avg. 400miles RT*\$0.55/mile*150teachers)	\$33,000

Other:

Other Lead Teacher Costs:

Travel Cost for State Science Teachers Assoc. Meeting	\$150,000
Teacher Stipend (\$5K each per yr)	\$750,000
Non-Capital Materials Provided to Lead STEM Teachers (\$500 each per yr)	\$75,000

Consultants	\$25,000
Staff Travel	\$20,000
Equipment	\$10,000
Materials & Supplies	\$5,000
Reproduction	\$5,000
Communications/ Webinars	\$10,000
Site Services	\$33,097
Office of Vice President for Science Education	\$16,712

7) Training Stipends

8) Other:

9) Total Direct Costs:

The sum of all direct costs is \$1,491,000. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs:

TDOE's indirect cost rate is 7.6%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$113,316.

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs:

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$1,604,316
---------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: SITES M					
Associated with Criteria: D(5)(i)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 8,000,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 8,000,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 152,000	\$ 152,000	\$ 152,000	\$ 152,000	\$ 608,000
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 2,152,000	\$ 2,152,000	\$ 2,152,000	\$ 2,152,000	\$ 8,608,000
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Strengthening Instruction in Tennessee Elementary Schools: Focus on Mathematics (SITES-M)

Associated with Criteria: D(5)(i)

- 1) Personnel
- 2) Fringe Benefits
- 3) Travel
- 4) Equipment
- 5) Supplies
- 6) Contractual:

The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) will expand its contract with SITES-M, a program that partners higher education institutions and elementary/middle schools to strengthen teaching and learning in mathematics, to continue their current work and double the size of their current network from five colleges and universities to ten. The cost per university is estimated to be \$200,000. Those universities would each work with five elementary schools and five middle schools.

- 7) Training Stipends
- 8) Other
- 9) Total Direct Costs:

The sum of all direct costs is \$8,000,000. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs:

TDOE’s indirect cost rate is 7.6%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$608,000.

- 11) Funding for Involved LEAs
- 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs
- 13) Total Costs:

Total Cost over 4 years:	\$8,608,000
---------------------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Integrating TVAAS into Pre-Service					
Associated with Criteria: B, D(2)(i)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ -	\$ 1,250,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,250,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ -	\$ 1,250,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,250,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ -	\$ 1,350,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,350,000
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE
Project Name: TVAAS Training Module for Pre-Service Curriculum
Associated with Criteria: B(3), D(2)(i)

- 1) Personnel
- 2) Fringe Benefits
- 3) Travel
- 4) Equipment
- 5) Supplies
- 6) Contractual:

The state will issue a request for proposals for a training module to be developed that can be disbursed to teacher preparation programs. The training module will focus on the use of TVAAS data in modifying and improving classroom instruction. This module will be an 8-hour component of a research methods course in all teacher preparation programs. The Tennessee Higher Education Commission will contract with teacher preparation programs to provide training to appropriate higher education faculty on the use of this training module, implementation into pre-service curriculum, and appropriate interventions based on the data. An estimate of \$5,000 per faculty member and 250 faculty members statewide was used for training and implementation costs for a total of \$1,250,000.

- 7) Training Stipends
- 8) Other
- 9) Total Direct Costs:

The sum of all direct costs is \$1,250,000. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs:

THEC's indirect cost rate is 8%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$100,000.

- 11) Funding for Involved LEAs
- 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs
- 13) Total Costs:

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Cost over 4 years	\$1,350,000
--------------------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Electronic Learning Center (ELC)					
Associated with Criteria: B(3), C(3)(ii), D(5)(i)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 4,400,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 4,400,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 83,600	\$ 83,600	\$ 83,600	\$ 83,600	\$ 334,400
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 1,183,600	\$ 1,183,600	\$ 1,183,600	\$ 1,183,600	\$ 4,734,400
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Electronic Learning Center
Associated with Criteria: B(3); C(3)(ii); D(5)(i)

- 1) Personnel**
- 2) Fringe Benefits**
- 3) Travel**
- 4) Equipment**
- 5) Supplies**
- 6) Contractual:**

The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) will contract to expand the Electronic Learning Center (ELC) to enhance professional development options by employing the service positions below. The contractual budget includes travel, supplies and general resources.

Positions:

- ELC Web designer (1)
- ELC Web Developer (1)
- ELC Data Manager (1)
- ELC Technology Support (1)
- Learning Management System Support/Maintenance Manager (1)
- Learning Management System Curriculum Developer (1)
- Learning Management System Curriculum Designer (1)
- Learning Management System Facilitator (3)
- Curriculum and Instruction Videographer (2)
- Curriculum and Instruction Podcast Lead (1)
- Curriculum and Instruction Podcast Developer (4)
- The estimated cost is \$4,400,000 over a four year period.

- 7) Training Stipends**
- 8) Other**
- 9) Total Direct Costs:**

The sum of all direct \$4,400,000. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs:

TDOE’s indirect cost rate is 7.6%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$334,400.

- 11) Funding for Involved LEAs**
- 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs**
- 13) Total Costs:**

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$4,734,400
---------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Tennessee Consortium on Research, Evaluation, and Development (TNCRED)					
Associated with Criteria: A(1)(ii), A(2)(i)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 3,000,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	\$ 3,000,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ 240,000
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 810,000	\$ 810,000	\$ 810,000	\$ 810,000	\$ 3,240,000
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Tennessee Consortium on Research, Evaluation and Development

Associated with Criteria: A(1)(ii); A(2)(i)

- 1) Personnel**
- 2) Fringe Benefits**
- 3) Travel**
- 4) Equipment**
- 5) Supplies**
- 6) Contractual:**

The Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) will contract with the Center for Business and Economic Research (CBER) at the University of Tennessee to coordinate a team of national and state measurement, research and evaluation experts. CBER will subcontract with researchers inside and outside of Tennessee to conduct evaluations of select interventions within the state’s Race to the Top proposal.

- 7) Training Stipends**
- 8) Other**
- 9) Total Direct Costs:**

The sum of all direct costs is \$3,000,000. (See chart above)

10) Indirect Costs:

THEC’s indirect cost rate is 8%. This will result in indirect costs of \$240,000.

- 11) Funding for Involved LEAs**
- 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs**
- 13) Total Costs:**

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$3,240,000
---------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: State Longitudinal Data System					
Associated with Criteria: A(1)(i); C(1); C(2)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ 1,111,250	\$ 1,236,000	\$ 1,273,080	\$ -	\$ 3,620,330
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ 38,675	\$ 460,513	\$ 474,328	\$ -	\$ 973,516
3. Travel	\$ 46,000	\$ 56,000	\$ 56,000	\$ -	\$ 158,000
4. Equipment	\$ 702,029	\$ 75,750	\$ 77,037	\$ -	\$ 854,816
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 2,430,000	\$ 4,650,000	\$ 4,525,000	\$ -	\$ 11,605,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ 756,744	\$ 749,743	\$ 752,342	\$ -	\$ 2,258,829
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 5,084,698	\$ 7,228,006	\$ 7,157,787	\$ -	\$ 19,470,491
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 5,084,698	\$ 7,228,006	\$ 7,157,787	\$ -	\$ 19,470,491
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Statewide Longitudinal Data System

Associated with Criteria: A(1)(i);C(1);C(2)

The written description of the SLDS budget that was submitted to the Department of Education for the SLDS grant application appears below, following this narrative.

- 1) Personnel
- 2) Fringe Benefits
- 3) Travel
- 4) Equipment
- 5) Supplies
- 6) Contractual
- 7) Training Stipends
- 8) Other
- 9) Total Direct Costs

The sum of all direct costs is \$19,470,491. (See chart above.)

- 10) Indirect Costs
- 11) Funding for Involved LEAs
- 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs
- 13) Total Costs:

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$19,470,491
---------------------	---------------------

The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) will contract with the Center for Business and Economic Research (CBER) to advance Tennessee’s existing statewide longitudinal data system. Please refer to the contractual budget below, submitted as part of Tennessee’s official application for one of the competitive Statewide Longitudinal Data System Recovery Act Grant.

7. Budget Narrative and Justification

7(a) Budget Narrative by Year

7(a)(i) Outcome Goals – Year 1

System Architecture Products and Features – Much of Year 1 will be directed toward this outcome. The security plans will be planned and documented. Hardware will be determined and much of it purchased and implemented. The functional requirements for TLDS will be defined to a greater level of detail. Data taxonomies and structures will be planned and databases will be

developed for existing data sources. Evaluation needs will be documented and some tools or techniques researched. Audit features will be discussed and a preliminary plan will be documented. Data integrity issues will be discussed for known data sources and options for verifying data integrity will be developed.

Data Integration Products and Features – Potential data sources will be developed and considered for inclusion in the TLDS design. Some “phase 1” effort will be started in the first year with most of the effort directed at existing LDS data sources from within the DOE, CBER and SAS sources. Types and categories of data to be included will be documented along with source options. A temporary unique identifier will be determined and used with early database implementations.

Reporting and Research – Existing reporting and research capabilities from CBER and SAS will be evaluated to determine their applicability to P-20 types of reporting and research options. Requirements for future P-20 reporting and research options will be developed and potential tools listed that can help deliver the services and features required for reporting and research.

Budget by Object Class – Year 1

Object Class	Year 1	Justification	Comments/Issues
Personnel	\$1,111,250	DOE Project Director – 1 FTE DOE Oracle Expert – 2 FTE, DOE Research Analyst – 2 FTE, DOE Admin Support – 1 FTE, GOCC Policy Analyst – 1 FTE, CBER Project Director – 1 FTE, CBER Architecture Manager – 1 FTE, CBER Database Manager – 1 FTE, CBER Faculty – 1 FTE CBER Staff – 1 FTE College of Business Staff – 1 FTE OIT Staff – 1.5 FTE	Salary estimate averages are: DOE PD - \$100k, DOE Oracle - \$75k DOE RA - \$55k, GOCC PA - \$100k, CBER PD - \$150k, CBER AM – \$125k, CBER DBM – \$90k, CBER Fac. - \$100k, CBER staff - \$75k, COB Staff – 75,000, OIT staff - \$80,000
Fringe Benefits	\$385,675	Based on 50% benefits for DOE and GOCCC and 28% for benefits for UT	
Travel	\$46,000	Based on 2 trips per month at \$250 per trip between Knoxville and Nashville plus 8 training trips at \$5000 each	
Equipment	\$450,000	Eight servers, about 100TB storage, 2 firewalls, and 50 tapes at UT 4 servers and 100GB storage at State	Both development and production
Contractual	\$2,430,000	Subcontractor (8 FTE for 6 months), SRE license, Oracle support, and SAS support for TVAAS for six months	Subcontractor at \$125 per hour, SRE estimated at \$530k,

			Oracle estimated at \$525k, SAS - \$750k per year
Other	\$756,744	Agency Support, 8% F&A for CBER plus a third of MPI development project	Agency Support - \$75k
TOTAL	\$5,179,669		

Budget by Outcome – Year 1

Outcome	Year 1	Justification
System Architecture Product and Features	\$1,855,101	Hardware plus 30% of personnel, benefits, contractual and other
Data Integration Products and Features	\$1,653,468	40% of personnel, benefits, and other, 50% of travel, and 30% of contractual
Research and Reporting	\$1,671,101	30% of personnel, benefits, and other, 50% of travel, and 40% of contractual
TOTAL	\$5,179,669	

7(a)(iii) Outcome Goals – Year 2

System Architecture Products and Features – Security plans will be implemented and evaluated. Adjustments will be made as needed, but the process to get access approvals will be set and followed. Hardware will be planned and acquired for agencies as needed. The functional requirements for TLDS will be reviewed and refined as new requirements are discovered. Data taxonomies and structures will be verified and databases will be developed for new agency data sources. Evaluation needs will be implemented and feedback started. Audit features will be finalized and implemented. Data integrity processes will be followed will be refined for each data source.

Data Integration Products and Features – The Master Person Index (MPI) feature will be developed and implemented. Existing databases will be retrofitted with the MPI. Data sources will continue to be developed and considered for inclusion in the TLDS design. Integration processes for “phase 1” data sources will be completed. Attention will be given to “phase 2 & 3” data sources depending on the respective agency’s ability to participate.

Reporting and Research – Additional plans for reporting and research will be implemented to support the extended needs for P-20 deliverables. The Business Intelligence interface will be implemented to support expanded reporting and research requirements. A web portal will provide access needed for DOE defined data needs, other agency defined data needs, and public data needs. A solution for research support will be developed and made available as authorized. Some standard research reports and policy analyses will be made available to approved people.

Budget by Object Class – Year 2

Object Class	Year 2	Justification	Comments/Issues
Personnel	\$1,236,000	DOE Project Director – 1 FTE DOE Oracle Expert – 2 FTE, DOE Research Analyst – 2 FTE, DOE Admin Support – 1 FTE, GOCC Policy Analyst – 1 FTE, CBER Project Director – 1 FTE, CBER Architecture Manager – 1 FTE, CBER Database Manager – 1 FTE, CBER Faculty – 1 FTE CBER Staff – 1 FTE College of Business Staff – 1 FTE OIT Staff – 1. FTE	
Fringe Benefits	\$460,513	Based on 50% benefits for DOE and GOCC and 28% for benefits for UT	
Travel	\$56,000	Based on 2 trips per month at \$250 per trip between Knoxville and Nashville plus 10 training trips at \$5000 each	
Equipment	\$100,000	4 servers and 100 GB storage at state	
Contractual	\$4,650,000	Subcontractor - 10 FTE, Documentation and Training – 3 FTE (for six months), SRE license, Oracle support, and SAS support for TVAAS	Documentation and Training - \$75 per hour
Other	\$749,743	8% F&A for CBER plus a third of MPI development project	
TOTAL	\$7,252,256		

Budget by Outcome – Year 2

Outcome	Year 2	Justification
System Architecture Product and Features	\$809,626	Hardware plus 10% of personnel, benefits, contractual, and other
Data Integration Products and Features	\$3,576,128	50% of personnel, benefits, travel, contractual, and other
Research and Reporting	\$2,866,502	40% of personnel, benefits, contractual, and other plus 50% of travel
TOTAL	\$7,252,256	

7(a)(v) Outcome Goals – Year 3

System Architecture Products and Features – System architecture products and features will continue to be reviewed and improved as needed including security processes. Hardware will be planned and acquired for new agencies as needed. Data taxonomies and structures will be applied to the new agency data sources. Evaluation and audit efforts will be review and the process refined as needed. Data integrity processes will be followed will be refined for each data source.

Data Integration Products and Features – The Master Person Index (MPI) feature will be reviewed and refined as needed to support existing and new data sources. Data sources will continue to be developed and considered for inclusion in the TLDS design as new agencies join the project.

Reporting and Research – Reporting and Research options will continue to be reviewed and improved. New options will be added. The Business Intelligence interface will be expanded to incorporate new features. The web portal will also be enhanced to improve access as needed for DOE defined data needs, other agency defined data needs, and public data needs. The solution for research support will be reviewed and enhanced as new requirements are formed. Standard research reports and policy analysis will be expanded as new features are added.

Budget by Object Class – Year 3

Object Class	Year 3	Justification	Comments/Issues
Personnel	\$1,273,080	DOE Project Director – 1 FTE DOE Oracle Expert – 2 FTE, DOE Research Analyst – 2 FTE, DOE Admin Support – 1 FTE, GOCC Policy Analyst – 1 FTE, CBER Project Director – 1 FTE, CBER Architecture Manager – 1 FTE, CBER Database Manager – 1 FTE, CBER Faculty – 1 FTE CBER Staff – 1 FTE College of Business Staff – 1 FTE OIT Staff – 1 FTE	
Fringe Benefits	\$474,328	Based on 50% benefits for DOE and GOCC and 28% for benefits for UT	
Travel	\$56,000	Based on 2 trips per month at \$250 per trip between Knoxville and Nashville plus 10 training trips at \$5000 each	
Equipment	\$100,000	4 servers and 100 GB storage at state	
Contractual	\$4,525,000	Subcontractor - 10 FTE, Documentation and Training – 3 FTE, SRE license, Oracle support, and SAS support for TVAAS	

Other	\$752,342	8% F&A for CBER plus a third of MPI development project	
TOTAL	\$7,180,750		

Budget by Outcome – Year 3

Outcome	Year 3	Justification
System Architecture Product and Features	\$451,238	Hardware plus 5% of personnel, benefits, contractual, and other
Data Integration Products and Features	\$2,837,900	40% of personnel, benefits, contractual, and other plus 50% of travel
Research and Reporting	\$3,891,613	55% of personnel, benefits, contractual, and other plus 50% of travel
TOTAL	\$7,180,750	

7(b) Budget Narrative by Contract and Year

7(b)(i) Projected CBER/UT Contract Costs by Object Class and Year

The College of Business Economic Research (CBER) group is a well respected set of faculty and staff from the University of Tennessee that has experience with research with the Department of Education and others. CBER has some existing research databases that can be leveraged to get a quick start on P-20 outcomes and have the ability to expand their role to meet the needs of P-20.

CBER has research expertise and some technical expertise that will assist the project during start-up, but additional expertise will need to be brought into the project. Additional database experts will be needed to design new databases and to review and prepare data to be loaded into the databases. Business Intelligence expertise will be needed to design and build the various access paths and tools to use the data effectively.

CBER will coordinate the P-20 project in concert with the Tennessee state Department of Education. CBER will establish a set of databases that will collect data from the state agencies and develop protocols to allow access to the data for research and related purposes. CBER will accomplish this effort in conjunction with the Tennessee state Department of Education and other state agencies through CBER resources, other University of Tennessee resources, and other contract resources.

CBER Budget – Year 1

Object Class	Year 1	Justification	Comments/Issues
Personnel	\$772,500	CBER Project Director – 1 FTE,	Salary estimate

		CBER Architecture Manager – 1 FTE, CBER Database Manager – 1 FTE, CBER Faculty – 1 FTE CBER Staff – 1 FTE College of Business Staff – 1 FTE OIT Staff – 1.5 FTE	averages are: CBER PD - \$150k, CBER AM – \$125k, CBER DBM – \$90k, CBER Fac. - \$100k, CBER staff - \$75k, COB Staff – \$75k, OIT staff - \$80k
Fringe Benefits	\$216,300	Based on an estimated average of 28% for benefits	
Travel	\$33,000	Based on 1 trip per month at \$250 per trip between Knoxville and Nashville plus 6 training trips at \$5000 each	
Equipment	\$350,000	Eight servers, about 100TB storage, 2 firewalls, and 50 tapes at UT	
Other	\$81,744	8% F&A for CBER	
TOTAL	\$1,453,544		

CBER Budget – Year 2

Object Class	Year 2	Justification	Comments/Issues
Personnel	\$715,850	CBER Project Director – 1 FTE, CBER Architecture Manager – 1 FTE, CBER Database Manager – 1 FTE, CBER Faculty – 1 FTE CBER Staff – 1 FTE College of Business Staff – 1 FTE OIT Staff – 1 FTE	
Fringe Benefits	\$200,438		
Travel	\$18,000	Based on 1 trip per month at \$250 per trip between Knoxville and Nashville plus 3 training trips at \$5000 each	
Equipment			
Other	\$74,743	8% F&A for CBER	
TOTAL	\$1,009,031		

CBER Budget – Year 3

Object Class	Year 3	Justification	Comments/Issues
Personnel	\$737,326	CBER Project Director – 1 FTE,	

		CBER Architecture Manager – 1 FTE, CBER Database Manager – 1 FTE, CBER Faculty – 1 FTE CBER Staff – 1 FTE College of Business Staff – 1 FTE OIT Staff – 1 FTE	
Fringe Benefits	\$206,451		
Travel	\$23,000	Based on 1 trip per month at \$250 per trip between Knoxville and Nashville plus 4 training trips at \$5000 each	
Equipment			
Other	\$77,342	8% F&A for CBER	
TOTAL	\$1,044,119		

7(b)(ii) Projected Data Architecture Subcontractor Costs by Object Class and Year

CBER will contract with one or more technical services organization to provide database and security expertise including data analysis and acquisition, database design, database implementation, and data access protocols in a secure manner at the direction of the CBER technical director. The subcontracting personnel will work with CBER staff, other university staff, and state agency staff as needed to accomplish their objectives.

Data Architect Budget – Year 1

Object Class	Year 1	Justification	Comments/Issues
Personnel	\$875,000	Database and Security Contractor – 7 FTE for 6 months	Salary estimate averages are: Database Contractor - \$125 per hour
Fringe Benefits			
Travel			
Equipment			
Other			
TOTAL	\$875,000		

Data Architect Budget – Year 2

Object Class	Year 2	Justification	Comments/Issues
Personnel	\$2,000,000	Database and Security Contractor – 8 FTE	

Fringe Benefits			
Travel			
Equipment			
Other			
TOTAL	\$2,000,000		

Data Architect Budget – Year 3

Object Class	Year 3	Justification	Comments/Issues
Personnel	\$2,000,000	Database and Security Contractor – 8 FTE	
Fringe Benefits			
Travel			
Equipment			
Other			
TOTAL	\$2,000,000		

7(b)(iii) Projected Business Intelligence Subcontractor Costs by Object Class and Year

CBER will contract with one or more technical services organization to provide Business Intelligence (BI) expertise including secure data access to P-20 data and data analysis assistance protocols at the direction of the CBER technical director. The subcontracting personnel will work with CBER staff, other university staff, and state agency staff as needed to accomplish their objectives.

Business Intelligence Budget – Year 1

Object Class	Year 1	Justification	Comments/Issues
Personnel	\$325,000	BI Software Expert – 1FTE for six months BI Contractor – 1 FTE for six months	Salary estimate averages are: BI Software Expert - \$200 per hour BI Contractor - \$125 per hour
Fringe Benefits			
Travel			
Equipment			
Other	\$150,000	Software Licenses – six months	
TOTAL	\$625,000		

Business Intelligence Budget – Year 2

Object Class	Year 2	Justification	Comments/Issues
Personnel	\$700,000	BI Software Expert – 1 FTE BI Contractor – 2 FTE	
Fringe Benefits			
Travel			
Equipment			
Other	\$300,000	Software Licenses	
TOTAL	\$1,000,000		

Business Intelligence Budget – Year 3

Object Class	Year 3	Justification	Comments/Issues
Personnel	\$700,000	BI Software Expert – 1 FTE BI Contractor – 2 FTE	
Fringe Benefits			
Travel			
Equipment			
Other	\$300,000	Software Licenses	
TOTAL	\$1,000,000		

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Integrating Data to Improve Instruction					
Associated with Criteria: A2(i), B(3), D(2)(i), D(2)(iv)(a), D(3)(i)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 8,620,255	\$ 6,136,617	\$ 6,169,648	\$ 3,597,349	\$ 24,523,869
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 8,620,255	\$ 6,136,617	\$ 6,169,648	\$ 3,597,349	\$ 24,523,869
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 655,139	\$ 466,383	\$ 468,893	\$ 273,399	\$ 1,863,814
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 9,275,394	\$ 6,603,000	\$ 6,638,541	\$ 3,870,748	\$ 26,387,683
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Integrating Data to Improve Instruction

Associated with Criteria: A(2)(i); B(3); D(2)(i); D(2)(iv)(a); D(3)(i)

- 1) Personnel
- 2) Fringe Benefits
- 3) Travel
- 4) Equipment
- 5) Supplies
- 6) Contractual:

The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) will contract with an external nonprofit training partner to deliver statewide supports around the use of data to inform instruction. Staff from the external organization will be responsible for coordination, oversight, creative solutions, and fiscal management. Specifically, the nonprofit training partner will collaborate with SAS to deliver statewide supports in the following areas:

- Building the capacity of teachers and school leaders in the area of balanced assessment
- Enhancing educators’ capacity to maximize the robust value-added information at their disposal
- Ensuring quality, transparency, and utility in data systems
- Providing research and innovation expertise in identifying the impact of specific interventions and determine potential for replication statewide
- Supporting districts as they research, develop, implement, and enhance systems of differentiated compensation
- Supporting educators in the Coalition of Large School Systems (CLASS) districts that comprise 34% of the students in our state
- Supporting a select number of schools in the Rural School Improvement Collaborative
- Supporting TDOE in developing long-term capacity to deliver the innovative outcomes outlined in the Race to the Top proposal

Contractual Cost Description	Contractual Cost Assumption	Total
(1)Contracted Personnel	Salary of all covered positions for 4 years; positions include Engagement Manager, Project Manager, Project Coordinator, Communications Lead, Graphics Design Lead, Administrative Assistant, Professional Development Lead, Qualitative Research Lead, Data Quality Lead, Innovative Data Solutions Lead, Differentiated Compensation Lead	\$5,051,633
(2)Contracted Fringe	Fringe benefits for all positions for 4 years for	\$2,164,985

Benefits	all contracted personnel	
(3)Travel	Flights, accommodations, rental cars, meals, and mileage for 4 years; Travel costs incurred to train personnel in data literacy/use, formative assessment, and differentiated compensation; provide Learning Map work; provide Highly Effective Teacher and Principal work; provide direct coaching by Exemplary Educators	\$563,868
(4)Equipment	One laptop for 11 Exemplary Educators; technology storage and capacity required to deliver outcomes	\$304,340
(5)Supplies / Materials	Costs of all materials for all trainings as well as customized Value-Added Toolkits for each building in Tennessee.	\$914,939
(6)Contracted Total (sum of 1-5, 7,8)	Total cost of all services provided to Tennessee over 4 years.	
(7)Training Stipends	Paid time for Exemplary Educators (20 days x 8 hours per day); Covers Exemplary Educators for 11 schools in Year 1	\$70,400
(8) Contracted Other	Purchase of perpetual, state-wide license to access Formative Assessment Courses, Online Value-Added courses, Differentiated Compensation courses, and other products; Four-Year fee for Learning Management System for all the above.	\$11,481,500
	Direct on-site professional development provided to Centers of Excellence personnel and Exemplary Educators; Direct support to Tennessee educators to develop and deliver Rural and Urban context Learning Map activities; Creation of reports to align with prescribed research	\$1,643,382
	Funds to provide highly trained Exemplary Educators to 11 identified schools	\$1,006,720
	Event, meeting, and overall delivery expenses such as facilities, office, food, etc. other than training materials	\$1,322,102
	Tennessee communications portal and all associated communications collateral to deliver all items in scope of work. Online educator forum will be included in the Tennessee portal.	Included

	Ongoing enhancement to Tennessee portal as required.	
--	--	--

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs:

The sum of all direct costs is \$24,523,869. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs

TDOE's indirect cost rate is 7.6%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$1,813,814.

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs:

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$26,387,683
---------------------	---------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Data Dashboard					
Associated with Criteria: A(2)(i),B(3), C(2), D(2)(iii), D(2)(iv)(a),D(3)(i)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 600,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 600,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 11,400	\$ 11,400	\$ 11,400	\$ 11,400	\$ 45,600
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 161,400	\$ 161,400	\$ 161,400	\$ 161,400	\$ 645,600
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Data Dashboard

Associated with Criteria: A(2)(i), B(3), C(2), D(2)(iii), D(2)(iv)(a), D(3)(i)

- 1) Personnel**
- 2) Fringe Benefits**
- 3) Travel**
- 4) Equipment**
- 5) Supplies**
- 6) Contractual:**

The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) has a current contract with SAS that will be expanded to provide a new data dashboard. SAS will provide support for districts through the newly developed data dashboard. The purpose of the data dashboard is to empower parents, students, educators, agency staff, researchers, business, and community users by providing easy access to detailed education statistics and data.

SAS will provide online dashboard training for teachers, school leaders and TDOE personnel. The estimated cost is \$600,000 over a four year period.

- 7) Training Stipends**
- 8) Other**
- 9) Total Direct Costs:**

The sum of all direct costs is \$600,000. (See chart above)

10) Indirect Costs:

TDOE’s indirect cost rate is 7.6%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$45,600.

- 11) Funding for Involved LEAs**
- 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs**
- 13) Total Costs:**

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$645,600
---------------------	------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: School Leaders Supply and Demand Study					
Associated with Criteria: D(1)(i)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 100,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 160,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 100,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 160,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 8,000	\$ 1,600	\$ 1,600	\$ 1,600	\$ 12,800
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 108,000	\$ 21,600	\$ 21,600	\$ 21,600	\$ 172,800
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: School Leaders Supply/ Demand Study

Associated with Criteria: D(1)(i)

- 1) **Personnel**
- 2) **Fringe Benefits**
- 3) **Travel**
- 4) **Equipment**
- 5) **Supplies**
- 6) **Contractual:**

The Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) and the State Board of Education will construct a School Leader Supply/Demand Study to complement the Teacher Supply/Demand Study. THEC will contract with the UT Center for Business and Economic Research (CBER), the research entity that developed the Teacher Supply/Demand Study, to construct a comparable School Leader Supply/Demand Study. This tool will be critically important to Tennessee K-12 and higher education graduate programs in gauging the needs of school leaders. Part of the contractual obligation for CBER will be distribution of data to LEAs, higher education, and state K-12 agencies. CBER will update the study annually.

- 7) **Training Stipends**
- 8) **Other**
- 9) **Total Direct Costs**

The sum of all direct costs is \$160,000. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs:

The indirect cost rate is 8%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$12,800.

- 11) **Funding for Involved LEAs**
- 12) **Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs**
- 13) **Total Costs:**

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$172,800
---------------------	------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: U Teach Program Replication					
Associated with Criteria: D(3)(ii), Priority 2					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 3,800,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 900,000	\$ 3,800,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 88,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 72,000	\$ 304,000
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 1,188,000	\$ 972,000	\$ 972,000	\$ 972,000	\$ 4,104,000
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: UTeach Replication

Associated with Criteria: D(3)(i), Priority 2

- 1) Personnel**
- 2) Fringe Benefits**
- 3) Travel**
- 4) Equipment**
- 5) Supplies**
- 6) Contractual:**

The Tennessee Higher Education Commission (THEC) and the Tennessee Department of Education have collaborated to establish two UTeach replication sites based on the nationally recognized program from the University of Texas, Austin. Through the RFP and selection process, four institutions were identified as prepared to replicate the UTeach model, which focuses on pre-service training and enhancing teacher effectiveness. The UTeach model is based on a four-year roll-out with the first year of awards being a planning year. Due to the UTeach process already being underway in Tennessee, the planning year and Year 1 have been combined in this grant application. The UTeach grants would be awarded to the University of Memphis and the University of Tennessee, Chattanooga. The institutions would receive the following amounts:

Year 1: \$550,000 each for a total of \$1,100,000

Year 2-4: \$450,000 each for a total of \$900,000

Four Year Total: \$3,800,000

- 7) Training Stipends**
- 8) Other**
- 9) Total Direct Costs**

The sum of all direct costs is \$3,800,000. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs:

THEC's indirect cost rate is 8%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$304,000.

- 11) Funding for Involved LEAs**
- 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs**
- 13) Total Costs:**

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$4,104,000
---------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Teacher Preparation Program Effectiveness Report Card					
Associated with Criteria: D(1)(i)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 400,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 400,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 8,000	\$ 8,000	\$ 8,000	\$ 8,000	\$ 32,000
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 108,000	\$ 108,000	\$ 108,000	\$ 108,000	\$ 432,000
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE
Project Name: Teacher Preparation Program Effectiveness Report Card
Associated with Criteria: D(1)(i)

1) Personnel:

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
The Research Director at Tennessee Higher Education Commission will coordinate data collection, perform analysis and report data.	100%	\$70,000	\$70,000

2) Fringe Benefits:

Fringe benefits are calculated at 28% and equal \$19,600 annually.

- 3) Travel**
- 4) Equipment**
- 5) Supplies**
- 6) Contractual**
- 7) Training Stipends**
- 8) Other**
- 9) Total Direct Costs:**

The sum of all direct cost is \$400,000 (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs:

The Tennessee Higher Education Commission's indirect cost rate is 8%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$32,000.

- 11) Funding for Involved LEAs**
- 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs**
- 13) Total Costs:**

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$432,000
---------------------	------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Teacher Working Conditions Survey					
Associated with Criteria: D(3)(i)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 300,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 1,000,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 48,000
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 312,000	\$ 212,000	\$ 312,000	\$ 212,000	\$ 1,048,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 23,712	\$ 16,112	\$ 23,712	\$ 16,112	\$ 79,648
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 335,712	\$ 228,112	\$ 335,712	\$ 228,112	\$ 1,127,648
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Teacher Working Conditions Survey

Associated with Criteria: D(3)(i)

- 1) **Personnel**
- 2) **Fringe Benefits**
- 3) **Travel**
- 4) **Equipment**
- 5) **Supplies**
- 6) **Contractual:**

The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) will contract to conduct a Teacher Working Conditions Survey Statewide. The contract will pay for survey design and customization, online survey delivery and data warehousing, data analysis and reporting, which is estimated at \$300,000 in Year One and Year Three. TDOE will also contract for report delivery, data training, technical assistance to schools and school leaders to utilize the data, estimated at \$200,000 in Year Two and Year Four.

- 7) **Training Stipends**
- 8) **Other:**

NCLB Consolidated Administration Funds will be used to provide salaries for the Executive Director, support staff, and other professional staff used to support the administration of the project (data collection and analysis, fiscal management, etc.)

State funds through Title IIA of NCLB will be used to support the Electronic Learning Center in disseminating the Teacher Working Conditions surveys and results.

9) Total Direct Costs

The sum of all direct costs is \$1,048,000. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs:

TDOE's indirect cost rate is 7.6%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$79,648.

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs:

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$1,127,648
---------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Leadership Action Tank					
Associated with Criteria: D(5)(i)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 2,569,234	\$ 2,721,883	\$ 2,124,336	\$ 2,254,558	\$ 9,670,011
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 2,569,234	\$ 2,721,883	\$ 2,124,336	\$ 2,254,558	\$ 9,670,011
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 195,262	\$ 206,863	\$ 161,450	\$ 171,346	\$ 734,921
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 2,764,496	\$ 2,928,747	\$ 2,285,786	\$ 2,425,904	\$ 10,404,932
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Leadership Action Tank

Associated with Criteria: D(5)(i)

- 1) **Personnel**
- 2) **Fringe Benefits**
- 3) **Travel**
- 4) **Equipment**
- 5) **Supplies**
- 6) **Contractual:**

The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) will contract with an external organization to provide a Leadership Action Tank. The Leadership Action Tank will serve as a principal effectiveness laboratory that will capture the evidence of practices demonstrated to improve student achievement through TVAAS and other factors. The Leadership Action Tank will focus on high-poverty, high-performing schools statewide.

Leadership Action Tank staff will be responsible for implementing learning processes, in particular coaching practice and local residency experience. The staff will also be responsible for refining tools to gather feedback from principals, as well as developing a platform to share actionable knowledge and ongoing lessons from the Action Tank, particularly in rural schools.

Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as contracted employees of the project.	Total
Senior Manager of Action Tank, Director of Knowledge Capture, Research Analyst, Policy Writer	\$584,830
Fringe Benefits	\$266,660

Trip Description	Basis of Cost Estimate	Total
Breakthrough school visit mileage reimbursement	5,000 miles/year at reimbursement of \$.55; \$2,750 per year	\$11,000 over 4 years
Breakthrough school visit overnight stay	10 nights; 20 days \$125/nightly hotel rate; 50\$ per diem; 2 people; \$3,250 per	\$13,000 over 4 years

	year	
National advisors trip to support work in Tennessee	\$500 airline ticket; \$125/nightly hotel rate; \$50 per diem; \$60/day for rental car; 3 nights, 4 days; 3 people, 4 trips per yer	\$67,750 over 4 years
Training for Action Tank Directors of Knowledge Capture	4 days; 3 nights, NYC; \$250/nightly hotel rate; \$500 hotel; \$50 per diem; 2 trips per year; 3 team members	\$37,366
TOTAL		\$129,116

Equipment	Cost of Item	Item Description (components)	Total
Equipment Description: Nine laptop computers new employees.	\$1,500	Laptop computer	\$13,500

Contractual			
TDOE plans to hire consultants with content expertise to provide direct service to schools (e.g., school culture experts, reading specialists) or professional development to principal coaches in content areas (e.g., development of leadership teams, data-driven instruction).			
Service Type	Purpose /relation to project	Basis of cost estimate	Cost
Consultants:		\$100 - \$125/ hour Up to 300 hours of consulting services; hourly rate estimated to grow 5% per year	FY11: \$30,000 FY12: \$31,500 FY13: \$33,075 FY14: \$34,729 TOTAL: \$129,304

Other		
Purpose	Basis for cost estimate (eg. price per item based on previous experience and estimates provided to TDOE)	Cost
Recruit, select and train turnaround leaders	FY11: \$377,839 FY12: \$439,149 FY13: \$467,532 FY14: \$497,335	\$1,781,855
Train and develop curriculum for turnaround leaders	FY11: \$645,475 FY12: \$750,212 FY13: \$798,700 FY14: \$849,613	\$3,044,001
Coaching for 1 st year principal support	FY11: \$362,096 FY12: \$420,851 FY13: \$448,051 FY14: \$476,612	\$1,707,610
Coaching for 2 nd year and beyond	FY11: \$188,920 FY12: \$219,574 FY13: \$233,766 FY14: \$248,667	\$890,927
Expand EPIC data capture practices (case studies)	FY11: \$803,250 FY12: \$626,063	\$1,429,313
Develop strategy and build out IT system to capture and integrate data streams from new learning processes	FY11: \$83,333 FY12: \$68,250 FY13: \$11,375 FY14: \$11,375	\$174,333
		\$9,028,039

Indirect Cost

Indirect costs include the cost of organization-wide functions, such as Finance, Information Technology, and Human Resources, required to conduct business.

Item Type / Category	What does it include	Basis for cost estimate (eg. price per item)	Cost
Indirect		20% of direct costs. Based on experience of similar national program	\$259,548

7) Training Stipends**8) Other****9) Total Direct Costs**

The sum of all direct costs is \$9,670,011. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs

TDOE's indirect cost rate is 7.6%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$734,921.

11) Funding for Involved LEAs**12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs****13) Total Costs:**

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$10,404,932
---------------------	---------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Innovation Acceleration Fund					
Associated with Criteria: D(2)(iv)(b)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 12,000,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 12,000,000
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Innovation Acceleration Fund

Associated with Criteria: D(2)(iv)(b)

- 1) Personnel
- 2) Fringe Benefits
- 3) Travel
- 4) Equipment
- 5) Supplies
- 6) Contractual
- 7) Training Stipends
- 8) Other
- 9) Total Direct Costs
- 10) Indirect Costs
- 11) Funding for Involved LEAs
- 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs:

The Tennessee Department of Education will conduct a grant competition for funding to allow districts to develop transition plans for or to fund differentiated compensation plans. It is anticipated that there would be grants for three to five districts per year. In order to be successful, districts would have to demonstrate that the differentiated compensation plan would be fully funded through district resources after the period of the grant.

13) Total Costs:

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$ 12,000,000
---------------------	----------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Teach Tennessee Expansion					
Associated with Criteria: A(3)(i), D(3)(ii), Priority 2					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 600,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 600,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 11,400	\$ 11,400	\$ 11,400	\$ 11,400	\$ 45,600
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 161,400	\$ 161,400	\$ 161,400	\$ 161,400	\$ 645,600
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Teach Tennessee Expansion

Associated with Criteria: A(3)(i), D(3)(ii), Priority 2

- 1) Personnel
- 2) Fringe Benefits
- 3) Travel
- 4) Equipment
- 5) Supplies
- 6) Contractual:

The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) will contract to expand the Teach Tennessee program by providing training for an additional 35 teachers per year for each of the four years of the Race to the Top. The cost is \$4,286 per teacher. The teachers will be paid using state funds.

- 7) Training Stipends
- 8) Other
- 9) Total Direct Costs:

The sum of all direct costs is \$600,000. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs

TDOE’s indirect cost rate is 7.6%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$45,600.

- 11) Funding for Involved LEAs
- 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs
- 13) Total Costs:

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$645,600
---------------------	------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Distinguished Professionals					
Associated with Criteria: D(3)(ii)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 400,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 400,000
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Distinguished Professionals

Associated with Criteria: D(3)(ii)

- 1) Personnel**
- 2) Fringe Benefits**
- 3) Travel**
- 4) Equipment**
- 5) Supplies**
- 6) Contractual**
- 7) Training Stipends**
- 8) Other**
- 9) Total Direct Costs**
- 10) Indirect Costs**
- 11) Funding for Involved LEAs**
- 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs:**

Based on the proven success in Knox County Schools and interest expressed by several other urban districts, the Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) will conduct a competitive grant program to expand the Distinguished Professionals program. The Distinguished Professionals program recruits highly qualified professionals in math, science, and foreign language to teach courses as “adjunct” high school teachers. The Distinguished Professionals program will be expanded to at least three of the large school districts identified below over a four year period with an estimated cost of \$400,000:

- Metro Nashville
- Hamilton County
- Johnson City /Kingsport
- Memphis
- Clarksville-Montgomery County

Realizing the critical need for course matter experts in districts beyond the urban boundaries, TDOE and the Distinguished Professionals program will also seek to identify and partner with at least one interested rural school district.

Funds will allow TDOE and the Distinguished Professionals program to:

1. Hire and train between 50 and 75 technical professionals to teach courses that the schools are unable to staff with properly certified full time educators.
2. Offer approximately 100 critical high school courses that ,without the Distinguished Professionals program either would not be offered or would not be taught by properly certified teachers.

At the end of four years, the Distinguished Professionals programs will be financially self-supporting in the school systems that are chosen to participate.

13) Total Costs:

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$400,000
---------------------	------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Teacher and Principal Residencies					
Associated with Criteria: D(1)(i)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 8,000,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 8,000,000
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Teacher & Principal Residency Program

Associated with Criteria: D(1)(i)

- 1) Personnel
- 2) Fringe Benefits
- 3) Travel
- 4) Equipment
- 5) Supplies
- 6) Contractual
- 7) Training Stipends
- 8) Other
- 9) Total Direct Costs
- 10) Indirect Costs
- 11) Funding for Involved LEAs
- 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs:

The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) will issue a competitive proposal for school districts to establish or expand Teacher and Principal Residency programs, which will offer high-quality teacher and principal support and training. The anticipated funding is \$500,000 per year for each of the 4 residencies, which includes teacher stipends. Grants will require districts to demonstrate ongoing support and a sustainability plan.

13) Total Costs:

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$8,000,000
---------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Teacher and Principal Evaluation Development					
Associated with Criteria: A(1)(i), D(2)(ii), D(2)(iii), D(2)(iv)(a)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ 24,000	\$ 24,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 48,000
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 120,000
6. Contractual	\$ 1,050,000	\$ 1,050,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,100,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ 60,000	\$ 60,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 120,000
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 1,194,000	\$ 1,194,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,388,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 90,744	\$ 90,744	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 181,488
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 1,284,744	\$ 1,284,744	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,569,488
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Teacher and Principal Evaluation Development

Associated with Criteria: A(1)(i), D(2)(ii), D(2)(iii), D(2)(iv)(a)

- 1) Personnel**
- 2) Fringe Benefits**
- 3) Travel:**

Twelve meetings per year for 15 committee members over two years at \$2,000 per meeting.

- 4) Equipment**
- 5) Supplies:**

Document production, general resource expenditures.

6) Contractual:

The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) will contract with national and state level experts on teacher and principal evaluation to provide consultation on development and implementation of a new evaluation system. TDOE will also engage consultants on the creation of developmentally appropriate assessments for early learning.

- 7) Training Stipends**
- 8) Other:**

Development and dissemination of communications materials about new evaluation system.

9) Total Direct Costs

The sum of all direct costs is \$2,388,000. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs

TDOE's indirect cost rate is 7.6%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$181,488.

- 11) Funding for Involved LEAs**
- 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs**
- 13) Total Costs:**

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$2,531,280
---------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Focus Schools					
Associated with Criteria: E(2)(ii)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ 924,840	\$ 989,222	\$ 935,705	\$ 895,322	\$ 3,745,090
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 924,840	\$ 989,222	\$ 935,705	\$ 895,322	\$ 3,745,090
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Focus Schools

Associated with Criteria: E(2)(ii)

- 1) Personnel
- 2) Fringe Benefits
- 3) Travel
- 4) Equipment
- 5) Supplies
- 6) Contractual
- 7) Training Stipends
- 8) Other
- 9) Total Direct Costs
- 10) Indirect Costs
- 11) Funding for Involved LEAs
- 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs:

Each school that falls in the categories of School Improvement 1 and School Improvement 2 will be given approximately \$6,000 to purchase school support services from a provider identified through a statewide Request for Information. This estimate is based upon a desire to provide each school with twenty days of consultation on school turnaround at \$300 per day.

Estimated numbers of schools in the Focus Schools category are based upon the number of schools in School Improvement 1 and School Improvement 2 in 2009-10 and the anticipated growth in schools in these categories as a result of implementation of the new standards and assessments. In Year 1, we estimate 154 schools in these categories. In Year 2, we estimate 165 schools. In Year 3, we estimate 156 schools. In Year 4, we estimate 149 schools.

13) Total Costs:

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$3,745,090
---------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Renewal Schools					
Associated with Criteria: E(2)(ii)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ 6,750,000	\$ 9,900,000	\$ 13,500,000	\$ 22,500,000	\$ 52,650,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 6,750,000	\$ 9,900,000	\$ 13,500,000	\$ 22,500,000	\$ 52,650,000
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Renewal Schools
Associated with Criteria: E(2)(ii)

- 1) Personnel**
- 2) Fringe Benefits**
- 3) Travel**
- 4) Equipment**
- 5) Supplies**
- 6) Contractual**
- 7) Training Stipends**
- 8) Other**
- 9) Total Direct Costs**
- 10) Indirect Costs**
- 11) Funding for Involved LEAs**
- 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs:**

Each school that falls in the categories of Corrective Action or Restructuring 1 will be given approximately \$300,000 to purchase school support services from a provider identified through a statewide Request for Information. This is based upon similar services previously contracted for by the Tennessee Department of Education with a national provider of school turnaround support.

Estimated numbers of schools in the Renewal Schools category are based upon the number of schools in Corrective Action or Restructuring 1 in 2009-10 and the anticipated growth in schools in these categories as a result of implementation of the new standards and assessments. In Year 1, we estimate 30 schools in these categories. In Year 2, we estimate 44 schools. In Year 3, we estimate 60 schools. In Year 4, we estimate 75 schools.

The state will commit approximately \$8,900,000 in School Improvement Grant funds to this project in addition to the Race to the Top funds.

13) Total Costs:

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$52,650,000
---------------------	---------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Achievement School District					
Associated with Criteria: A(1)(i), D(2)(iv)(a)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ 250,000	\$ 257,500	\$ 265,225	\$ 273,182	\$ 1,045,907
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ 70,000	\$ 72,100	\$ 74,263	\$ 76,491	\$ 292,854
3. Travel	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 80,000
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 80,000
6. Contractual	\$ 7,962,270	\$ 8,458,052	\$ 9,954,569	\$ 17,822,323	\$ 44,197,215
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 8,322,270	\$ 8,827,652	\$ 10,334,057	\$ 18,211,996	\$ 45,695,975
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 632,492	\$ 670,902	\$ 785,388	\$ 1,384,112	\$ 3,472,894
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 8,954,762	\$ 9,498,554	\$ 11,119,446	\$ 19,596,108	\$ 49,168,869
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Achievement School District

Associated with Criteria: Section E(2)(ii)

1) Personnel:

The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.	% FTE	Base Salary	Total
The Tennessee Department of Education will hire a Superintendent to manage the Achievement School District.	100%	\$250,000	\$250,000

2) Fringe Benefits:

Benefits are calculated at 28%.

3) Travel:

It is anticipated that there will be 13 schools in the Achievement School District. School leaders from the schools would meet in Nashville up to 6 times per year, at an average cost of \$125 per trip for a total cost of \$9,750.

It is also anticipated that the Superintendent of the Achievement School District would need to travel frequently to the schools in the district. Travel is calculated based on an average of \$125 per trip, with travel on 40% of school days (72 days) and an additional 10 days in the summer for a total cost of \$10,250.

4) Equipment

5) Supplies:

General resource expenditures.

6) Contractual:

To enable the best possible reform conditions, the state will create a collaborative to assist the Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) in operations of the Achievement School District. TDOE will contract with carefully selected non-profit organizations with a demonstrated a track record of reform in recruiting highly effective teachers or principals, working with districts and states on revamping human capital systems, creating and expanding high-quality charter schools, and paving the way for dramatic improvement in student outcomes. Tennessee will seek out leading non-profits that have already have proven they can do this work and enlist them in the ASD effort. Working individually and as a collaborative, the selected partners will commit resources, expertise, and assistance so that students and schools in Tennessee’s ASD will see rapid achievement growth.

The ASD could consist of the 10 schools identified as persistently lowest-achieving in Tier 1, as well as three schools that are in the second year of Restructuring and beyond according to Tennessee's accountability rules.

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs:

The sum of all direct costs is \$45,695,975. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs

TDOE's indirect cost rate is 7.6%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$3,472,894.

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs:

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$49,168,869
---------------------	---------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Competitive Supplemental Fund					
Associated with Criteria: D(2)(iv)(b)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ 375,000	\$ 375,000	\$ 375,000	\$ 375,000	\$ 1,500,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 375,000	\$ 375,000	\$ 375,000	\$ 375,000	\$ 1,500,000
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Competitive Supplemental Fund

Associated with Criteria: D(2)(iv)(b)

- 1) **Personnel**
- 2) **Fringe Benefits**
- 3) **Travel**
- 4) **Equipment**
- 5) **Supplies**
- 6) **Contractual:**

The state also will create a competitive supplemental fund of \$375,000 per year for innovation in those school districts whose share of funds is within the bottom 20% of the total share of the LEA funds under this application. These districts can apply for supplemental funding within their scopes of work to encourage compensation reform or turning around of low-performing schools.

- 7) **Training Stipends**
- 8) **Other**
- 9) **Total Direct Costs:**

The sum of all direct costs is \$1,500,000. (See chart above.)

- 10) **Indirect Costs**
- 11) **Funding for Involved LEAs**
- 12) **Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs**
- 13) **Total Costs:**

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$1,500,000
---------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: STEM Platform Schools					
Associated with Criteria: Priority 2					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 9,000,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 9,000,000
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: STEM Platform Schools

Associated with Criteria: Competitive Priority 2

- 1) Personnel**
- 2) Fringe Benefits**
- 3) Travel**
- 4) Equipment**
- 5) Supplies**
- 6) Contractual**
- 7) Training Stipends**
- 8) Other**
- 9) Total Direct Costs**
- 10) Indirect Costs**
- 11) Funding for Involved LEAs**
- 12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs:**

The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) will provide funding for in Years One and Two to expand existing STEM programs in Knox County and Metro Nashville. In Years 3 and 4, based on successes from the other schools, TDOE will provide seed funding in a competitive grant process for three additional programs or schools in the amount of \$500,000 per year per school over two years. Districts that are successful in the competitive grant process will be required to contribute matching funds and a sustainability plan.

13) Total Costs:

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$9,000,000
---------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Regional STEM Hubs					
Associated with Criteria: Priority 2					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 5,000,000
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 5,000,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 95,000	\$ 95,000	\$ 95,000	\$ 95,000	\$ 380,000
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 1,345,000	\$ 1,345,000	\$ 1,345,000	\$ 1,345,000	\$ 5,380,000
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Regional STEM Hubs

Associated with Criteria: Priority 2

- 1) **Personnel**
- 2) **Fringe Benefits**
- 3) **Travel**
- 4) **Equipment**
- 5) **Supplies**
- 6) **Contractual:**

Develop regional hubs of support for STEM schools, professional development and teaching practice — to be developed independently or in concert with existing STEM assets such as K-12 schools, universities, professional development centers, etc.

This will involve at least one competitive grant process. There will be cost sharing structure in place for Years 2-4, with matching funds then going to expanded outreach and tools for future use.

- 7) **Training Stipends**
- 8) **Other**
- 9) **Total Direct Costs:**

The sum of all direct costs is \$5,000,000. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs

The Tennessee Department of Education’s indirect cost rate is 7.6%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$380,000.

- 11) **Funding for Involved LEAs**
- 12) **Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs**
- 13) **Total Costs:**

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$5,380,000
---------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: STEM Innovation Network Infrastructure					
Associated with Criteria: A(2)(i), D(3)(ii), Priority 2					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 387,500	\$ 387,500	\$ 387,500	\$ 387,500	\$ 1,550,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 387,500	\$ 387,500	\$ 387,500	\$ 387,500	\$ 1,550,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 29,450	\$ 29,450	\$ 29,450	\$ 29,450	\$ 117,800
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 416,950	\$ 416,950	\$ 416,950	\$ 416,950	\$ 1,667,800
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: STEM Innovation Network Infrastructure

Associated with Criteria: A(2)(i), D(3)(ii), Priority 2

- 1) Personnel
- 2) Fringe Benefits
- 3) Travel
- 4) Equipment
- 5) Supplies
- 6) Contractual:

STEM Leadership Development Program	Teacher & principal learning exchanges with specifics to be determined	\$100,000
STEM Infrastructure & Sustainability Support	Internal STEM Liaison Team coordinators at Department of Education and THEC (portion of role) to interact with the STEM Innovation Council and STEM Innovation Network management. Responsible for connecting relevant agency personnel with the emerging network infrastructure and management.	Leveraged with state funds
	Three designated development coordinators (contracted and/or buying time from higher ed existing faculty) to develop sustainability plans for STEM efforts across the TN STEM Innovation Network for three years	\$450,000
	STEMResources.com website continued development & support	\$150,000

	Annual STEM Education convening, curriculum development workshops and conferences (over 3 years)	\$750,000
	STEM Education Research Activities in coordination with the TN Consortium on Research, Evaluation & Development	\$100,000

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs:

The sum of all direct costs is \$1,550,000. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs

The Tennessee Department of Education’s indirect cost rate is 7.6%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$117,800.

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs:

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$1,667,800
---------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: College Access Network					
Associated with Criteria: E(2)(i)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 48,000
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ 3,300	\$ 3,300	\$ 3,300	\$ 3,300	\$ 13,200
3. Travel	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 6,000	\$ 24,000
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 4,000
6. Contractual	\$ 450,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 450,000	\$ 1,800,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 472,300	\$ 472,300	\$ 472,300	\$ 472,300	\$ 1,889,200
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 37,784	\$ 37,784	\$ 37,784	\$ 37,784	\$ 151,136
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 1,200,000
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 810,084	\$ 810,084	\$ 810,084	\$ 810,084	\$ 3,240,336
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: College Access Network

Associated with Criteria: E(2)(i)

1) Personnel:

Five percent of time and effort of four employees at the Tennessee Higher Education Commission in the Office of P-16 Initiatives.

2) Fringe Benefits:

Five percent of benefits for four employees at the Tennessee Higher Education Commission in the Office of P-16 Initiatives.

3) Travel:

Statewide travel and travel to the National College Access Network annual conference.

4) Equipment

5) Supplies:

General resource expenditures.

6) Contractual:

The Tennessee Higher Education Commission will expand its contract to support the establishment and expansion of a statewide college access network. Funding would support 2-3 full time staff, professional development, incubation of new programs, expansion of current programs and connection of existing college access programs statewide.

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs

The sum of all direct costs is \$1,889,200. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs

The Tennessee Higher Education Commission's indirect cost rate is 8%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$151,136.

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs:

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$3,240,336
---------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Rural Literacy Programs					
Associated with Criteria: E(2)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ 34,476	\$ 34,476	\$ 34,476	\$ 34,476	\$ 137,905
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ 8,274	\$ 8,274	\$ 8,274	\$ 8,274	\$ 33,097
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ 346,152	\$ 346,152	\$ 346,152	\$ 346,152	\$ 1,384,607
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 388,902	\$ 388,902	\$ 388,902	\$ 388,902	\$ 1,555,609
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 29,557	\$ 29,557	\$ 29,557	\$ 29,557	\$ 118,226
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 418,459	\$ 418,459	\$ 418,459	\$ 418,459	\$ 1,673,835
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Rural Literacy Programs

Associated with Criteria: E(2)

- 1) **Personnel**
- 2) **Fringe Benefits**
- 3) **Travel**
- 4) **Equipment**
- 5) **Supplies**
- 6) **Contractual:**

Save the Children currently provides literacy programs including tutoring, formative assessments, extended learning, and professional development in Tennessee’s rural school districts. The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) will contract with Save the Children to continue and expand its current efforts.

Other	Cost for 4 Years at 80% of total budget (Save the Children will contribute 20%)
Sub-grant LEA cost	\$874,400
Reading and support teachers	\$208,000
Literacy Training Summit	\$18,720
Literacy Training	\$5,980
Vehicles operation and maintenance and Fuel	\$4,800
RL software Licenses	\$20,800
Literacy site evaluation	\$8,547
Telecommunication cost	\$2,960
Program operations cost	\$14,369
Management support cost	\$226,028

Personnel	
Senior Education Advisor, Education specialist, Training and Technical Assistance Specialists, Regional Director, Finance and Administration support (Person/ month), Office Manager, Associate Director for Partnership management	\$172,379
Fringe Benefits	\$41,371

7) Training Stipends

8) Other

9) Total Direct Costs:

The sum of all direct costs is \$1,555,609. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs

TDOE's indirect cost rate is 7.6%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$118,226.

11) Funding for Involved LEAs

12) Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs

13) Total Costs:

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$1,673,835
---------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: Integrating PBS into Electronic Learning Center					
Associated with Criteria: D(5)(i)					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 1,075,500	\$ 1,075,500	\$ 1,075,500	\$ 1,075,500	\$ 4,302,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 1,075,500	\$ 1,075,500	\$ 1,075,500	\$ 1,075,500	\$ 4,302,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 81,738	\$ 81,738	\$ 81,738	\$ 81,738	\$ 326,952
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 1,157,238	\$ 1,157,238	\$ 1,157,238	\$ 1,157,238	\$ 4,628,952
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Integrating PBS into Electronic Learning Center

Associated with Criteria: D(5)(i)

- 1) **Personnel**
- 2) **Fringe Benefits**
- 3) **Travel**
- 4) **Equipment**
- 5) **Supplies**
- 6) **Contractual:**

The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) will contract with PBS to provide a web-based Digital Learning Library (DLL) on the Electronic Learning Center (ELC). Services will include technical integration of the PBS Digital Learning Library into Tennessee’s education web-based portal. Tennessee Public Television stations will develop content as needed by TDOE.

TDOE will also contract with PBS to provide the PBS TeacherLine. The PBS TeacherLine program is a set of courses offered to PreK-12 teachers in areas of science, math and technology as a way to address STEM learning. The TeacherLine will also offer PreK-3 teachers courses in ELL curriculum and reading.

In working with PBS, the TDOE will also contract to implement their three *Ready to Learn* initiatives:

- SuperWhy Literacy Camps
- Family Literacy Workshops
- Martha Speaks Reading Buddies

- 7) **Training Stipends**
- 8) **Other**
- 9) **Total Direct Costs:**

The sum of all direct costs is \$4,302,000. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs

TDOE’s indirect cost rate is 7.6%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$326,952.

- 11) **Funding for Involved LEAs**
- 12) **Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs**
- 13) **Total Costs:**

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$4,628,952
---------------------	--------------------

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: Integrating PBS into Electronic Learning Center

Associated with Criteria: D(5)(i)

- 1) **Personnel**
- 2) **Fringe Benefits**
- 3) **Travel**
- 4) **Equipment**
- 5) **Supplies**
- 6) **Contractual:**

The Tennessee Department of Education (TDOE) will contract with PBS to provide a web-based Digital Learning Library (DLL) on the Electronic Learning Center (ELC). Services will include technical integration of the PBS Digital Learning Library into Tennessee’s education web-based portal. Tennessee Public Television stations will develop content as needed by TDOE.

TDOE will also contract with PBS to provide the PBS TeacherLine. The PBS TeacherLine program is a set of courses offered to PreK-12 teachers in areas of science, math and technology as a way to address STEM learning. The TeacherLine will also offer PreK-3 teachers courses in ELL curriculum and reading.

In working with PBS, the TDOE will also contract to implement their three *Ready to Learn* initiatives:

- SuperWhy Literacy Camps
- Family Literacy Workshops
- Martha Speaks Reading Buddies

- 7) **Training Stipends**
- 8) **Other**
- 9) **Total Direct Costs:**

The sum of all direct costs is \$4,302,000. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs

TDOE’s indirect cost rate is 7.6%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$326,952.

- 11) **Funding for Involved LEAs**
- 12) **Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs**
- 13) **Total Costs:**

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$4,628,952
---------------------	--------------------

Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table					
Project Name: STEM Professional Development					
Associated with Criteria: Priority 2					
Budget Categories	Project Year 1 (a)	Project Year 2 (b)	Project Year 3 (c)	Project Year 4 (d)	Total (e)
1. Personnel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2. Fringe Benefits	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3. Travel	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4. Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5. Supplies	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
6. Contractual	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 6,000,000
7. Training Stipends	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
8. Other	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 6,000,000
10. Indirect Costs*	\$ 120,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 120,000	\$ 480,000
11. Funding for Involved LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
13. Total Costs (lines 9- 12)	\$ 1,620,000	\$ 1,620,000	\$ 1,620,000	\$ 1,620,000	\$ 6,480,000
All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.					
Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.					
Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.					
*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.					

BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Project Name: STEM Professional Development

Associated with Criteria: Priority 2

- 1) **Personnel**
- 2) **Fringe Benefits**
- 3) **Travel**
- 4) **Equipment**
- 5) **Supplies**
- 6) **Contractual:**

The Tennessee Higher Education Commission will contract with the STEM Centers of Excellence to provide professional development in the STEM fields to K-12 educators.

- 7) **Training Stipends**
- 8) **Other**
- 9) **Total Direct Costs:**

The sum of all direct costs is \$6,000,000. (See chart above.)

10) Indirect Costs

THEC's indirect cost rate is 8%. The total indirect cost over the four year period is \$480,000.

- 11) **Funding for Involved LEAs**
- 12) **Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs**
- 13) **Total Costs:**

The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.

Total Costs:	\$6,480,000
---------------------	--------------------

Budget: Indirect Cost Information

To request reimbursement for indirect costs, please answer the following questions:

Does the State have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal government?

YES

If yes to question 1, please provide the following information:

Period Covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement (mm/dd/yyyy):
From: 07/01/2009 To: 06/30/2010

Approving Federal agency: ED Other
(Please specify agency): _____

Directions for this form:

1. Indicate whether or not the State has an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement that was approved by the Federal government.
2. If “No” is checked, ED generally will authorize grantees to use a temporary rate of 10% of budgeted salaries and wages subject to the following limitations:
 - (a) The grantee must submit an indirect cost proposal to its cognizant agency within 90 days after ED issues a grant award notification; and
 - (b) If after the 90-day period, the grantee has not submitted an indirect cost proposal to its cognizant agency, the grantee may not charge its grant for indirect costs until it has negotiated an indirect cost rate agreement with its cognizant agency.
3. If “Yes” is checked, indicate the beginning and ending dates covered by the Indirect Cost Rate Agreement. In addition, indicate whether ED, another Federal agency (Other) issued the approved agreement. If “Other” was checked, specify the name of the agency that issued the approved agreement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS FOR APPENDIX

Appendix Name	Appendix Description	Page
Appendix A-1-1	“First to the Top” Graphic	A-1
Appendix A-1-2	Tennessee MOU for Districts	A-2
Appendix A-1-3	Tennessee Scope of Work for Districts	A-6
Appendix A-1-4	Achievement Goals Through 2014	A-7
Appendix A-1-5	Accommodations Provided in NAEP and Tennessee State Assessments	A-19
Appendix A-2-1	Oversight Team Structure and Staffing	A-20
Appendix A-2-2	DOE Agency Reorganization	A-22
Appendix A-2-3	Support Letters	A-27
Appendix A-3-1	Tennessee Achievement Outcomes from 2003-2009	A-150
Appendix A-3-2	Policy Brief by Balfanz/West	A-165
Appendix B-1-1	Common Core MOA	B-1
Appendix B-1-2	Proposed Common Core standards	B-4
Appendix B-1-3	Documentation of International Benchmarking of Common Core standards	B-198
Appendix B-1-4	States Participating in the Common Core Consortium	B-200
Appendix B-1-5	CCRPI Policy Plan Submission	B-203
Appendix B-1-6	Final Feedback Letter from CCRPI Partners	B-222
Appendix B-1-7	Tennessee Statutes on Standards	B-229
Appendix B-1-8	Letter from Tennessee Board of Education re: Common Core Adoption	B-232
Appendix B-2-1	Achieve/NGA/CCSSO Statement of Principles	B-233
Appendix B-2-2	Florida Race to the Top Assessment Consortium	B-234
Appendix B-2-3	Maine Balanced Assessment Consortium	B-240
Appendix B-2-4	SMARTER MOU	B-247
Appendix B-2-5	MOSAIC MOU	B-249
Appendix B-3-1	<i>Timeline: Implementation and Development of New Standards and Assessments</i>	B-253
Appendix B-3-2	<i>Timeline: Training for Pre-Service Teachers</i>	B-258
Appendix C-1-1	Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems Grant Abstract and Narrative	C-1
Appendix C-1-2	Data Quality Campaign 2009 Survey for Tennessee	C-38
Appendix C-2-1	Explanation of SAS Dashboard	C-40
Appendix C-2-2	<i>Timeline: Accessing and Using State Data</i>	C- 42
Appendix C-3-1	Tennessee’s Consortium on Research, Evaluation, and Development (TN CRED)	C-46
Appendix C-3-2	Supporting Tennessee Districts, Schools and Teachers in Using Data for Decision Making	C-54

Appendix D-1-1	Tennessee Statutes on Licensure	D- 1
Appendix D-1-2	Board of Education Rules on the Transitional Licensure Policy.	D-3
Appendix D-1-3	Board of Education Rules on Licensure of Administrators from Alternative Providers	D-28
Appendix D-1-4	Alternative Route Providers in Tennessee	D-70
Appendix D-1-5	Role of Higher Education in Human Capital Needs	D-74
Appendix D-1-6	Proposal to Expand UTeach	D-76
Appendix D-1-7	Board of Education Rules on Teacher Preparation Program Approval	D-79
Appendix D-2-1	Explanation of Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System	D-96
Appendix D-2-2	<i>Timeline: Improving Teacher and Principal Effectiveness</i>	D-117
Appendix D-2-3	Brief Explanation of Teacher Effect Reporting	D-119
Appendix D-2-4	Tennessee Teacher Effectiveness Cycle	D-120
Appendix D-2-5	Summary of Memphis Teacher Effectiveness Initiative	D-121
Appendix D-3-1	2007 Tennessee Research Brief on Effective Teachers	D-126
Appendix D-3-2	2009 Tennessee Research Brief on Distribution of Effective Teachers	D-133
Appendix D-3-3	Sample Teacher Effect Report	D-143
Appendix D-3-4	Sample Teacher Effect Report for Principals	D-144
Appendix D-3-5	<i>Timeline: Ensuring Equitable Distribution of Teachers</i>	D-145
Appendix D-3-6	Explanation of BASE-TN Program	D-152
Appendix D-3-7	2010 Tennessee Teacher Equity Plan	D-180
Appendix D-3-8	Additional Data on Equitable Distribution of Effective Principals	D-194
Appendix D-3-9	Additional Data on Equitable Distribution of Teachers	D-195
Appendix D-4-1	<i>Timeline: Improving the Effectiveness of Teacher and Principal Preparation Programs</i>	D-196
Appendix D-5-1	<i>Timeline : Providing Effective Support to Teachers and Principals</i>	D-198
Appendix E-1-1	Tennessee Statutes on Accountability	E-1
Appendix E-1-2	Tennessee Accountability Continuum	E-8
Appendix E-1-3	Tennessee First to the Top Act of 2010	E- 16
Appendix E-2-1	Decision Tree on Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools	E-24
Appendix E-2-2	Calculating Numerical Rank for Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools	E-25
Appendix E-2-3	<i>Timeline: Identifying Tennessee’s Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools</i>	E-26
Appendix E-2-4	Graphical Representation of Supports for Low-Performing Schools	E-28

Appendix E-2-5	Performance Measure Chart for Section E(2) and Lessons Learned from Accountability in Tennessee	E-29
Appendix E-2-6	Letters of Support from National Partners	E-33
Appendix E-2-7	<i>Timeline: Turning Around Low-Achieving Schools</i>	E-38
Appendix E-2-8	Role of Higher Education in School Turnaround	E-46
Appendix F-1-1	Tennessee Education Funding	F-1
Appendix F-2-1	Tennessee Statutes on Charter Schools	F-2
Appendix F-2-2	Other Laws that Promote Innovative Schools	F-18
Appendix F-2-3	Community Collaboration on Charter Schools	F-22
Appendix F-3-1	Press Release on Charter School Incubator	F-24
Appendix F-3-2	Innovative Programs: Benwood Initiative and TAP	F-26
Priority 2 – STEM-1	Announcement of Tennessee STEM Innovation Network	STEM - 1
Priority 2 – STEM-2	STEM Investment Strategy	STEM -3
Priority 2 – STEM-3	MOU Between Battelle and Tennessee	STEM - 6
Priority 2 – STEM-4	Planning Document from Oak Ridge Associated Universities	STEM - 17

ⁱ Balfanz, Robert, and Thomas C. West. Raising graduation rates: Progress toward increasing national and state graduation rates. Rep. Baltimore: Center for Social Organization of Schools, 2009. Everyone Graduates Center. 11 Jan. 2009.

ⁱⁱ A final FY 2009 figure is expected when FY 2009 closes.

ⁱⁱⁱ During the most recent application window, 25 applications were filed, and eight charter schools were authorized to open in the 2010-2011 school year (seven in Memphis and one in Nashville). Ten denied schools have appealed to the State Board of Education. More applications are expected because of the raised cap and the turnaround strategy described in Section E(2).