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Dear Colleague:

On July 24, President Obama and I released the proposed priorities, requirements, definitions, and selection criteria for the $4.35 billion Race to the Top Fund. That announcement precipitated a vigorous national dialogue about how to best reform our schools and educate our Nation’s children. With your assistance, that dialogue is beginning to generate far-reaching reforms that will help America boost student learning, narrow achievement gaps, and increase college and career readiness. Today, the U.S. Department of Education is releasing the final priorities, requirements, definitions, and selection criteria, along with the application for the Race to the Top competition.

Race to the Top provides an unprecedented opportunity to reform our schools and challenge an educational status quo that is failing too many children. President Obama and Congress have provided more money for school reform than ever before in history. This is a once-in-a-lifetime chance to change our schools and accelerate student achievement. And everyone committed to education reform can be partners in promoting the success of our children.

Through Race to the Top, we are asking States to advance reforms around four specific areas:

- Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy;
- Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction;
- Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and
- Turning around our lowest-achieving schools.

Awards in Race to the Top will go to States that are leading the way with ambitious yet achievable plans for implementing coherent, compelling, and comprehensive education reform. Race to the Top winners will help trail-blaze effective reforms and provide examples for States and local school districts throughout the country to follow as they too are hard at work on reforms that can transform our schools for decades to come.

The momentum for reform is already building. Some 1,161 commenters submitted thousands of unique comments, ranging from one paragraph to 67 pages. Educators and members of the public from every State and the District of Columbia submitted comments, and the commenters included parents, teachers, principals, superintendents, school board members, chief state school officers, and governors. This outpouring of thoughtful input prompted the Department to make numerous changes and improvements to the final application. But just as important, the overwhelming volume of comments demonstrates the potential for Race to the Top to propel the transformational changes that students and teachers need.

I hope this process becomes a model – one where transparent and candid dialogue informs our policies and your work, enabling all stakeholders to act in the best interests of children. I am heartened by and grateful for your participation to date. And I invite you to continue that conversation as we move forward in the effort to build an education system that our students deserve, one that ensures that our country is ready to compete in the global economy of the 21st Century.

Sincerely,

/s/

Arne Duncan
I. APPLICATION INTRODUCTION AND INSTRUCTIONS

Introduction
Race to the Top is authorized under section 14006 of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). The purpose of the Race to the Top Fund, a competitive grant program, is to encourage and reward States that are creating the conditions for education innovation and reform; achieving significant improvement in student outcomes, including making substantial gains in student achievement, closing achievement gaps, improving high school graduation rates, and ensuring student preparation for success in college and careers; and implementing ambitious plans in four core education reform areas:

- Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy;
- Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how they can improve instruction;
- Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and
- Turning around our lowest-achieving schools.

General Instructions
The Department encourages all potential applicants to read through the entire application package – including the notice inviting applications; the notice of final priorities, requirements, definitions, and selection criteria; and this application – before beginning to prepare the application proposal.

This application includes sections that require response or action by the State, as well as several sections of background information that are directly relevant to the program. For example, Section II includes definitions that are used throughout the application.

Page Length Recommendation
The Department recommends a page length for the State’s response to each selection criterion; these are indicated in the application next to each criterion. We recommend that States limit their total page count (that is, the narrative responses to all selection criteria in Section VI) to no more than 100 pages of State-authored text, and that they limit their appendices to no more than 250 pages. For all responses, we request that the following standards be used:

- A “page” is 8.5" x 11", on one side only, with 1" margins at the top, bottom, and both sides.
- Each page has a page number.
- Line spacing for the narratives is set to 1.5 spacing, and the font used is 12 point Times New Roman.

The Secretary strongly requests that applicants follow the recommended page limits, although the Secretary will consider applications of greater length.
Instructions for Responding to Selection Criteria
The application provides space for the State to address the selection criteria, including performance measures and supporting evidence. As required by the Absolute Priority (explained in more detail below), the State must address all education reform areas. It need not address every individual selection criterion. However, a State will not earn points for selection criteria that it does not address. There are two types of selection criteria – State Reform Conditions Criteria and Reform Plan Criteria—to which the State may respond.

State Reform Conditions Criteria are used to assess a State’s progress and its success in creating conditions for reform in specific areas related to the four ARRA education reform areas. The State must provide, for each State Reform Conditions Criterion addressed, a description of the State’s current status in meeting that criterion, and at a minimum, the information requested as supporting evidence that the State has met the criterion. The State may also submit additional information that it believes will be helpful to reviewers in judging the criterion.

Reform Plan Criteria are used to assess a State’s plan for future efforts in the four ARRA education reform areas. The State must provide, for each Reform Plan Criterion that the State chooses to address, a detailed plan for use of grant funds that includes, but need not be limited to—

- The key goals;
- The key activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, which should include why the specific activities are thought to bring about the change envisioned and how these activities are linked to the desired goals;
- The timeline for implementing the activities;
- The party or parties responsible for implementing the activities;
- The State’s annual targets for this plan, where applicable, with respect to the performance measures, if any. Where the State proposes plans for reform efforts not covered by a specified performance measure, the State may propose performance measures and annual targets for those efforts; and
- The information requested as supporting evidence, if any, for the criterion, together with any additional information the State believes will be helpful to reviewers in judging the credibility of the State’s plan.

Responding to Selection Criteria: For each criterion, there are up to three parts: the narrative, the performance measures, and the evidence.

- **Narrative:** For each criterion the State addresses, the State writes its narrative response in the text box below the selection criterion (in the space marked, “Enter text here”). In this space, the State describes how it has addressed or will address that criterion. Response lengths are indicated in the directions.

- **Performance Measures:** For several selection criteria, the State is asked to provide goals and annual targets, baseline data, and other information; these are indicated in the application. In addition, the State may provide additional performance measures, baseline data, and targets for any criterion it chooses. Reviewers will consider, as part of their evaluations of the State’s application, the extent to which the State has set ambitious yet achievable annual targets for the performance measures in support of the State’s plan.
Tables for all of the performance measures are provided in the application. For criteria to which a State is responding, the State must complete the tables or provide an attachment in the Appendix responding to the performance measures. If there are data the State does not have, the State should indicate that the data are not available and explain why.

Some data elements may require States to collect information from participating LEAs. It may be helpful to begin gathering this information as early as possible (see especially criteria (A)(1), (D)(2), and (D)(3)).

To minimize burden, performance measures have been requested only where the Department intends to report nationally on them and for measures that lend themselves to objective and comparable data gathering. In the future, the Department may require grantees to submit additional performance data as part of an annual report, program evaluation, or other mechanism.

For optional performance measures, no submission of the measures is required; however if the State wishes to include performance measures in these optional cases, it may use the templates provided in the application or it may submit attachments.

- **Evidence:** Some selection criteria require the State to provide specific evidence; this is indicated in the application. In addition, the State may provide additional evidence for any criterion it chooses.

The State must provide the evidence in the narrative text below each selection criterion or provide an attachment in the Appendix.

**Appendix:** The Appendix must include a complete Table of Contents. Each attachment in the Appendix must be described in the narrative text of the relevant selection criterion, with a rationale for how its inclusion supports the narrative and a notation of its location in the Appendix.

**Competition Priorities:** The Race to the Top competition includes absolute, competitive, and invitational priorities. The competition priorities can be found in Section VII of this application. The absolute priority will be addressed under State Success Factors, section A, and through the State’s comprehensive approach to addressing the four education reform areas, selection criteria sections B, C, D and E. A State that is responding to the competitive preference 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 priority in Section VII. Applicants responding to the invitational priorities may address them throughout their applications or in the text boxes below each priorities in Section VII. Responding to the competitive and invitational priorities is optional.

**Competition Description and Scoring Rubric**
For information on the competition review and selection process, see (a) the section entitled, Review and Selection Process, in the notice inviting applications; and (b) Section XI, Scoring Rubric (Appendix B in the notice). In addition, point values have been included throughout the application.
**Technical Assistance Planning Workshops**
To assist States in preparing the application and to respond to questions, the Department intends to host two Technical Assistance Planning Workshops for potential applicants prior to the Phase 1 application submission deadline. The purpose of the workshops would be for Department staff to review the selection criteria, requirements, and priorities with teams of participants responsible for drafting State applications, as well as for Department staff to answer technical questions about the Race to the Top program. The Department plans to release more details regarding the workshops in late November. The Department also intends to host at least one Technical Assistance Planning Workshop for potential applicants prior to the Phase 2 application submission deadline. Updates about all events will be available at the Race to the Top website [www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop](http://www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop). Attendance at the workshops is strongly encouraged. For those who cannot attend, transcripts of the meetings will be available on our website. Announcements of any other conference calls or webinars and Frequently Asked Questions will also be available on the Race to the Top website [www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop](http://www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop).

**Frequently Asked Questions**
The Department has also prepared frequently asked questions in order to assist States in completing an application. Frequently Asked Questions are available at [www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop](http://www.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop).
II. DEFINITIONS

**Alternative routes to certification** means pathways to certification that are authorized under the State’s laws or regulations, that allow the establishment and operation of teacher and administrator preparation programs in the State, and that have the following characteristics (in addition to standard features such as demonstration of subject-matter mastery, and high-quality instruction in pedagogy and in addressing the needs of all students in the classroom including English language learners and student with disabilities): (a) 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; (b) are selective in accepting candidates; (c) provide supervised, school-based experiences and ongoing support such as effective mentoring and coaching; (d) significantly limit the amount of coursework required or have options to test out of courses; and (e) upon completion, award the same level of certification that traditional preparation programs award upon completion.

**College enrollment** refers to the enrollment of students who graduate from high school consistent with 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1) and who enroll in an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act, P.L. 105-244, 20 U.S.C. 1001) within 16 months of graduation.

**Common set of K-12 standards** means a set of content standards that define what students must know and be able to do and that are substantially identical across all States in a consortium. A State may supplement the common standards with additional standards, provided that the additional standards do not exceed 15 percent of the State's total standards for that content area.

**Effective principal** means a principal whose students, overall and for each subgroup, achieve acceptable rates (e.g., at least one grade level in an academic year) of student growth (as defined in this notice). States, LEAs, or schools must include multiple measures, provided that principal effectiveness is evaluated, in significant part, by student growth (as defined in this notice). Supplemental measures may include, for example, high school graduation rates and college enrollment rates, as well as evidence of providing supportive teaching and learning conditions, strong instructional leadership, and positive family and community engagement.

**Effective teacher** means a teacher whose students achieve acceptable rates (e.g., at least one grade level in an academic year) of student growth (as defined in this notice). States, LEAs, or schools must include multiple measures, provided that teacher effectiveness is evaluated, in significant part, by student growth (as defined in this notice). Supplemental measures may include, for example, multiple observation-based assessments of teacher performance.

**Formative assessment** means assessment questions, tools, and processes that are embedded in instruction and are used by teachers and students to provide timely feedback for purposes of adjusting instruction to improve learning.

**Graduation rate** means the four-year or extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rate as defined by 34 CFR 200.19(b)(1).

---

1The term English language learner, as used in this notice, is synonymous with the term limited English proficient, as defined in section 9101 of the ESEA
**Highly effective principal** means a principal whose students, overall and for each subgroup, achieve high rates (e.g., one and one-half grade levels in an academic year) of student growth (as defined in this notice). States, LEAs, or schools must include multiple measures, provided that principal effectiveness is evaluated, in significant part, by student growth (as defined in this notice). Supplemental measures may include, for example, high school graduation rates; college enrollment rates; evidence of providing supportive teaching and learning conditions, strong instructional leadership, and positive family and community engagement; or evidence of attracting, developing, and retaining high numbers of effective teachers.

**Highly effective teacher** means a teacher whose students achieve high rates (e.g., one and one-half grade levels in an academic year) of student growth (as defined in this notice). States, LEAs, or schools must include multiple measures, provided that teacher effectiveness is evaluated, in significant part, by student growth (as defined in this notice). Supplemental measures may include, for example, multiple observation-based assessments of teacher performance or evidence of leadership roles (which may include mentoring or leading professional learning communities) that increase the effectiveness of other teachers in the school or LEA.

**High-minority school** is defined by the State in a manner consistent with its Teacher Equity Plan. The State should provide, in its Race to the Top application, the definition used.

**High-need LEA** means an LEA (a) that serves not fewer than 10,000 children from families with incomes below the poverty line; or (b) for which not less than 20 percent of the children served by the LEA are from families with incomes below the poverty line.

**High-need students** means students at risk of educational failure or otherwise in need of special assistance and support, such as students who are living in poverty, who attend high-minority schools (as defined in this notice), who are far below grade level, who have left school before receiving a regular high school diploma, who are at risk of not graduating with a diploma on time, who are homeless, who are in foster care, who have been incarcerated, who have disabilities, or who are English language learners.

**High-performing charter school** means a charter school that has been in operation for at least three consecutive years and has demonstrated overall success, including (a) substantial progress in improving student achievement (as defined in this notice); and (b) the management and leadership necessary to overcome initial start-up problems and establish a thriving, financially viable charter school.

**High-poverty school** means, consistent with section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA, a school in the highest quartile of schools in the State with respect to poverty level, using a measure of poverty determined by the State.

**High-quality assessment** means an assessment designed to measure a student’s knowledge, understanding of, and ability to apply, critical concepts through the use of a variety of item types and formats (e.g., open-ended responses, performance-based tasks). Such assessments should enable measurement of student achievement (as defined in this notice) and student growth (as defined in this notice); be of high technical quality (e.g., be valid, reliable, fair, and aligned to
standards); incorporate technology where appropriate; include the assessment of students with disabilities and English language learners; and to the extent feasible, use universal design principles (as defined in section 3 of the Assistive Technology Act of 1998, as amended, 29 U.S.C. 3002) in development and administration.

**Increased learning time** means using a longer school day, week, or year schedule to significantly increase the total number of school hours to include additional time for (a) instruction in core academic subjects, including English; reading or language arts; mathematics; science; foreign languages; civics and government; economics; arts; history; and geography; (b) instruction in other subjects and enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education, including, for example, physical education, service learning, and experiential and work-based learning opportunities that are provided by partnering, as appropriate, with other organizations; and (c) teachers to collaborate, plan, and engage in professional development within and across grades and subjects.  

**Innovative, autonomous public schools** means open enrollment public schools that, in return for increased accountability for student achievement (as defined in this notice), have the flexibility and authority to define their instructional models and associated curriculum; select and replace staff; implement new structures and formats for the school day or year; and control their budgets.

**Instructional improvement systems** means technology-based tools and other strategies that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with meaningful support and actionable data to systemically manage continuous instructional improvement, including such activities as: instructional planning; gathering information (e.g., through formative assessments (as defined in this notice), interim assessments (as defined in this notice), summative assessments, and looking at student work and other student data); analyzing information with the support of rapid-time (as defined in this notice) reporting; using this information to inform decisions on appropriate next instructional steps; and evaluating the effectiveness of the actions taken. Such systems promote collaborative problem-solving and action planning; they may also integrate instructional data with student-level data such as attendance, discipline, grades, credit accumulation, and student survey results to provide early warning indicators of a student’s risk of educational failure.

**Interim assessment** means an assessment that is given at regular and specified intervals throughout the school year, is designed to evaluate students’ knowledge and skills relative to a specific set of academic standards, and produces results that can be aggregated (e.g., by course, grade level, school, or LEA) in order to inform teachers and administrators at the student, classroom, school, and LEA levels.

---

2 Research supports the effectiveness of well-designed programs that expand learning time by a minimum of 300 hours per school year. (See Frazier, Julie A.; Morrison, Frederick J. “The Influence of Extended-year Schooling on Growth of Achievement and Perceived Competence in Early Elementary School.” Child Development. Vol. 69 (2), April 1998, pp.495-497 and research done by Mass2020.) Extending learning into before- and after-school hours can be difficult to implement effectively, but is permissible under this definition with encouragement to closely integrate and coordinate academic work between in-school and out-of school. (See James-Burdumy, Susanne; Dynarski, Mark; Deke, John. "When Elementary Schools Stay Open Late: Results from The National Evaluation of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program." <http://www.mathematica-mpr.com/publications/redirect_PubsDB.asp?strSite=http://epa.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/29/4/296> Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Vol. 29 (4), December 2007, Document No. PP07-121.)
**Involved LEAs** means LEAs that choose to work with the State to implement those specific portions of the State’s plan that necessitate full or nearly-full statewide implementation, such as transitioning to a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice). Involved LEAs do not receive a share of the 50 percent of a State’s grant award that it must subgrant to LEAs in accordance with section 14006(c) of the ARRA, but States may provide other funding to involved LEAs under the State’s Race to the Top grant in a manner that is consistent with the State’s application.

**Low-minority school** is defined by the State in a manner consistent with its Teacher Equity Plan. The State should provide, in its Race to the Top application, the definition used.

**Low-poverty school** means, consistent with section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA, a school in the lowest quartile of schools in the State with respect to poverty level, using a measure of poverty determined by the State.

**Participating LEAs** means LEAs that choose to work with the State to implement all or significant portions of the State’s Race to the Top plan, as specified in each LEA’s agreement with the State. Each participating LEA that receives funding under Title I, Part A will receive a share of the 50 percent of a State’s grant award that the State must subgrant to LEAs, based on the LEA’s relative share of Title I, Part A allocations in the most recent year, in accordance with section 14006(c) of the ARRA. Any participating LEA that does not receive funding under Title I, Part A (as well as one that does) may receive funding from the State’s other 50 percent of the grant award, in accordance with the State’s plan.

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

**Rapid-time**, in reference to reporting and availability of locally-collected school- and LEA-level data, means that data are available quickly enough to inform current lessons, instruction, and related supports.
Student achievement means—

(a) For tested grades and subjects: (1) a student’s score on the State’s assessments under the ESEA; and, as appropriate, (2) other measures of student learning, such as those described in paragraph (b) of this definition, provided they are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

(b) For non-tested grades and subjects: alternative measures of student learning and performance such as student scores on pre-tests and end-of-course tests; student performance on English language proficiency assessments; and other measures of student achievement that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

Student growth means the change in student achievement (as defined in this notice) for an individual student between two or more points in time. A State may also include other measures that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

Total revenues available to the State means either (a) projected or actual total State revenues for education and other purposes for the relevant year; or (b) projected or actual total State appropriations for education and other purposes for the relevant year.

America COMPETES Act elements means (as specified in section 6401(e)(2)(D) of that Act): (1) a unique statewide student identifier that does not permit a student to be individually identified by users of the system; (2) student-level enrollment, demographic, and program participation information; (3) student-level information about the points at which students exit, transfer in, transfer out, drop out, or complete P–16 education programs; (4) the capacity to communicate with higher education data systems; (5) a State data audit system assessing data quality, validity, and reliability; (6) yearly test records of individual students with respect to assessments under section 1111(b) of the ESEA (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)); (7) information on students not tested by grade and subject; (8) a teacher identifier system with the ability to match teachers to students; (9) student-level transcript information, including information on courses completed and grades earned; (10) student-level college readiness test scores; (11) information regarding the extent to which students transition successfully from secondary school to postsecondary education, including whether students enroll in remedial coursework; and (12) other information determined necessary to address alignment and adequate preparation for success in postsecondary education.
### III. RACE TO THE TOP APPLICATION ASSURANCES
(CFDA No. 84.395A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Legal Name of Applicant (Office of the Governor):</strong></th>
<th><strong>Applicant's Mailing Address:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor Gary R. Herbert</td>
<td>Utah State Capitol Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>350 North State Street, Suite 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 142220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-2220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Employer Identification Number:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Organizational DUNS:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87-6000545</td>
<td>029999372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>State Race to the Top Contact Name:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Contact Position and Office:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Single point of contact for communication)</td>
<td>Associate Superintendent, Student Achievement and School Success, Utah State Office of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Hales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Contact Telephone:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Contact E-mail Address:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>801-538-7515</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brenda.hales@schools.utah.gov">brenda.hales@schools.utah.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Required Applicant Signatures:**

To the best of my knowledge and belief, all of the information and data in this application are true and correct.

I further certify that I have read the application, am fully committed to it, and will support its implementation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor (Printed Name):</strong></th>
<th><strong>Telephone:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary R. Herbert</td>
<td>801-538-1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signature of Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor:**

![Signature]

Jan. 12, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Chief State School Officer (Printed Name):</strong></th>
<th><strong>Telephone:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larry K. Shumway</td>
<td>801-538-7510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signature of the Chief State School Officer:**

![Signature]

Jan. 13, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>President of the State Board of Education (Printed Name):</strong></th>
<th><strong>Telephone:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Debra G. Roberts</td>
<td>435-438-5843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signature of the President of the State Board of Education:**

![Signature]

Jan. 14, 2010
UTAH STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL CERTIFICATION

State Attorney General Certification

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.

(See especially Eligibility Requirement (b), Selection Criteria (B)(1), (D)(1), (E)(1), (F)(2), (F)(3).)

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.

(State Attorney General or Authorized Representative (Printed Name):)  
Mark L. Shurtleff

(Telephone:)
801-538-1191

(Signature of the State Attorney General or Authorized Representative:)

(Date:)
1/12/2010

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.
IV. 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

**SIGNATURE BLOCK FOR CERTIFYING OFFICIAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor (Printed Name):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gary R. Herbert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Governor or Authorized Representative of the Governor:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>Jan. 12, 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. 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.*

There are no barriers at the state level to linking data on student achievement or student growth to teachers and principals for the purpose of teacher and principal evaluation. 2009 legislation (Utah Code, Section 53A-17a-163) [see Appendix 1] provides funding for a pilot program that requires participating district and charter LEAs to include “student learning gains” to account for performance-based compensation that may be awarded to an employee. Additionally, the Educator Evaluation Act, (Utah Code, Section 53A-10-101 et seq.) provides no barriers to linking data on student achievement to teacher compensation and Utah Code, Section 53A-10-106 [see Appendix 2] provides that an educator evaluation program adopted at the local level shall include multiple lines of evidence such as “student achievement data.”
VI. 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)³ 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

³ See Appendix D for more on participating LEA MOUs and for a model MOU.
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—\textit{(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.

\textit{In the text box below, the State shall describe its current status in meeting the criterion, as well as projected goals as described in \textit{(A)(1)(ii)}. 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 \textit{(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 \textit{(A)(1)(ii)(b)}, below).
- The completed summary table indicating which LEA leadership signatures have been obtained (see Summary Table for \textit{(A)(1)(ii)(c)}, below).

Evidence for \textit{(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)

(A)(1)(i) Comprehensive Reform Agenda

Utah’s Comprehensive Reform Plan [see Appendix 3] is based on the goals adopted by the Utah State Board of Education as part of its Promises to Keep effort. Promises to Keep is a statement of vision and mission for Utah's system of public education. The statement relies on the language of the Utah Constitution for its central premise. It is intended to provide focus to the work of the State Board of Education, the Utah State Office of Education (USOE), all LEAs (district and charter schools), and local boards of education within the general control and supervision of the Board. The premise of Promises to Keep is that there are essential, core "promises" that leaders in the public education system should be clear about with citizens of Utah; that these "promises" are made as part of the civic compact at work as the citizens of Utah give into our hands resources for the public education system; and that citizens should have high expectations regarding our success in the essential "promised" work of public education.

The fifteen (15) projects and all of the goals associated with this application have been aligned to the Utah State Board of Education’s mission, goals, and the four ARRA reform areas. They were derived from an exhaustive look at our state data, an evaluation of our current conditions and efforts, the input from education roundtables held throughout the state, and feedback from our education stakeholders. Special attention has been given to Reform Area Three: Great Teachers and Leaders. High-quality instruction is the most important factor to improving student success. It is also, perhaps, the least well measured part of our public education system. Developing and implementing tools to measure and improve the quality of instruction is a centerpiece of our plan.
Current Status in Implementing Reforms in the Four Reform Areas

Over the past two decades Utah has engaged in many successful initiatives, beginning with the establishment of state core standards in the 1980's (Reform Area 1), that support the four reform areas. Utah's LEAs have been part of the core curriculum development process and have a long history of success with well-defined sets of standards and aligned assessments. Utah has core curriculum standards and master plans for achievement in the following core areas: language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, fine arts, health/physical education, library media, and each Career Technical Education (CTE) career area. The Utah State Office of Education (USOE) holds monthly meetings that focus on curriculum and instruction with all of the LEAs in the state and is successfully implementing a number of projects designed to improve student achievement and reduce achievement gaps. The USOE also has developed products that have resulted in increased student achievement. To date, only one Utah Title I school has been identified as a persistently low-performing school under ESEA. The USOE staff believes that the combination of projects that they have developed and implemented have contributed to the State's success in improving student outcomes state wide. The following examples of State initiatives demonstrate the current status of projects implemented in the four reform areas:

Reform Area One: Adopting Standards and Assessments that Prepare Students to Succeed in the Workplace

- The K-3 Reading Initiative, which began in 2004, has successfully combined the use of professional development (PD) and school-based reading coaches, who use a three-tiered reading approach, and state developed Student Tutoring Achievement in Reading (STAR) Program to prevent and remediate the reading difficulties of kindergarten through third grade students. This ongoing initiative is funded through a combination of legislative and local LEA support.
- Utah’s Three-Tiered Model of Instruction has been in use for a decade. It is our primary special education model.
- To increase access to core learning, the USOE has extended our core standards with documents that help teachers meet the needs of students with significant cognitive disorders.
- Family Literacy Centers that are scattered throughout the state provide early intervention for English Language Learner (ELL) students and their parents. Software and other instructional strategies are used to jumpstart student language acquisition.
• Our Extended-day Kindergarten Program, which focuses on placing at-risk students in full-day kindergarten programs, has shown success in significantly improving reading and mathematics outcomes for participating students.

• Our 4-6 Mathematics Initiative has shown that a combination of intense (PD), coaching, and financial incentives for teachers leads to increases in grade 4-6 mathematics achievement.

• Our CTE program has resulted in increased graduation rates. In addition, over 200,000 Skills Certification Exams are successfully completed annually. The CTE standards that have been updated to align with business, industry, and higher education. New programs, such as engineering, biotech, information technology, and Pro-Start, which is a professional culinary arts program, have been successfully expanded. The parent and teen guide outlining high school to college in career pathways has been distributed to over 100,000 students. Students throughout the state have access to these programs through onsite and/or distance learning. Utah has had an aligned criterion-referenced testing program since the early 1980’s.

Reform Area Two: Building Data Systems that Measure Student Growth and Success, and Inform Teachers and Principals about How They Can Improve Instruction

• Our longitudinal data system has been in compliance with the America COMPETES Act for several years, and we have had the ability to exchange student demographic and achievement data since 2007.

• Our concurrent enrollment program allows motivated students to graduate with associate degrees and receive higher education scholarships from all higher education institutions. Utah has an Early College High School Program that focuses on encouraging students from underrepresented groups to pursue a science and engineering associate degrees and receive automatic admission to state colleges and universities.

• The Utah Mentor Teacher Academy has given special education teachers and coaches access to a data system to track ongoing student progress.

• The USOE’s Utah Test Item Pool (UTIPS) Program provides teachers with pool items they may use for formative math and reading assessments. The USOE holds an annual Secondary Data Institute that provides intensive PD in data use, data
collection, and data interpretation for secondary principals. Our Title I System of Support, which was developed in connection with the Southwest Comprehensive Regional Center at WestEd, uses school support teams, research-based appraisals, and improvement grants to help struggling Title I schools and LEAs receiving Title I funds develop their capacity to improve instruction.

**Reform Area Three: Recruiting, Developing, and Retaining Effective Teachers and Principals, Especially Where They Are Need Most**

- A Principals Literacy Institute that trains 30-50 elementary principals annually in high quality instructional strategies in reading has been highly successful.
- Through signing bonuses and tuition scholarships, our Public Education Job Enhancement Program (PEJEP) has been very successful in recruiting and retaining teachers in hard to find content areas.
- Utah’s ARL system gives non-traditional teacher candidates multiple ways to become teachers. Our retention rates for Alternative Route to Licensure (ARL) candidates are higher than the national average, and such licensure routes are supported in state statutes and through USOE sponsored courses and ongoing monitoring.
- Utah’s secondary Utah Science Technology and Research (USTAR) Program extends teacher pay for math and science and extends the school year.

**Reform Area Four: Turning around Lowest Achieving Schools**

With our Title I, Part A funding, USOE developed a system of support for struggling schools, in collaboration with WestEd, which includes a requirement for school leadership teams, an instructional appraisal process, and identification of the strengths and challenges of the school, and revision of the school’s school improvement plans. The USOE School Support Team monitors progress through data analysis and reference to the appraisal rubrics. Because of the System of Support, of the 29 “alert” schools for 2008-2009, only two moved into improvement status for 2009-2010. The fifteen schools in improvement status in 2008-2009 also improved. Fourteen achieved adequate yearly progress (AYP), five exited improvement status altogether, and nine will exit if they
make AYP next year. No Utah schools are currently in corrective action or restructuring. Utah has had only one school that has gone through a restructuring process. West Middle School, in the Uintah School District, had not achieved AYP for several years. Under the direction of the USOE Support Team, the district leadership considered closing the school and sending the students to a school in another town 30 miles away. The Uintah School Board held a public hearing that was well attended by the Ute Tribal Council, the School Board, and parents of the students attending the school. During the course of the meeting, there was a commitment by the parents and the Tribal Council that they would increase the level of intervention in the case of truant students if a school could remain in their community. The School Board decided to use a turnaround model. The Board tore down the older, existing middle school and built a new K-8 school. The District hired one of the most dynamic in the district to open the new school with a staff that was hand picked. The adjacent elementary school, R. Todd Elementary was also closed. The newly constituted school, Eagle Elementary, opened as a K-8 school using an elementary model, which kept students primarily with one teacher for the school year. There are new curriculum areas of emphasis and focus, a stronger data driven delivery system, and much greater school to community collaboration. The school made AYP its first year of operation.

*Utah’s Comprehensive Reform Plan* [see Appendix 3] is designed to increase Utah's the system-wide capacity to successfully address the key elements needed K-12 reform. Specifically, the plan will help us achieve literacy by third grade, increase effective teaching K-12, assist us in creating school environments that are more conducive to learning, and will assist us in engaging the community in turning around struggling schools. The following outline of *Utah’s Comprehensive Reform Plan* includes a brief description for the proposed projects in each of the four reform areas. Each description is accompanied with the rationale for including the project in the plan. State goals, student outcomes, and supporting rationales align with the projects and key activities. More detailed descriptions of the activities are outlined in a table that is included in Appendix 3.

*Utah will use Race to the Top (RTTT) funds to meet the following measurable student outcome goals:*
**Goal 1:** Beginning with baseline data from July 2009, Utah will **decrease the number** of K-12 students who are not at grade-level proficiency in literacy as measured by the state Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) required criterion-referenced tests (CRT) and National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) scores by **5%** per administration.

**Goal 2:** Beginning with baseline data from July 2009, Utah will **decrease the number** of K-12 students who are not at grade-level proficiency in numeracy as measured by the state ESEA required CRT and NAEP scores by **5%** per administration.

**Goal 3:** Beginning with baseline data from July 2009, Utah will **decrease the number** of students not graduating from high school by **5%** per year.

**Goal 4:** Beginning with baseline data from July 2009, Utah will **decrease the achievement gap** for student subgroups. The following chart shows baseline and goal percentages by subgroup:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>84% prof</td>
<td>91% prof</td>
<td>73% prof</td>
<td>84% prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>65% prof</td>
<td>79% prof</td>
<td>45% prof</td>
<td>68% prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>85% prof</td>
<td>91% prof</td>
<td>73% prof</td>
<td>84% prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>60% prof</td>
<td>76% prof</td>
<td>44% prof</td>
<td>67% prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>58% prof</td>
<td>75% prof</td>
<td>42% prof</td>
<td>66% prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>71% prof</td>
<td>83% prof</td>
<td>54% prof</td>
<td>73% prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>69% prof</td>
<td>82% prof</td>
<td>55% prof</td>
<td>73% prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ Disadvantaged</td>
<td>52% prof</td>
<td>72% prof</td>
<td>41% prof</td>
<td>65% prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWD</td>
<td>47% prof</td>
<td>69% prof</td>
<td>42% prof</td>
<td>66% prof</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reform Area One Measurable Goals: Adopting Standards and Assessments that Prepare Students to Succeed in the Workplace

**Goal 1:** By **August 2010**, Utah will adopt and begin implementation of national K-12 standards in mathematics and literacy created in conjunction with the Council of Chief State School Officers national consortium.

**Goal 2:** By **July 2011**, Utah will develop and implement high quality instructional materials to support the adoption and implementation of the Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics Common Core State Standards.
Goal 3: By July 2012, Utah will align mathematics and English standards between all high schools and Utah public and private institutions of higher education to increase student success in the first year of post-secondary instruction.

Goal 4: By 2012, Utah will develop a system to monitor student enrollment in courses preparing students for post-secondary education that will provide feedback to students, parents, and schools.

Goal 5: By 2014, Utah, working with national consortia, will implement high quality assessments that are aligned with the standards to determine student academic achievement.

Path to Achieving Identified Goals

Implementation of the following projects will allow Utah to meet Reform Area One Goals and our student outcome goals.

Project One: New Common Core State Standards in Reading/Language Arts and in Mathematics (supports Reform Area One Goals 1 and 2 and Competitive Priority 2: STEM)

Upon adoption of the Common Core State Standards, Utah will prepare and provide PD to support implementation of the new Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics Common Core State Standards. **Rationale:** Utah has successfully used rigorous core standards for over twenty years. The adoption of nationally recognized, relevant Common Core Standards will provide a more stable set of expectations for teachers, students, parents, higher education, and other interested stakeholders. This will result in greater consistency in teacher lesson preparation, concept instruction, and improvement in student outcomes.

Project Two: Using the Common Core Standards to Improve Reading Instruction (supports Reform Area One Goals 1 and 2)

Utah will (1) begin development of Web-based lesson plans for reading/languages arts areas that ensure alignment across schools/classrooms regardless of variations in materials and which capture the experience and talents of master teachers and the use of best practices; (2) embed a reading strand into the science, social studies, healthy lifestyles, and fine arts cores, and CTE standards; (3) hire an adolescent literacy specialist and support staff to assist with LEA outreach, PD, and development of common core materials
(4) Implement recommendations for the expansion of the literacy initiative through eighth grade with a focus on adolescent literacy; and (5) continue to support the work of the Family Literacy Centers and the use of ELL software to assist students with acquisition of English academic language skills and increase reading/language arts proficiency. **Rationale:** The adoption of new Common Core State Standards gives Utah the opportunity to address all aspects of effective delivery of reading instruction. Using lessons learned from our successful K-3 Literacy Initiative, PD, coaching, and use of Utah's Three-Tiered Model of Reading Instruction will help us implement the new Core. Expanding our literacy initiative, while implementing the new Core, will help us increase our capacity to deliver high quality reading instruction that will, in subsequent years, increase student achievement in reading/language arts, increase our high school graduation rate, and increase college enrollment.

**Project Three: Using the Common Core Standards to Ensure Mathematics Literacy for All Utah Students (supports Reform Area One Goals 1 and 2 and Competitive Priority 2: STEM)**

Utah will begin development of Web-based lesson plans for mathematics that ensure alignment across schools/classrooms regardless of variations in materials and which capture the experience and talents of master teachers and the use of best practice; create rigorous and relevant math courses that are an alternative to the traditional calculus track, while avoiding the "historic" problem of "dumbing down"; and prepare and implement recommendations for a state K-6 mathematics initiative and an Algebra mathematics initiative. **Rationale:** The adoption of new Common Core Standards gives Utah an opportunity to address all aspects of effective delivery of mathematics instruction. Using lessons learned from our successful 4-6 Mathematics Initiative, PD and coaching will help us implement the new core. Expanding our mathematics initiative, while implementing the new core, will help us increase our capacity to deliver high quality mathematics instruction, which will, in subsequent years, increase our high school graduation rate and increase college enrollment.

**Project Four: Ensuring Postsecondary Success (supports Reform Area One Goals 3 and 4, Competitive Priority 2: STEM, and Priority 5: Invitational Priority - P-20 Coordination, Vertical and Horizontal)**

Utah will hire a project manager and support staff to create annual information for students and parents regarding career and college
pathways and aligned coursework beginning at the end of sixth grade and continuing through twelfth grade; revise and add academic pathways to the career pathway materials; work with LEAs and higher education to advise and initiate secondary renewal and reform; continue coordination with higher education to ensure that dual and concurrent enrollment courses that may lead to an associate degree (AD) are offered and develop at least five areas of emphasis for ADs that include sufficient flexibility to accommodate academic and CTE issues; using lessons learned from Utah's highly effective Advanced Placement (AP) program, work with two high need LEAs as a pilot to ensure that disadvantaged subgroups have quality access to AP and concurrent enrollment programs; coordinate with higher education to review and ensure that English and mathematics courses are vertically and horizontally aligned and that other current courses required for graduation are aligned to student needs for career and college readiness; review the data and reports from current STEM initiatives and propose continued, enhanced, or new initiatives, including CTE initiatives, that increase student participation in the study of STEM fields; and work with business, industry, and higher education partners to define needs for a quality workforce and develop instruction to support acquisition of skills to meet those needs. **Rationale:** Utah has implemented many successful initiatives designed to help secondary students prepare for college and careers. Enhancing these initiatives and using lessons learned from the National High School Center (NHSC) reports will help Utah deliver the Core in a manner that leads to greater student engagement, higher levels of achievement, and horizontal and vertical coordination between school levels and higher education.

**Project Five: Improving Early Learning Outcomes (supports Invitational Priority 3: Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes)**

Utah will hire an early literacy specialist; review the data and reports from Utah's K-3 Reading Initiative and use the data to identify and replicate high-performing projects and practices; maintain and expand full-day kindergarten to eligible students and use data to identify and replicate high-performing projects and practices; and support early intervention programs for high-need Pre-K children by reviewing the data and reports from the Utah Preparing Students Today for a Rewarding Tomorrow (UPSTART) Early Learning Initiative (a Waterford Institute Project for in-home, computer-based preparation for school success), CTE sponsored preschools, and
other state preschool programs. **Rationale:** The foundation for success in reading and mathematics begins before kindergarten. This is especially true for economically disadvantaged students, English language learners, and students with disabilities. As we have learned from our Optional Extended Day Kindergarten Initiative, early intervention at the preschool level is essential to narrowing achievement gaps.

**Project Six: Refinement of Utah Performance Assessment System for Students (U-PASS) Testing (supports Reform Area One Goal 5)**

Utah will UOSE will design and implement testing systems and high quality assessments that are aligned to the new Common Core State Standards and that will evaluate both student growth and status, including testing systems for English Language Learners (ELLs) and students with disabilities; design and implement testing systems that use computer technology; continue and expand the current testing pilot; revise the high school "exit" exam requirements; provide assistance and recommendations for informal, ongoing formative assessment of math and reading in all schools; and create a common, standard kindergarten entry and post assessment.

**Rationale:** Utah has successfully used rigorous core assessments for over twenty years. The adoption of nationally recognized, relevant Common Core State Standards will require development and adoption of assessments that align with the new standards.

**Reform Area 2 Measurable Goals: Building Data Systems that Measure Student Growth and Success, and Inform Teachers and Principals about How They Can Improve Instruction**

**Goal 1:** By December 2014, Utah will fully implement a statewide, high-quality longitudinal data system to measure the academic achievement of students and link their achievement to educator readiness and preparation.

**Goal 2:** By December 2014, all participating LEAs will adopt and implement local instructional improvement systems to support the effective use of student data to inform instruction.

**Goal 3:** By December 2014, all LEA data teams, including at minimum superintendents, curriculum directors, and assessment directors, will participate in PD using the statewide data and create a plan for ongoing LEA training on the system.
Path to Achieving Identified Goals

Implementation of the following projects will allow Utah to meet Reform Area Two Goals and our student outcome goals.

**Project One: Expansion and Adaptation of State Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) (supports Reform Area Two Goal 1)**

This project consists of seven (7) activities. The first four activities summarize SLDS grant application outcomes. The Utah ARRA/2009 SLDS grant application brings several state agencies together to share de-identified data and coordinate analyses and research using those data. Completion of this project will allow Utah to fully implement a statewide, high-quality, longitudinal data system. **Rationale:** Utah has a P-20 longitudinal system that meets most of the America COMPETES required elements. Utah has applied for funds to enhance its existing capabilities in its ARRA/2009 SLDS grant application (#384A1000056).

**Project Two: Effective Data Access for Instructional Improvement (supports Reform Area Two Goal 1)**

Utah will increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems (technology-based tools and other strategies) that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with meaningful support and actionable data to systemically manage continuous instructional improvement that provides teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decisions-making, professional development activities, and overall effectiveness. The original targeted completion date for this project was 2025. SLDS grant funding will be used to accelerate completion within 5-8 years. **Rationale:** Utah has a robust longitudinal data system. For data to be used effectively to improve instruction and increase student learning, the appropriate technology must be used to collect and house the data, as well as provide accessibility to the data.

**Project Three: Effective Data Use (supports Reform Area Two Goals 2 and 3)**

Utah will Using lessons learned from Utah’s Data Institute, Utah will provide professional development (PD) to LEAs in the use of data to inform instruction, professional learning communities and school improvement strategies, and in the understanding and use of at-risk, dropout, and graduation data. The original targeted completion date for this project was 2025. RTTT funds will be used to accelerate completion within five years. **Rationale:** For data to be effectively used to improve instruction and increase student
learning, district administrators, principals, and teachers must have the skills, knowledge, and dispositions they need to use data effectively.

Reform Area 3: Recruiting, Developing, and Retaining Effective Teachers and Principals, Especially Where They Are Needed Most

Goal 1: By December 2014, a new statewide continuum of support for developing practicing teachers and principals will be implemented.

Goal 2: By December 2014, 90% of Utah's K-12 teachers will participate in LEA evaluation systems that require the use of high-quality instructional strategies as evidenced by appropriate and approved measures of quality instruction (including observations of teaching, student growth data, and stakeholder evaluation).

Goal 3: By December 2014, all participating LEAs will have in place a system by which effective and highly effective teachers and principals are identified by the schools and LEAs in which they work.

Goal 4: By December 2014, all participating LEAs will have in place a system by which ineffective teachers and principals are identified by the schools and LEAs in which they work and are remediated or terminated.

Path to Achieving Identified Goals

Implementation of the following projects will allow Utah to meet Reform Area 3 goals, which support Utah's efforts to achieve the State's student outcome goals.

Project One: UCSEE - Utah Continuum of Support for Educator Excellence (supports Reform Area Three Goal 1)

Part A - Teacher Leadership Pathways; Pre-Practitioner Preparation

Utah will (1) develop and implement teacher preparation program approval standards to augment current approval by National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) and ensure quality
in all teacher preparation programs in Utah. Standards will focus on millennial teachers, 21st Century learners, robust field experiences, and pedagogy embedded in content. Approval processes will include accountability measures, timelines, performance expectations; (2) design and implement a pilot resident PD school model for resident teacher preparation, including co-teaching assignments, internships, and job-embedded coursework; (3) continue the use of the Utah State Office of Education Alternative Route to Licensure (ARL) Program and expand support for ARL candidates in urban, suburban, and rural settings; and (4) adopt a statewide as an exit requirement from teacher preparation programs.

Part B - Teacher Leadership Pathways; Novice Practitioner

Utah will (1) provide a pilot program for a university and LEAs to provide collaborative induction support as a seamless transition to full licensure; (2) provide start-up funds for LEAs to improve induction programs that include release time to work with trained mentors, reduce class loads, and reduce non-classroom assignments; (3) expand rural outreach for educators to meet "highly qualified" teacher requirements through online coursework and online community support, (4) administer the Teaching Working Conditions Survey statewide in order to improve learning environments for students and retention rates for Utah educators; (5) implement statewide equitable distribution plans and monitor compliance.

Part C - Teacher Leadership Pathways; Developing Practitioner

Utah will (1) adopt high quality PD standards to ensure that professional learning for all educators results in positive changes in student learning; (2) implement the PD National Staff Development Council (NSDC) Standards Assessment Inventory (SAI) to establish baseline information regarding the effectiveness of current statewide PD efforts; (3) develop and provide resources for LEAs to provide career advancement and leadership opportunities (i.e., learning teams, coaching, peer evaluations); and (4) provide standards and innovation configurations for effective professional learning communities.

Part D - Teacher Leadership Pathways; Experienced Practitioner

Utah will (1) adopt a new teacher leader licensure level with accompanying performance standards, performance assessments, coursework, and criteria for advancement; (2) develop a cadre of teacher leaders who are expert in using formative assessment to
improve student learning resulting in capacity building for LEAs; (3) develop models of differentiated staffing options (i.e., full-time release: one-third with new teachers, one-third on school projects, one-third working with universities; and (4) provide leadership opportunities for teacher leaders outside of the classroom to enhance their content knowledge and leadership skills. **Rational:** Utah is in the process of establishing a statewide continuum of support for developing and practicing teachers. This initiative will help ensure that Utah educators will have opportunities for personal advancement and ongoing PD and support throughout the scope of their career. It will also help ensure that Utah students have access to high quality instruction in every classroom.

**Project Two: Principal Leadership Pathway (supports Reform Area Three Goal 1)**
Utah will (1) improve administrator preparation programs through: (a) development of state standards that include a strong focus on instructional leadership and (b) review and revise entrance requirements into principal evaluation programs; (2) work with LEAs to develop and implement collaborative induction and coaching programs for principals; (3) develop and implement principal standards of practice focused on instructional leadership; and (4) provide high quality PD, including online communities, face-to-face instruction, and regional academies for practicing principals. **Rationale:** Utah recognizes that the key to sustaining high quality instruction in every classroom is the school principal. Developing a continuum of support beginning with quality principal preparation and continuing support will ensure that principals will have the skills, knowledge, and dispositions they need to be effective instructional leaders. This will help ensure that Utah students have access to high quality instruction in every classroom.

**Project Three: Measures of Instructional Quality (supports Reform Area Three Goals 2-4)**
Utah will (1) revise the Utah Professional Teaching Standards to incorporate measures of instructional quality, stages of career of development, and expectations of student growth; (2) combine the services of two online vendors to provide models of instructional excellence including video vignettes, online communities, and online resources; (3) create model tools to facilitate measurement of instructional quality and provide technical assistance for LEA adaptation and implementation; (4) develop and implement a statewide framework for annual teacher evaluation, which includes parental input, student growth, and measures of instructional quality; and (5) create a state framework for principal evaluation focused on instructional leadership with technical support and PD for effective
Implementation. Rationale: Utah's current evaluation system requires that teachers and principals be evaluated every three years. This system is used to inform full certification, retention, tenure, and potential removal from the profession. This project will add measures of student growth and instructional quality. It will also change evaluations to annual evaluations, inform professional development, and be used to fairly inform compensation and promotion.

Project Four: Performance Pay Pilot Program
Utah will (1) analyze the data and results from the Differentiated Compensation pilots and prepare and implement recommendations; and (2) continue using the Public Education Job Enhancement Program (PEJEP) to increase the number and percentage of effective teachers teaching mathematics, science, technology, and special education. Rationale: Utah will continue its performance pay pilot program using state and local funds. This program is helping Utah recruit, reward, and train effective teachers.

Reform Area 4: Turning around Our Lowest-Achieving Schools
Goal 1: All Title I schools identified as persistently lowest achieving will immediately begin one of the four school intervention models.
Goal 2: By July 2010, Utah will have a system in place to identify secondary non-Title I schools that are at risk of becoming persistently lowest achieving and begin school improvement intervention.

Path to Achieving Identified Goals
Implementation of the following projects will allow Utah to meet Reform Area 4 goals, which support Utah's efforts to achieve the State's student outcome goals.

Project One: System of Support for Title I Struggling School (supports Reform Area Four Goal 1)
Utah will continue its established System of Support for Title I School Improvement Schools using Title I School Improvement and ARRA School Improvement Grant funds. Rationale: Utah’s System of Support has been very effective in preventing Title I schools from reaching the persistently low-performing schools designation. This program is helping turn around Utah Title I schools by
focusing resources on research-based strategies that lead to increased achievement.

Project Two: Preventing Low-Achieving Secondary Schools (supports Reform Area Four Goal 2)
Utah will use lessons learned and RTTT funds to prevent select non-Title I secondary schools from becoming persistently low-performing schools. Rationale: Utah’s System of Support has been very effective in preventing Title I schools from reaching the persistently low-performing schools designation. This program is helping turn around Utah Title I schools by focusing resources on research based strategies that lead to increased achievement.

(A)(1)(ii) Commitment of Participating LEAs to State Plan and Effective Implementation of Four Reform Areas
When Utah decided to make an RTTT application, a process was developed that brought all LEAs and other stakeholders together to frankly review our current conditions; engage in honest, transparent discussion about our needs; and come to consensus regarding what our future efforts should be. In all of these discussions, our need to meet our responsibilities to Utah’s children was forefront. We conducted roundtables and informal discussions and shared information with legislators, colleges of education, business leaders, our teacher and principal associations, and Parent Teacher Association, in addition to LEAs. Due to this collaboration, our LEAs and the State Office of Education have reached consensus on our comprehensive reform plan. Of our 105 LEAs, 100% of our 41 district LEAs and 91.4% of our 70 charter LEAs have elected to become participating LEAs. They are committed and anxious to receive funding and begin implementing the plan. The RTTT funds will give Utah an unprecedented opportunity to widely disseminate successful practices, jumpstart reform, and increase LEA capacity for meeting RTTT student outcome goals.

(A)(1)(iii) Participating LEAs Translate into Broad Statewide Impact and Ability for State to Reach Goals Overall and by Student Subgroup
Because 96.4% of our LEAs (100% of district LEAs and 94.2% of charter school LEAs) have elected to be participating LEAs, our reform efforts will directly impact nearly every student in the state. This commitment translates into 41 of 41 district LEAs, 64 of 70
charter LEAs, which includes 994 schools, 560,017 K-12 students, and 197,167 students in poverty (99.8% of students in poverty). Such a high percentage of participation will allow us to reach critical mass in a short period of time, which will allow us to make the envisioned improvements in our student outcomes, including closing the achievement gap, and increasing postsecondary transition and retention. Regardless of RTTT funding, Utah is committed to working on these goals.

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

- See Appendix 4 for an example of Utah's standard Participating LEA MOU.
- See table below for evidence of (A)(1)(ii)(b).
- See table below for evidence of (A)(1)(ii)(c).

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

- See table below for evidence of (A)(1)(iii).
- See bulleted points above the table in section (A)(1)(i) under Reform Area Four for the overall goals, the table shows the goals by subgroup. See below for adjusted goals if Utah were not to receive a Race to the Top award.

State Goals if Utah Did Not Receive RTTT Program Grant Award:

Because Utah’s RTTT goals were adopted by the Utah State Board of Education as part of its Promises to Keep Initiative, the areas of emphasis would remain the same if Utah was not awarded RTTT funding. However, the goal activities and timelines would change significantly. Without RTTT funds, Utah does not have the capacity to move all four reform areas forward quickly and simultaneously. Although we have a high taxing effort, Utah has the largest percentage of children in the United States per capita, the highest birth rate per capita, and the lowest state taxable property base (21%) due to the huge percentage of land within our geographic borders owned by the federal government. In the last decade, our population has grown by 27%. We are rapidly becoming more diverse and have more students with critical needs. During this same time period, our legislature has increase funding for
education by 48%. Even with this increase, Utah is dead last in every per student funding category in the nation. The federal
corribution to education in Utah is $650 per student compared to the national average of $968. The fact that Utah performs as well as
it does, is a tribute to the dedication of our teachers, parents, and administrators. The same dedication will support our RTTT efforts.

Utah’s intent is to use the RTTT funding to jumpstart, expedite, and otherwise dramatically speed up the projects necessary for
achieving the RTTT goals. Without the requested funding, Utah lacks the capacity and funding to meet the identified timelines. The
target completion of the Promises to Keep Initiative if limited to current funding resources would be fifteen years (2025). The
following adjustments would need to be made in the Reform Area and Student Outcome Goals if Utah does not receive the requested
funds:

**Adjusted (Non-RTTT Funded) Student Outcome Goals:**

**Goal 1:** Beginning with baseline data from July 2009, Utah will **decrease the number** of K-12 students who are not at grade-level
proficiency in literacy as measured by the state Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) required criterion-referenced tests
(CRT) and National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) scores by **1%** per administration.

**Goal 2:** Beginning with baseline data from July 2009, Utah will **decrease the number** of K-12 students who are not at grade-level
proficiency in numeracy as measured by the state ESEA required CRT and NAEP scores by **1%** per administration.

**Goal 3:** Beginning with baseline data from July 2009, Utah will **decrease the number** of students not graduating from high school by
**1%** per year.

**Goal 4:** Beginning with baseline data from July 2009, Utah will **decrease the achievement gap** for student subgroups. The following
table shows baseline and goal percentages by subgroup:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>84% prof</td>
<td>88% prof</td>
<td>73% prof</td>
<td>77% prof</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 – Revised Baseline and Goal Percentages by Subgroup
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>65%</th>
<th>69%</th>
<th>45%</th>
<th>49%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Econ Disadvantaged</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWD</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjusted (Non-RTTT Funded) Reform Area One Measurable Goals: Adopting Standards and Assessments that Prepare Students to Succeed in the Workplace

**Goal 1:** By **August 2016**, Utah will adopt and begin implementation of national K-12 standards in mathematics and literacy created in conjunction with the Council of Chief State School Officers National Consortium.

**Goal 2:** By **July 2016**, Utah will develop and implement high quality instructional materials to support the adoption and implementation of the Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics Common Core State Standards.

**Goal 3:** By **July 2016**, Utah will align mathematics and English standards between all high schools and Utah public and private institutions of higher education to increase student success in the first year of post-secondary instruction.

**Goal 4:** By **2016**, Utah will develop a system to monitor student enrollment in courses preparing students for post-secondary education that will provide feedback to students, parents, and schools.

**Goal 5:** By **2016**, Utah, working with national consortia, will implement high quality assessments that are aligned with the standards to determine student academic achievement.

Adjusted (Non-RTTT Funded) Reform Area 2 Measurable Goals: Building Data Systems that Measure Student Growth and Success, and Inform Teachers and Principals about How They Can Improve Instruction

**Goal 1:** By **December 2020**, Utah will fully implement a statewide, high-quality longitudinal data system to measure the academic achievement of students and link their achievement to educator readiness and preparation.
Goal 2: By December 2025, all participating LEAs will adopt and implement local instructional improvement systems to support the effective use of student data to inform instruction.

Goal 3: By December 2025, all LEA data teams, including at minimum superintendents, curriculum directors, and assessment directors, will participate in PD using the statewide data and create a plan for ongoing LEA training on the system.

Adjusted (Non-RTTT Funded) Reform Area 3: Recruiting, Developing, and Retaining Effective Teachers and Principals, Especially Where They Are Needed Most

Goal 1: By December 2025, a new statewide continuum of support for developing practicing teachers and principals will be implemented.

Goal 2: By December 2025, 90% of Utah's K-12 teachers will participate in LEA evaluation systems that require the use of high-quality instructional strategies as evidenced by appropriate and approved measures of quality instruction (including observations of teaching, student growth data, and stakeholder evaluation).

Goal 3: By December 2025, all participating LEAs will have in place a system by which effective and highly effective teachers and principals are identified by the schools and LEAs in which they work.

Goal 4: By December 2025, all participating LEAs will have in place a system by which ineffective teachers and principals are identified by the schools and LEAs in which they work and are remediated or terminated.

Adjusted (Non-RTTT Funded) Reform Area 4: Turning around Our Lowest-Achieving Schools

NA – Reform Area 4 goals would not need adjustment if Utah did not receive the requested RTTT funds.

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

• See tables below for evidence of (A)(1)(ii) and (A)(1)(iii).

Summary Table for (A)(1)(ii)(b)
### Elements of State Reform Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Standards and Assessments</th>
<th>Number of LEAs Participating (#)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participating LEAs (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Data Systems to Support Instruction</th>
<th>Number of LEAs Participating (#)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participating LEAs (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Use of local instructional improvement systems</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Professional development on use of data</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Availability and accessibility of data to researchers</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Great Teachers and Leaders</th>
<th>Number of LEAs Participating (#)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participating LEAs (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Measure student growth</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Design and implement evaluation systems</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Conduct annual evaluations</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)(a) Use evaluations to inform professional development</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)(b) Use evaluations to inform compensation, promotion and retention</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)(c) Use evaluations to inform tenure and/or full certification</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)(d) Use evaluations to inform removal</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals: | | |
| (i) High-poverty and/or high-minority schools | 105 | 94.6% |
| (ii) Hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas | 105 | 94.6% |

| (D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals: | | |
| (i) Quality professional development | 105 | 94.6% |
| (ii) Measure effectiveness of professional development | 105 | 94.6% |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools</th>
<th>Number of LEAs Participating (#)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participating LEAs (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Signatures acquired from participating LEAs:
### Number of Participating LEAs with all applicable signatures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA Demographics</th>
<th>Number of Signatures Obtained (#)</th>
<th>Number of Signatures Applicable (#)</th>
<th>Percentage (%) (Obtained / Applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEA Superintendent (or equivalent)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President of Local School Board (or equivalent, if applicable)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Teachers’ Union Leader (if applicable)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The LEAs that did not obtain the signature of the President of the local school Board all have Board meetings after the deadline. They will obtain the signature before the end of January. Most Utah charters do not have union leaders.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA Demographics</th>
<th>Participating LEAs (#)</th>
<th>Statewide (#)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Statewide (%) (Participating LEAs / Statewide)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAs</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Students</td>
<td>560,017</td>
<td>563,633</td>
<td>99.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in poverty</td>
<td>197,167</td>
<td>197,907</td>
<td>99.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[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

<p>| Name of LEA here          | # of Schools | # of K-12 Students | # of K-12 Students in Poverty | LEA Sert. or Approved (optional) | Board of Education (if applicable) | President of Local School (if applicable) | Uses Standard Terms &amp; Conditions? | (B)(3) | (C)(3)(a) | (C)(3)(b) | (C)(3)(c) | (D)(2)(b) | (D)(2)(g) | (D)(2)(h) | (D)(2)(l) | (D)(2)(m) | (D)(2)(v) | (D)(2)(v) | (D)(2)(w) | (D)(2)(v) | (D)(2)(v) |
|---------------------------|--------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Alpine District           | 74           | 64,351             | 16,991                        | 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  |
| Beaver District           | 6            | 1,600              | 732                           | Y/ Y/ Y                         | Y/ Y/ Y                           | Y/ Y/ Y                               | Yes                               | Y/ Y/ Y| Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   |
| Box Elder District        | 27           | 11,052             | 4,363                         | Y/ Y/ Y                         | Y/ Y/ Y                           | Y/ Y/ Y                               | Yes                               | Y/ Y/ Y| Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   |
| Cache District            | 26           | 14,917             | 4,340                         | Y/ Y/ N                         | Y/ Y/ Y                           | Y/ Y/ Y                               | Yes                               | Y/ Y/ Y| Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   |
| Carbon District           | 11           | 3,462              | 1,779                         | Y/ Y/ Y                         | Y/ Y/ Y                           | Y/ Y/ Y                               | Yes                               | Y/ Y/ Y| Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   |
| Daggett District          | 3            | 147                | 30                            | Y/ Y/ N/ NA                     | Y/ Y/ Y                           | Y/ Y/ Y                               | Yes                               | Y/ Y/ Y| Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   |
| Davis District            | 99           | 65,452             | 17,055                        | Y/ Y/ Y                         | Y/ Y/ Y                           | Y/ Y/ Y                               | Yes                               | Y/ Y/ Y| Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   |
| Duchesne District         | 14           | 4,436              | 1,764                         | Y/ Y/ Y                         | Y/ Y/ Y                           | Y/ Y/ Y                               | Yes                               | Y/ Y/ Y| Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   |
| Emery District            | 10           | 2,316              | 1,167                         | Y/ Y/ Y                         | Y/ Y/ Y                           | Y/ Y/ Y                               | Yes                               | Y/ Y/ Y| Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   |
| Garfield District         | 9            | 931                | 447                           | Y/ Y/ Y                         | Y/ Y/ Y                           | Y/ Y/ Y                               | Yes                               | Y/ Y/ Y| Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   |
| Grand District            | 5            | 1,526              | 697                           | Y/ Y/ Y                         | Y/ Y/ Y                           | Y/ Y/ Y                               | Yes                               | Y/ Y/ Y| Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   |
| Granite District          | 114          | 68,131             | 31,226                        | Y/ Y/ Y                         | Y/ Y/ Y                           | Y/ Y/ Y                               | Yes                               | Y/ Y/ Y| Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   |
| Iron District             | 19           | 8,365              | 4,024                         | Y/ Y/ Y                         | Y/ Y/ Y                           | Y/ Y/ Y                               | Yes                               | Y/ Y/ Y| Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   |
| Jordan District           | 52           | 48,411             | 11,791                        | Y/ Y/ Y                         | Y/ Y/ Y                           | Y/ Y/ Y                               | Yes                               | Y/ Y/ Y| Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   |
| Juab District             | 5            | 2,244              | 773                           | Y/ Y/ Y                         | Y/ Y/ Y                           | Y/ Y/ Y                               | Yes                               | Y/ Y/ Y| Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   |
| Kane District             | 9            | 1,194              | 554                           | Y/ Y/ Y                         | Y/ Y/ Y                           | Y/ Y/ Y                               | Yes                               | Y/ Y/ Y| Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   | Y/ Y/ Y   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>FSM Coverage</th>
<th>Nationwide Coverage</th>
<th>Statewide Coverage</th>
<th>Federal Coverage</th>
<th>Delta Coverage</th>
<th>Yes Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Millard District</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>Y Y Y Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,338</td>
<td>Y Y Y Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebo District</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28,282</td>
<td>Y Y N Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Sanpete</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,319</td>
<td>Y Y Y Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Summit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,003</td>
<td>Y Y Y Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park City District</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,563</td>
<td>Y N Y Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piute District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>Y Y Y Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>Y Y Y Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan District</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,953</td>
<td>Y Y N Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sevier District</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4,528</td>
<td>Y Y Y Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sanpete</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,025</td>
<td>Y Y Y Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Summit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td>Y Y Y Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tintic District</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>Y Y Y Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tooele District</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13,180</td>
<td>Y Y Y Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uintah District</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6,489</td>
<td>Y Y Y Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch District</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,959</td>
<td>Y Y Y Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington District</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25,202</td>
<td>Y Y N Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>Y Y Y Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weber District</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30,417</td>
<td>Y Y Y Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake District</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23,850</td>
<td>Y Y Y Yes</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td>Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District/Academy</td>
<td>Grade(s)</td>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>SafeZone</td>
<td>SRO</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Y:Yes</td>
<td>Y:Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden District</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12,578</td>
<td>8,266</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provo District</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13,241</td>
<td>6,376</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan District</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6,123</td>
<td>3,315</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murray District</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6,515</td>
<td>1,955</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyons District</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33,184</td>
<td>7,516</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogden Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walden School Of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy For Math Engineering &amp; Science (ames)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinnacle Canyon Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldier Hollow Charter School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuacahn High School For The Performing Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Hancock Charter School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>District</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Special Ed</td>
<td>Gifted</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Magnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timpanogos Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake Arts Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Forward High</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah County Academy Of Science</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odyssey Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalupe School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oquirrh Mountain Charter School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intech Collegiate High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channing Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl G Maeser Preparatory Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwell Charter High School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista At Entrada</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beehive Science &amp; Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy (bsta)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entheos Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectrum Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cs Lewis Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch Peak Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakeview Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse Arts Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Immersion Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake Center For Science Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Star Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Washington Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith Bowen Laboratory School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Virtual Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah Webster Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td># Students</td>
<td># Teachers</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daybreak</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reagan Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monticello Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake School For The Performing Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gateway Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excelsior Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,477</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Leadership Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountainville Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Classroom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit College Preparatory Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorn Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigator Pointe Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradigm High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Rim Academy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open High School Of Utah</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Ut Acad For Math Engineering &amp; Science (nuames)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(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)
(A)(2)(i) and (A)(2)(ii) Capacity to implement high quality plan:

(A)(i)(a) Providing strong leadership and dedicated teams:
Utah has strong commitment from leadership from the Utah State Board of Education, the Governor, the Utah State Office of Education, the Governor's Deputy for Education, the LEAs, the Utah Education Association, the Utah School Superintendents Association, the Utah School Boards Association, the Utah Association of Public Charter Schools, the Utah Elementary School Principals Association, the Utah Secondary School Principals Association, the Utah PTA, The Coalition of Minorities Advisory Committee, the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, the Ute Indian Tribe, the Utah System of Higher Education, the Utah Board of Regents, the Utah Technology Council, and the Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce. At the State Office level, we have dedicated personnel serving on three teams, an oversight team, a program implementation team, and a financial and reporting team, that have been working together since the ARRA funding began. They will oversee the implementation of our statewide education reform plan. A document outlining this reform plan is included in the Appendix [see Appendix 3]. The statewide reform effort will be overseen by Superintendent Larry Shumway. Dr. Shumway has held the post of Superintendent of Public Instruction since June 2009. Previous to this position, he served as Deputy Superintendent and Director of Education Licensing. Prior to coming to the State Office, Dr. Shumway was Superintendent of the Tooele School District and previously served as Director of Alternative Schools and Programs in the Davis School District. He earned his doctorate in education at the University of Nevada in Las Vegas, and his bachelors and masters degrees at Brigham Young University.

The Utah Education Community has a well-established and strong working relationship. The support for working on this application has been widespread. The letters of support are attached in the Appendix. The education climate in the state is unusually cooperative. There is a high level of agreement among stakeholders on education issues reaching the point of consensus on Race to the Top efforts. To prepare the application, USOE conducted several outreach meetings where community leaders, business leaders, superintendents, principals, teachers, legislators, and local school board members were invited to give input into Utah's Race to the
Top proposal and our comprehensive reform effort. They were held in five different locations in regions throughout the state (Murray, Cedar City, Ogden, Riverton, and Price). Participants included the Governor, the Governor's Deputy for Education, the Speaker of the Utah House of Representatives, the Chairs of the Education Appropriation Committee, the Commissioner of Utah's Higher Education System, several Deans from Utah's colleges and university, local LEA Superintendents, the Chair of the Utah State Charter School Board Utah Education Association Representatives, and all USOE Staff. In all, over 300 individuals participated. Utah used a format where cross-role focus groups and facilitators addressed each of the reform areas. The groups were asked to answer three questions related to their reform each reform area: (1) what conditions need to be in place, (2) what policies or initiatives need to be implemented, and (3) how would you prioritize these priorities or initiatives. A summary of the stakeholder responses is in the Appendix of this application [see Appendix 5].

(A)(i)(b) Supporting LEAs
A key component of our education reform plan is to support LEAs in successfully implementing the plan’s initiatives. In the attached comprehensive Reform Plan outline, activities have been identified that will help LEAs implement promising practices, evaluate these practices’ effectiveness, and eliminate ineffective practices. The focus will be on widely disseminating and replicating effective practices statewide. The State’s role will be to use the SEA funds as a facilitator and resource for positive LEA change. The primary focus of State assistance will be helping LEAs find their best way to implement reform. All participating LEAs have signed a MOU that holds them accountable for implementing the State reform plan. The Race to the Top Oversight Team will intervene if a participating LEA does not meet its obligations.

(A)(i)(c) Effective and Efficient Operations and Processes for RTTT Grant Implementation
The Finance Reporting Team has been working together since the initial ARRA funds were received by the State. This team will be responsible for providing effective and efficient processes in budget reporting and monitoring, performance measure tracking and reporting, fund disbursement, and all other issues related to required reports.
(A)(i)(d) Using RTTT Funds to Accomplish State's Plans and Meet Targets
As part of the Comprehensive Reform Plan, the Utah State Board of Education has directed that, where feasible, other state funds, programs, and resources will be re-purposed so they will align with our Comprehensive Reform Plan. All of the directors and specialists at the state level are aware and committed to using their time and financial resources to accomplish our goals. Because our reform plan features projects and activities that are designed to jumpstart and replicate effective practices statewide, we believe we have the capacity to maintain these efforts after the funding is gone, barring any unforeseen budget reductions similar to those recently experienced due to the current recession.

(A)(i)(e) Using State Fiscal, Political, and Human Capital to Continue Successful Reforms
The Race to the Top Program Implementation Team will provide effective grant administration and oversight, program tracking and reporting, and will help LEAs use the fiscal, political, and human capital resources of the State to continue the successful funded reforms after the grant has ended.

(A)(2)(ii)
For this application, the State has received many letters of support from a broad group of stakeholders. The following list represents the support letters included in Appendix 6: Utah Board of Education President Debra Roberts, Utah School Superintendent's Association President Ronald Wolff, Utah Education Association President Kimberly Campbell, Utah Association of Secondary School Principals President Todd Quarnberg, Utah Association of Elementary School Principal Executive Director Luana Searle, Utah State Governor Gary R. Herbert, Utah State Governor's Education Deputy Christine Kearl, Utah Speaker of the House of Representatives David Clark, Utah State Senate Minority Leader Patricia W. Jones, Utah State Charter School Board Chair Brian R. Allen, Utah Association of Public Charter Schools Executive Director Steven Winitzky, Utah Parent Teacher Association President Ilene Mecham, Utah Board of Regents Chair Jed H. Pitcher, Utah School Boards Association President Barbara Corry, University of Utah College of Education Dean Michael L. Hardman, Brigham Young University David O. McKay
School of Education Dean K. Richard Young, Utah State University Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services Dean Carol J. Strong, Southern Utah University Beverly Taylor Sorenson College of Education and Human Development Dean Prent Klag, Utah Valley University School of Education Dean Briant J. Farnsworth, Weber State University Jerry and Vickie Moyes College of Education Dean Jack L. Rasmussen, Dixie College Department of Education Associate Dean Brenda Sabey, Utah College of Applied Technology President Robert O. Brems, Chamber of Commerce President Lane Beattie, the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah Chairwoman Jeanine Borchardt, Ute Indian Tribe Education Board President Raymond Murray, Utah State Board of Education Coalition of Minorities Advisory Committee Robert R. DePoe III, Utah Technology Council President & CEO Richard R. Nelson.

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

- See the Utah State Budget and Budget Narrative, Appendix 47 from Section VIII of this application for evidence of (A)(2)(i)(d).

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

- See Appendix 6 Letters of Support for evidence for (A)(2)(ii).

(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

(A)(3)(i) Progress Made in Four Reform Areas over the Past Several Years

Reform Area 1: Adopting Standards that Prepare Student to Success in the Workplace

- To increase access to core learning, the USOE has extended our core standards with documents that help teachers meet the needs of students with significant cognitive disorders.
- Utah’s Three-Tiered Model of Reading Instruction has been in use for a decade. It is our primary special education model.
- The K-3 Reading Initiative, which began in 2004, has successfully combined the use of professional development and school-based reading coaches, who use a three-tiered reading approach, and state developed Student Tutoring Achievement in Reading (STAR) Program to prevent and remediate the reading difficulties of kindergarten through third grade students. This ongoing initiative is funded through a combination of legislative and local LEA support.
- A Principals Literacy Institute that trains 30-50 elementary principals annually in high quality instructional strategies in
reading has been highly successful.

- Family Literacy Centers that are scattered throughout the state provide early intervention for ELL students and their parents. Software and other instructional strategies are used to jumpstart student language acquisition.

- Our Extended-day Kindergarten Program, which focuses on placing at-risk students in full-day kindergarten programs, has shown success in significantly improving reading and mathematics outcomes for participating students. **(Priority 3: Improving Early Learning Outcomes)**

- Our 4-6 Mathematics Initiative has shown that a combination of intense professional development, coaching, and financial incentives for teachers leads to increases in grade 4-6 mathematics achievement.

- Utah’s secondary Utah Science Technology and Research (USTAR) Program extends teacher pay for math and science and extends the school year. **(Reform Area 3 and Competitive Priority: STEM)**

- Our CTE program has resulted in increased graduation rates. In addition, over 200,000 Skills Certification Exams are successfully completed annually. The CTE standards that have been updated to align with business, industry, and higher education. New programs, such as engineering, biotech, information technology, and Pro-Start, which is a professional culinary arts program, have been successfully expanded. The parent and teen guide outlining high school to college in career pathways has been distributed to over 100,000 students. Students throughout the state have access to these programs through onsite and/or distance learning. Utah has had an aligned criterion-referenced testing program since the early 1980’s.

- USOE’s U-TIPS Program provides teachers with pool items they may use for formative math and reading assessments. The USOE holds an annual Secondary Data Institute that provides intensive professional development in data use, data collection, and data interpretation for secondary principals. Our Title I System of Support, which was developed in connection with the Southwest Comprehensive Regional, uses school support teams, research-based appraisals, and improvement grants to help struggling Title I schools and LEAs receiving Title I funds develop their capacity to improve instruction.

Reform Area 2: Building Data Systems that Measure Student Growth and Success and Inform Teachers and Principals about How
They Can Improve Instruction

- Our longitudinal data system has been in compliance with the America COMPETES Act for several years, and we have had the ability to exchange student demographic and achievement data since 2007.
- Utah’s Data Institute has been used to increase the capacity of local district administrators, principals, and teachers in using data to improve instruction and increase student learning.

Reform Area 3: Recruiting, Developing, Rewarding and Retaining Effective Teachers and Principals, Especially Where They Are Needed Most

- Through signing bonuses and tuition scholarships, our PEJEP program has been very successful in recruiting and retaining teachers in hard to find content areas.
- The Utah Mentor Teacher Academy has given special education teachers and coaches access to a data system to track ongoing student progress.
- Utah’s ARL system gives non-traditional teacher candidates multiple ways to become teachers. Our retention rates for ARL candidates are higher than the national average, and such licensure routes are supported in state statutes and through USOE sponsored courses and ongoing monitoring.
- Utah’s Pre-Practitioner Support Program, a pilot program with Salt Lake School District and the University of Utah, focuses on helping pre-service elementary teachers be successful teachers has been successful
- The Granite School District System of Support for Non-Traditional ARL teacher has helped them make a successful transition as classroom teachers
- Utah’s Differentiated Compensation Pilot currently involves six districts that are experimenting with different types of performance pay options.

Reform Area 4: Turning around Lowest Achieving Schools

With our Title I, Part A funding, USOE developed a system of support for struggling schools, in collaboration with WestEd, which
includes a requirement for school leadership teams, an instructional appraisal process, and identification of the strengths and challenges of the school, and revision of the school’s school improvement plans. The USOE School Support Team monitors progress through data analysis and reference to the appraisal rubrics. Because of the System of Support, of the twenty-nine “alert” schools for 2008-2009, only two moved into improvement status for 2009-2010. The fifteen schools in improvement status in 2008-2009 also improved. Fourteen achieved adequate yearly progress (AYP), five exited improvement status altogether, and nine will exit if they make AYP next year. No Utah schools are currently in corrective action or restructuring. Utah has had only one school that has gone through a restructuring process. West Middle School, in the Uintah School District, had not achieved AYP for several years. Under the direction of the USOE Support Team, the district leadership considered closing the school and sending the students to a school in another town 30 miles away. The Uintah School Board held a public hearing that was well attended by the Ute Tribal Council, the School Board, and parents of the students attending the school. During the course of the meeting, there was a commitment by the parents and the Tribal Council that they would increase the level of intervention in the case of truant students if a school could remain in their community. The School Board decided to use a turnaround model. The Board tore down the older, existing middle school and built a new K-8 school. The District hired one of the most dynamic in the district to open the new school with a staff that was hand picked. The adjacent elementary school, R. Todd Elementary was also closed. The newly constituted school, Eagle Elementary, opened as a K-8 school using an elementary model, which kept students primarily with one teacher for the school year. There are new curriculum areas of emphasis and focus, a stronger data driven delivery system, and much greater school to community collaboration. The school made AYP its first year of operation.

(A)(3)(ii) Improved Student Outcomes Overall and Student Subgroups Since 2003
(A)(3)(ii)(a) Increasing student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA
Since 2003, Utah has gradually increased student achievement on our ESEA required CRTs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Arts</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Af Amer</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucas</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>54.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amer Ind</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pac Is</td>
<td>64.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Inc</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWD</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In language arts, our overall student achievement increased from 78.4% proficient to 80.9% proficient. Our successes in the language arts area have been positively impacted by our K-3 Reading Initiative, our Optional Extended Day Kindergarten Program, the use of Utah’s Three-Tiered Model of Reading Instruction, and our Family Literacy Centers.

Table 5

In mathematics, our students showed growth from 2003 to 2008. In 2009, the State changed the mathematics standards and corresponding assessments. This resulted in a decline in test scores. In terms of growth from 2003 to 2008, our overall student outcomes improved from 72.4% proficiency in 2003 to 74.5% proficiency in 2008. Our increases in mathematics are related to our 4-6
Mathematics Initiative, our USTAR program, and our UTIPS data program. Another factor in our improved CRT scores is Utah’s successful Title I Program. Utah recognizes the improvement of student outcomes both overall and by subgroup for Title I schools through two state level awards.

Table 6 – 2009 NAEP Data for Grade 4 and 8

Table 7 – 2003-2007 NAEP Data for Grade 4 and 8
Utah’s overall NAEP Reading scores are significantly higher than the nation and have shown a steady increase since 2003. The Mathematics scores are also better than the nation and show consistent upward trends.

(A)(3)(ii)(b) Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics (NAEP and on the assessment required under the ESEA)

Table 8 – Achievement Gap between Ethnic/Racial Groups Over Time

Utah is gradually decreasing the gap between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics on both the NAEP and our CRTs.
Our targeted subgroups showed increases on the state **Language Arts CRT**. Our Hispanic subgroup increased their achievement from 54.6% proficient to 61.3%. Our Pacific Islander subgroup increased from 65.8% to 69.2% proficient. Our economically disadvantaged students experienced an increase from 65.8% proficient to 69.2%. Students with disabilities increased proficiency from 39.9% to 48.1%. During the same period, our ELL population declined very slightly from 53.3% proficiency in language arts in 2003 to 53.1% in 2009. We attribute this decline to a growing population of ELL students during the same period. Our successes in the language arts area have been impacted by our K-3 Reading Initiative, our Optional Extended Day Kindergarten Program, the use of Utah’s Three-Tiered Model of Reading Instruction, and our Family Literacy Centers.

Our targeted subgroups also showed increases on the state **Mathematics CRT**. Our Hispanic student improved from 51.1% proficiency to 53.1% proficiency. Our American Indian students increased their proficiency from 48.0% to 51.7%. Our Pacific Islander students grew from 58.6% proficiency to 64.9% proficiency. Our economically disadvantaged subgroup improved from 61.9% proficiency to 62.0%. Students with disabilities improved from 41.1% to 47.5% proficiency. Our ELL students experienced a decline from 51.8% to 48.4% proficiency. We attribute this decline again to the growth of this population over the last six years. Our increases in mathematics are related to our 4-6 Mathematics Initiative, our USTAR program, and our UTIPS data program. Another factor in our improved CRT scores is Utah’s successful Title I Program. Utah recognizes the improvement of student outcomes both overall and by subgroup for Title I schools through two state level awards.

The trends for subgroups on **NAEP** are as follows: in fourth grade there is a consistent upward trend and our eighth grade trends are level. The mathematics trends in fourth grade are up and in eighth grade are level with the exception of our students with disabilities, which has a slightly decreased trend.

**(A)(3)(ii)(c) Increasing high school graduation rates.**
The Utah State Office of Education (USOE) uses a Statewide Student Identifier (SSID) to accurately track each student. The class of 2007 was the first high school class to be tracked in this manner. Utah’s overall graduation rate has remained constant at 88%. The single year dropout rates have improved slightly each year from 2007 to 2009. Utah’s graduation rate for Caucasian students is relatively high at 91%. Utah’s primary challenge in this area is increasing the graduation rates of our large Hispanic population and our smaller but significantly at-risk population of American Indian students. As our population diversifies and grows, we are seeing downward trends in graduation rates among American Indian, Hispanic, and limited English proficient students. Utah is not content with an overall 88% graduation rate and is concerned and committed to reducing the gap between Caucasian and other subgroups while moving the whole state toward a 100% graduation rate. RTTT funds will enable Utah to address these gaps and continue efforts to raise the graduate rate for all subgroups by providing the necessary capacity to implement several initiatives outlined in *Utah’s Comprehensive Reform Plan* [see Appendix 3].

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

- See graphs and analysis throughout (A)(3)(ii) for summarized results from 2003 to 2009. See Appendix 7 for raw data for ESEA.

---

**(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.\(^4\)

*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.

\(^4\) 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.
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

(B)(1)(i) State’s participation in a consortium of States
In April 2009, Utah’s Governor and State Superintendent of Public Instruction signed a memorandum of agreement, which committed Utah to the Council of Chief State School Officers and National Governors Association development and adoption of Common Core State Standards in English/language arts and mathematics. The standards will be aligned with college and work expectations, be research based, include rigorous content and skills, and will be internationally benchmarked. At the present time, 48 states, 2 territories, and the District of Columbia are committed to developing this common core. The college and career readiness standards were released in September 2009. The K-12 core standards will be released in January 2010. An advisory group, including experts from Achieve, Inc., ACT, the College Board, the National Association of State School Boards of Education, and the State Higher Education Executive Officers, is providing advice and guidance on this initiative.

(B)(1)(ii) Plan and Commitment for Adopting Commitment to and progress toward adopting a common set of K-12 standards
Utah is committed to adopting the common set of K-12 standards by August 2, 2010, or at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 if the standards are not yet complete. Our Comprehensive Reform Plan details how we plan to help the LEAs adopt the new standards.
### Evidence for (B)(1)(i):
- See Appendix 8 for the Memorandum of Agreement, executed by the State, showing that it is part of a standards consortium.
- See Appendix 9 for a copy of the draft standards. It is anticipated that the standards will be released in January 2010.
- See Appendix 10 for documentation that the standards will be internationally benchmarked and will help to ensure students are prepared for college and careers.
- See Appendix 11 for a list of States participating. There are 48 States, 2 territories, and the District of Columbia participating.

### Evidence for (B)(1)(ii):
- Utah Code, Section 53A-1-401(1), [see Appendix 12] directs the Utah State Board of Education to establish rules and minimum standards for the public schools consistent with the law. The Utah State Board of Education, in accordance with this section, adopts statewide core curriculum. Under Utah State Board of Education Rule R277-700, [see Appendix 13] the Utah State Board of Education reviews curriculum standards regularly, at least every five years. The Utah State Board of Education establishes minimum credits and credit requirements attached to the standards, which impact high school graduation. Local school boards and charter school governing boards may add additional graduation requirements. Several LEAs also offer differentiated diplomas demonstrating outstanding academic achievement, exceptional citizenship, and exceptional community service. The Utah State Board of Education has already voted and agreed to adopt the Common Core State Standards.

### (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

(B)(2)(i) and (B)(2)(ii) Work Toward Jointly Developing and Implementing Common Assessments with a significant number of states.

Utah has joined four consortiums that are working toward preparing high-quality assessments aligned with the common set of K-12 standards. The first consortium is the Summative Multi-State Resources for Teachers and Education Researcher Consortium (SMARTER). Utah has been a lead state in this consortium since November 2009. SMARTER will develop a high-quality assessment system that is aligned to the standards, uses online adaptive tests, innovative item design, and open-ended items to address the full breadth of cognitive demand by the Common Core Standards. The assessments will report student, school, LEA, and state results and will include benchmarks to a variety of other achievement standards, including NAEP, international
assessments, and other benchmarks predictive of student success in college and careers. The assessments will be designed based
upon principles of universal design and will be consistent with professional standards as described by the APA/AERA/NCME
Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. The SMARTER Consortium will coordinate with MOSAIC Consortium so
that schools and LEAs will have access to a variety of high-quality instructional support assessment options. See evidence of (B)(2)
below for a list of lead and participating states. Utah was invited to participate in the Multiple Options for Student Assessment and
Instruction Consortium (MOSAIC) and has been a participant since December 1, 2009. MOSAIC is established to add complexity
and depth of use to summative assessment systems. MOSAIC will include curricular frameworks, formative and local assessment
items customized for local use, timely data turnaround, and reports generated in parent and teacher friendly formats. A major effort
of this consortium will be to develop an item bank that can be used to diagnose student strengths and deficiencies and serve as an
early warning system. See Evidence for (B)(2) for a list of lead and participating states. Utah was invited to join the Balance
Assessment Consortium on the first of January 2010. This consortium will bring together leading curriculum and assessment experts
to evaluate the new Common Core and build the most credible and well-vetted assessments in the field. The results of this effort
will be made available online in a digital platform that offers materials for curriculum building, model syllabi for specific courses
linked to the standards, and formative and summative assessments. An electronic scoring platform will support training, calibration,
benchmarking and reporting. This consortium will create a common reference examination, which includes selective response,
constructive response, and performance components aimed at higher-order skills linked to the Common Core Standards. All
components of the system will incorporate principles of universal design. In addition, designers who are skilled at developing
linguistically supportive assessments for students with learning disabilities and for non-native English speakers will be engaged
from the beginning in developing the assessments for maximum access. The evaluations will emphasize assessment of student
growth over time and on tying standards to a concept of learning progressions. See Evidence for (B)(2) for a list of states
participating in this consortium. Finally, Utah has been invited and elected to participate in the Achieve Consortium in mid-
January. This group will work on ensuring principles of comparability, college and career readiness and international benchmarking.
See Evidence for (B)(2) for a list of states in this consortium.

Evidence for (B)(2) Consortium Participation [Rachel – remember to update this]

- As of January 13, 2010, the SMARTER Consortium consisted of 14 lead states: Colorado, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, Oregon, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming; and 8 participating states: California, the District of Columbia, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Montana, Ohio, and South Carolina.

- As of January 13, 2010, there were twenty-five states in the MOSAIC consortium, three lead states and twenty-two participating states. Lead states are: Missouri, Nebraska, and Wisconsin. Participating states are: Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, New Jersey, North Dakota, Ohio Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.


- As of January 14, 2010, eighteen states had signed on for the Achieve Consortium: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Utah and Wisconsin.

- See Appendix 14 for the SMARTER MOU, Appendix 15 for the MOSAIC MOU, Appendix 16 for the Balanced Assessment Consortium MOU, and Appendix 17 for the Achieve Consortium MOU.

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

(B)(3) Supporting the Transition of Enhanced Standards and High-Quality Assessments

Utah has a long history of success with implementing well-defined sets of standards and aligned assessments, beginning with establishment of state core standards in the 1980's. As a result, Utah has well-established processes for updating and implementing new core standards and aligned assessments. These established processes are incorporated into Utah's RTTT Application Plan. The plan is a more detailed version of the plan outlined in Utah's Reform Agenda. Implementation of the following projects will allow Utah to meet Reform Area One Goals and support the transition to the new Common Core State Standards and accompanying high quality assessments. A detailed chart describing these activities (listed as Projects Two and Three under Reform Area One) is included in Appendix 3 (Project One is described in (B)(2).
Project One: New Common Core State Standards in Reading/Language and Mathematics

Project Goals (Reform Area One Goals 1 and 2):

- By **August 2010**, Utah will adopt and begin implementation of national K-12 standards in mathematics and literacy created in conjunction with the CCSSO National Consortium.
- By **July 2012**, Utah will develop and implement high quality instructional materials to support the adoption and implementation of the national standards.

**Rationale:** Utah has successfully used rigorous core standards for over twenty years. The adoption of nationally recognized, relevant Common Core State Standards will provide a more stable set of expectations for teachers, students, higher education, and other interested stakeholders. This will result in greater consistency in teacher lesson preparation, concept instruction, and improvement in student outcomes.

**Project Summary, Responsible Parties, Activities, and Timelines:** Upon adoption of the new Common Core State Standards, the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) will prepare and deliver new core standards professional development for educators, supervisors, and administrators at state and regional levels, with a focus on integration of academic core standards used across the curriculum, and support LEA’s efforts in implementing the new Common Core State Standards into daily instruction. Dr. Lynne Greenwood, USOE Curriculum and Instruction Department Director for Graduation Requirements, Personnel, and Special Projects will have responsibility for managing this project. This project consists of two (2) activities. Because Utah recently adopted new language/arts and mathematics standards and the next revision does not fall within the RTTT timeline, some RTTT funds are needed to complete this project. **Activity 1:** Professional development (PD) to support implementation of the new Reading/Language Arts Common Core State Standards. **2010/11:** PD for administrators and teacher representatives from all LEAs through a trainer-of-trainers model. LEAs share training with local stakeholders. **2011/12:** Follow-up PD. LEAs share training with local stakeholders. On-site PD support as needed for rural/small LEAs. **2012/14:** Targeted PD to LEAs with identified needs. LEAs provide targeted PD to schools with identified needs. **Activity 2:** PD to support implementation of the new Mathematics Common Core State Standards. **2011/12:** PD for administrators and teacher representatives from all LEAs.
through a trainer-of-trainers model. LEAs share training with local stakeholders. **2012/13:** Continued PD for administrators and teacher representatives. LEA provided PD for local administrators and teachers. On-site professional development support as needed for rural/small LEAs. **2013/14:** Targeted PD for LEAs with identified needs. LEAs target PD to schools with identified needs.

**Project Two: Using the Common Core Standards to Improve Reading Instruction**

**Project Goals (Reform Area One Goals 1 and 2):**

- **By August 2010,** Utah will adopt and begin implementation of national K-12 standards in mathematics and literacy created in conjunction with the CCSSO National Consortium.
- **By July 2012,** Utah will develop and implement high quality instructional materials to support the adoption and implementation of the national standards.

**Rationale:** The adoption of new Common Core State Standards gives Utah the opportunity to address all aspects of effective delivery of reading instruction. Using lessons learned from our successful K-3 Literacy Initiative, PD, coaching, and use of Utah's Three-Tiered Model of Reading Instruction will help us implement the new Core. Expanding our literacy initiative, while implementing the new Core, will help us increase our capacity to deliver high quality reading instruction that will, in subsequent years, increase student achievement in reading/language arts, increase our high school graduation rate, and increase college enrollment. **Project Summary, Responsible Parties, Activities, and Timelines:** This project consists of five (5) activities. USOE staff will (1) begin development of Web-based lesson plans for reading/language arts areas that ensure alignment across schools/classrooms regardless of variations in materials and which capture the experience and talents of master teachers and the use of best practices; (2) embed a reading strand into the science, social studies, healthy lifestyles, and fine arts Cores, and CTE standards; (3) hire an adolescent literacy specialist and support staff to assist with LEA outreach, PD, and development of Common Core materials; (4) implement recommendations for the expansion of the literacy initiative through eighth grade with a focus on
adolescent literacy; and (5) continue to support the work of the Family Literacy Centers and the use of ELL software to assist
students with acquisition of English academic language skills and increase reading/language arts proficiency. Dr. Reed Spencer,
USOE Curriculum Department Coordinator for Language Arts, K-3 Reading Initiative, Secondary Literacy, Reading First, and
Optional Extended Day Kindergarten will have responsibility for managing this project. Because Utah recently adopted new
language arts standards and the next revision does not fall within the RTTT timeline, RTTT funds are needed to complete this
project. **Activity 1:** Develop Web-based lesson plans for reading/language arts areas. **2010/12:** Create a repository site for
supporting instructional materials (e.g., lesson plans, instructional materials, "best practices" video clips) and provide PD regarding
the repository through established LEA Curriculum Directors Meetings. LEAs share repository concept with LEA stakeholders and
contribute materials for posting on repository. **2012/13:** Continue repository development. LEAs begin using repository. **2013/14:**
Complete repository by July 1, 2014. **Activity 2:** Embed a reading strand into the science, social studies, healthy lifestyles, and fine
arts Core and CTE standards. **2010/11:** Form content-specific working groups consisting of USOE and key LEA staff to develop
literacy strands for each content area. Groups develop a framework for the literacy strand for their content-area literacy and populate
the framework for each grade and course in their content area. **2011/12:** Provide the populated framework to all identified content
teachers and high quality PD on the literacy strands for representatives from all LEAs. Gather input on the literacy strands through a
Web-based format. Working groups reconvene in spring 2012 to refine the strands. **2012/13:** Full implementation of the literacy
strand. PD support provided to rural/small LEAs as needed. **2013/14:** Implementation sustained. Support to targeted principals and
coaches to strengthen implementation. Support provided to rural/small LEAs as needed. Support should give all LEAs the capacity
to achieve full implementation by the end of the 2013-2014 school year. **Activity 3:** As soon as allowable under RTTT funding, hire
curriculum specialist and support staff with expertise in adolescent literacy. **Activity 4:** Implement recommendations for the
expansion of the literacy initiative through eighth grade with a focus on adolescent literacy. **2010/11:** Establish Adolescent Literacy
Working Committee, consisting of USOE and key LEA staff. Committee develops Core-aligned adolescent literacy standards which
include a focus on standards for teaching struggling readers. **2011/12:** Distribute and pilot standards. Develop and promote courses
for striving readers in all secondary settings. Develop PD on the standards and best practices for teaching them. LEAs participate in the development process. **2012/13:** Provide PD on the standards and best practices for teaching them to LEA teacher representatives. LEAs provide teacher representatives to participate in the PD. **2013/14:** Sustain implementation through targeted, needs-based PD. LEAs begin local PD and implementation with USOE support for rural/small LEAs as needed. LEAs offer courses for striving readers. **Activity 5:** Continue to support the work of the Family Literacy Centers and the use of ELL software to assist students with acquisition of English academic language skills and increase reading/language arts proficiency. **2010/11:** Provide sharing and networking opportunities to help Family Literacy Center personnel use the most effective practices. Construct and implement data-gathering protocols to measure the effectiveness of the program. LEAs share Family Literacy Center efforts and select future Family Literacy Center sites. **2011/12:** Continued sharing and networking opportunities. Initial program implementation at additional sites. **2012/14:** Assist LEAs as needed to support ongoing implementation.

**Project Three: Using the Common Core Standards to Ensure Mathematics Literacy for All Utah Children**

**Project Goals (Reform Area One Goals 1 and 2):**

- By **August 2010**, Utah will adopt and begin implementation of national K-12 standards in mathematics and literacy created in conjunction with the CCSSO National Consortium.
- By **July 2012**, Utah will develop and implement high quality instructional materials to support the adoption and implementation of the national standards.

**Rationale:** The adoption of new Common Core State Standards gives Utah the opportunity to address all aspects of effective delivery of mathematics instruction. Using lessons learned from our successful 4-6 Mathematics Initiative, professional development and coaching will help us implement the new Core. Expanding our mathematics initiative, while implementing the new Core, will help us increase our capacity to deliver high quality mathematics instruction that will, in subsequent years, increase student achievement in mathematics, increase our high school graduation rate, and increase college enrollment. **Project Summary,**
Responsible Parties, Activities, and Timelines: USOE will begin development of Web-based lesson plans for mathematics that ensure alignment across schools/classrooms regardless of variations in materials and which capture the experience and talents of master teachers and the use of best practice; create rigorous and relevant math courses that are an alternative to the traditional calculus track, while avoiding the "historic" problem of "dumbing down"; and prepare and implement recommendations for a state K-6 mathematics initiative and an Algebra mathematics initiative. Diana Suddreth, USOE Curriculum Department Specialist for Title II, Part A and Secondary Mathematics will have responsibility for managing this project. This project consists of three (3) activities. Because Utah recently adopted new mathematics standards and the next revision does not fall within the RTTT timeline, RTTT funds are needed to complete this project.

Activity 1: Begin development of Web-based lesson plans for mathematics.

2011/12: Create a repository for supporting instructional materials. Provide PD regarding the repository through established LEA Curriculum Directors Meetings. LEAs share repository concept with LEA stakeholders.

2012/13: Continue repository development.

2013/14: Continued development and posting of materials to the repository. LEAs begin using the repository.

Activity 2: Create rigorous and relevant math courses that are alternatives.

2010/11: With input from LEAs, industry, and higher education partners, design rigorous and relevant courses that can be taken for credit during the senior year of high school.

2011/13: Prepare and deliver PD in the content and pedagogy of the new courses for LEA teacher representatives. Support implementation of the new courses, including distance learning opportunities for rural/small LEAs. LEAs offer new courses.

2013/14: Provide ongoing PD support to LEAs as needed to support sustainability.

Activity 3: Prepare and implement recommendations for a state K-6 mathematics initiative and an Algebra mathematics initiative.

2010/11: Form a mathematics strategic planning task force that includes key LEA staff to develop a K-6 mathematics initiative and an Algebra initiative.

2011/12: Form a development group that includes key LEA staff to design appropriate PD and resources for initiative implementation.

2012/14: PD for LEA teacher and principal representatives. LEAs implement and participate in evaluation of initiatives.

Project Four: Ensuring Postsecondary Success
Project Goals (Reform Area One Goals 3 and 4):

- By **July 2012**, Utah will align math and English standards between all high schools and Utah public and private institutions of higher education to increase student success in the first year of postsecondary instruction.
- By **2012**, Utah will develop a system to monitor student enrollment in courses preparing students for postsecondary education that will provide feedback to students, parents, and schools.

**Rationale:** Utah has implemented successful initiatives designed to help secondary students prepare for college and careers. Enhancing these initiatives and using lessons learned from the National High School Center (NHSC) reports will help Utah deliver the Core in a manner that leads to greater student engagement, higher levels of achievement, and horizontal and vertical coordination between school levels and higher education. **Project Summary, Responsible Parties, Activities, and Timelines:**

Upon adoption of the new Common Core State Standards, the USOE will hire a project manager and support staff to create annual student and parent information regarding career and college pathways and aligned coursework beginning at the end of sixth grade and continuing through twelfth grade; revise and add academic pathways to the career pathway materials; work with LEAs and higher education to advise and initiate secondary renewal and reform; continue coordination with higher education to ensure that dual and concurrent enrollment courses that may lead to an associate degree (AD) are offered, and develop at least five areas of emphasis for ADs that include sufficient flexibility to accommodate academic and CTE issues; using lessons learned from Utah's highly effective AP program, work with two high need LEAs as a pilot to ensure that disadvantaged subgroups have quality access to AP and concurrent enrollment programs; coordinate with higher education to review and ensure that English and mathematics courses are vertically and horizontally aligned and that other current courses required for graduation are aligned to student needs for career and college readiness; review the data and reports from current STEM initiatives and propose continued, enhanced, or new initiatives, including CTE initiatives, that increase student participation in the study of STEM fields; and work with business, industry, and higher education partners to define needs for a quality workforce and develop instruction to support acquisition of skills to meet those needs. Effective coordination and implementation of this project requires full-time staff. RTTT funding is
required to support this project because USOE lacks adequate staff and resources to develop and implement this initiative. This project consists of nine (9) activities. Activity 1: The USOE will work with a broad-based committee to hire a project director and support staff during the 2010-2011 school year. Activity 2: The Project Director will create annual information for students and parents regarding career and college pathways and aligned coursework. 2010/11: Form a broad-based committee to develop a career pathway initiative that includes a parent and student Web site, annual guides, and postsecondary pathway tracking and commitment materials. 2011/12: Establish PD for guidance counselors to increase their knowledge of pathways and enhance their ability to communicate information to families, post to parent and student Web site, distribute guides, and assist LEAs in using the pathway commitment materials. LEAs participate in PD, link to the USOE Web site, distribute the guides, and assist parents and students in using the pathway commitment materials. 2012/14: Maintain initiative and update the guides as needed. LEAs continue implementation. Project 3: Revise and add academic pathways to the career pathway materials. 2010/11: Form committees to begin analysis of academic pathways and determine format with LEA participation. 2011/12: Continue development of pathway project. 2012/13: LEAs implement the project. 2013/14: Provide Web access to pathways for all students and parents. LEAs provide ongoing support to parents and students. Activity 4: Work with LEAs and higher education to advise and initiate secondary renewal and reform. 2010/11: Work with struggling secondary schools and others identified by LEAs. Identify and disseminate information about effective high schools, transition issues, and college readiness. 2011/14: Provide ongoing support to LEAs. Activity 5: Continue coordination with higher education for dual and concurrent enrollment courses. 2010/11: Work with higher education partners to maintain and enhance the concurrent enrollment program. Establish working agreements on AD offerings for high school students in five areas of emphasis. Activity 6: Work with two high need LEAs to ensure that disadvantaged subgroups have quality access to AP and concurrent enrollment programs. 2010/11: Analyze data from the two high need LEAs. With the assistance of College Board, create a plan to address access issues for disadvantaged subgroups in the high need LEAs. The two LEAs participate in development of USOE's plan to address AP and concurrent enrollment access issues. 2011/12: Provide implementation support for the two LEAs. The two LEAs implement the plan. 2012/14: Monitor implementation progress and evaluate success. The two
LEAs make adjustments as necessary. **Activity 7:** Coordinate with higher education to review and ensure that English and mathematics are vertically and horizontally aligned and that other current courses required for graduation are aligned to student needs for career and college readiness. **2010/11:** Work with business representatives and higher education to determine needed courses and align current courses for career and college readiness. **2011/12:** Provide new course implementation support, including distance learning opportunities for rural/small LEAs. LEAs offer new courses. **2012/14:** Provide ongoing implementation support.

**Activity 8:** Review the data and reports from current STEM initiatives and propose continued, enhanced, or new initiatives, including CTE initiatives, that increase student participation in the study of STEM fields. **2010/11:** Analyze data regarding current STEM readiness and participation. **2011/12:** Review the data and reports from current STEM initiatives. Determine a model for enhanced and new initiatives to increase student participation in the study of STEM fields. **2012/14:** Pilot and support enhanced and new initiatives.

**Activity 9:** Work with business, industry, and higher education partners to define needs for a quality workforce and develop instruction to support acquisition of skills to meet those needs. **2010/11:** Conduct a statewide study of workforce preparation, with LEA support, to ascertain the skills required for students to be successful in the workforce. **2011/12:** Analyze data and work with business and industry to develop a 6-year plan. LEAs utilize statewide data in developing local plans. **2012/14:** Provide PD and collaborate with business and industry to implement plan at the state, region, and local level with workforce and higher education partners. LEAs implement local plans.

**Project Five: Improving Early Learning Outcomes**

**Rationale:** The foundation for success in reading and mathematics begins before kindergarten. This is especially true for economically disadvantaged students, English language learners, and students with disabilities. As we have learned from our Optional Extended Day Kindergarten Initiative, early intervention at the preschool level is essential to narrowing achievement gaps.

**Project Summary, Responsible Parties, Activities and Timelines:** USOE staff will hire an early literacy specialist; review the data and reports from Utah's K-3 Reading Initiative and use the data to identify and replicate high-performing projects and practices;
maintain and expand full-day kindergarten to eligible students and use data to identify and replicate high-performing projects and practices; and support early intervention programs for high-need Pre-K children by reviewing the data and reports from State preschool programs, CTE-sponsored preschools, and the Utah Preparing Students Today for a Rewarding Tomorrow (UPSTART) Early Learning Initiative (a Waterford Institute Project for in-home, computer-based preparation for school success). Dr. Reed Spencer, USOE Curriculum Department Coordinator for Language Arts, K-3 Reading Initiative, Secondary Literacy, Reading First, and Optional Extended Day Kindergarten will have responsibility for managing this project. RTTT funding is needed to jumpstart the use of common data-gathering protocols. This project consists of five (5) activities. **Activity 1:** Hire early learning specialist during the 2010-2011 school year. **Activity 2:** Use data and reports from the Utah K-3 Reading Initiative to identify and replicate high performing projects and practices. **2010/11:** Identify common data-gathering protocols for both student achievement and program practices. LEAs participate in the development of protocols. **2011/12:** Implement common data-gathering protocols for both student achievement and program practices. Provide guidance and support for principals and coaches for monitoring and driving best practices into every classroom. **2012/14:** Continue previous year’s activities. LEAs initiate local efforts. **Activity 3:** Maintain full-day kindergarten for eligible students using State funds and use data to replicate high performing projects and practices. **2010/11:** Identify data-gathering protocols for both student achievement and effective practices. LEAs participate in the development of protocols. **2011/13:** Implement protocols. Provide ongoing PD in effectiveness with sharing and networking opportunities for teachers. **2013/14:** Provide ongoing support for implementation of extended and full-day kindergarten programs. **Activity 4:** Support early intervention programs for high need Pre-K children. Use data and reports from the UPSTART, CTE sponsored preschools, and other state preschool programs. Make recommendations for changes or for adoption of successful practices. **2010/11:** Form a Pre-K Advisory Committee reflective of all stakeholders to make recommendations statewide. Provide ongoing monitoring and possible expansion of UPSTART and provide common PD and assessment protocols for CTE-based and private providers with LEAs support. **2011/12:** Implement committee recommendations. Select or develop common assessment procedures, provide ongoing monitoring and possible expansion of UPSTART, and provide PD focused on interventions and

Project Six: Refinement of Utah Performance Assessment System for Students (U-PASS) Testing

Project Goals (Reform Area One Goal 5):

- Goal 5: By 2014, Utah, working with the national consortium, will implement high-quality assessments that are aligned with the standards to determine student academic achievement.

Rationale: Utah has successfully used rigorous core assessments for over twenty years. The adoption of nationally recognized, relevant Common Core State Standards will require development and adoption of assessments that align with the new standards.

Project Summary, Responsible Parties, Activities, and Timelines: USOE will design and implement testing systems and high quality assessments that are aligned to the new Common Core State Standards and that will evaluate both student growth and status, including testing systems for English Language Learners (ELLs) and students with disabilities; design and implement testing systems that use computer technology; continue the current testing pilot and expand the pilot; revise the high school "exit" exam requirements; provide assistance and recommendations for informal, ongoing formative assessment of math and reading in all schools; and create a common, standard kindergarten entry and post assessment. John Jesse, USOE Director for Assessment and Accountability, will have responsibility for managing this project. RTTT funds are needed for expansion of formative assessments, creation of a kindergarten assessment, and to jumpstart technology acquisition for districts in need. This project consists of seven (7) activities. Activity 1: Design and implement testing systems and high quality assessments that are aligned to the New Common Core State Standards that will evaluate both student growth and status: 2010/12: Participate in Common Assessment Consortium
work for language arts and mathematics. **2012/13:** Pilot assessments in LEAs. **2013/14:** Fully implement assessments. **Activity 2:** Design and implement testing systems that use computer technology (dependent upon receiving Common Assessment Consortium Grant). **2010/12:** Participate in Common Assessments Consortium work for language arts and mathematics to develop a framework and plan for specific software requirements. Develop and pilot computer-based assessments. **2012/14:** Fully implement computer-based Common Core language arts and mathematics assessments. **Activity 3:** Continue and expand current pilot to allow four urban districts, six rural districts, and ten charter schools to participate. **2010/14:** Increase implementation in pilot LEAs. Continue to evaluate the success of the testing pilots. **Activity 4:** Revise the high school "exit" exam requirements. Consider using a combination of CRTs, Explore, Plan, and the ACT for all students. **2010/11:** Design and implement new "exit" exam requirements. **2011/12:** Implement improved "exit" exam requirements. **Activity 5:** Participate in the formative and interim assessment consortium while expanding informal, ongoing formative assessment of mathematics and reading in all schools. **2010/11:** Update the current Utah formative assessment tool (UTIPS) to allow for interim assessments, an increased item bank aligned to the Common Core standards, and data linked to the State's SIS system. **2011/12:** Begin UTIPS professional development for all LEAs. **2012/14:** Expand the item bank and accompanying PD. **Activity 6:** Create a common, standard kindergarten assessment to be used at both the entry of kindergarten and as a post test. **2010/11:** Pilot assessment. LEAs review the assessment. **2011/12:** Conduct statistical procedures (i.e. item analyses, etc.) to refine and improve effectiveness. **2012/13:** Fully implement assessment. **Activity 7:** Expand and refine assessment systems for ELLs and students with disabilities. **2010/11:** Explore and implement ELL assessment system. Develop an approved assessment system for students with disabilities. Provide new assessment PD for LEAs. **2011/14:** Implement ELL assessment system. Implement improved assessment system for students with disabilities. Provide new assessment PD. **2012/14:** Analyze data to improve assessments and student performance.
### Performance Measures
Performance measures for this criterion are optional. If the State wishes to include performance measures, please enter them as rows in this table and, for each measure, provide annual targets in the columns provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of the new Common Core State Standards</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of Language Arts Common Core Standards professional development completed in 100% LEAs</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of Mathematics Arts Common Core Standards professional development completed in 100% LEAs</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of Language Arts Common Core Standards assessment developed</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% of Mathematics Common Core Standards assessment developed</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts Common Core assessment implemented in 100% LEAs</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Common Core assessment implemented in 100% LEAs</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(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

Utah has a well established history of strong, longitudinal data systems. Utah has implemented all of the seven (7) capabilities and the twelve (12) elements described in the America COMPETES Act. Our system currently has the following America COMPETES seven capabilities and twelve data elements: (1) student progress is examined over time from pre-school to postsecondary; (2) the exchange of data among agencies is facilitated and enabled; (3) student data is linked with teachers; (4) teachers are matched with certifications and teacher preparation programs; (5) data can be easily generated for continuous improvement and decision making; (6) data quality/integrity checks and validations are ensured; and (7) the system facilitates the ability of the State to meet the reporting requirements under ARRA. The 12 elements Utah has in place are: (1) the unique student identifier; (2) student level enrollment information; (3) demographic and program participation information; (4) student level exit, transfer, dropout, or continuation to postsecondary institution information; (5) the ability to communicate with postsecondary data systems; (6) state data audit systems which assess data quality, validity, and reliability; (7) yearly individual student test records; (8) information on students not tested by grade and subject; (9) teacher identifier with ability to match teachers to students; (10) student level transcript information, which includes courses completed and grades earned; (11) student level college readiness test scores; (12) data on student transitions to secondary through postsecondary, including information on remedial course work and additional data necessary to address preparation/alignment for student success in postsecondary education. Documentation for each of Utah’s America COMPETES Act elements can be found in Appendix 18.
With the other members of the Utah Data Alliance, which consists of USOE, the UCAT (Utah Career Applied Technology), the Division of Workforce Services, the Utah Education Network, and the Utah Education Policy Center, we have applied for an ARRA 2009 Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) Grant, which will help us fine tune the entire set of longitudinal data requirements, most notably in the availability of data for decision making among state agencies.

The Utah Education Network will build and manage the data share system to manage the data while the other agencies provide and consume information from the data. The SLDS Grant will help us take an already functioning system to the next level of service. Utah will be able to generate reports and other student and teacher data faster, so decisions regarding instruction and interventions can be accomplished in a timely manner. Programming will be added that will enable principals to use handhelds or netbooks to gather teacher evaluation data and monitor student dropout information.

Evidence for (C)(1):

- See Appendix 18 for documentation of each of Utah's America COMPETES Act elements.

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.5

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

---

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

Utah has a **P-20 longitudinal data system** that meets most of the America COMPETES required elements. Utah’s RTTT Application Plan for accessing and using State data will expand and adapt our State Longitudinal Data system (SLDS) to enhance existing capabilities, which includes increased data accessibility for educational stakeholders. Implementation of the following projects will allow Utah to meet Reform Area Two Goals. A detailed chart describing these activities is included in Appendix 3.

**Project One: Expansion and Adaptation of State Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS)**

**Project Goals (Reform Area Two Goal 1):**

- By **December 2014**, Utah will fully implement a state-wide, high-quality longitudinal data system to measure the academic achievement of students and link their achievement to educator readiness and preparation.

**Rationale:** Utah has a P-20 longitudinal system that meets most of the America COMPETES required elements. Utah has applied for funds to enhance its existing capabilities in its ARRA/2009 SLDS grant application (#384A1000056). **Project Summary,** **Responsible Parties, Activities, and Timelines:** This project consists of seven (7) activities. The first four activities summarize SLDS grant application outcomes. The Utah ARRA/2009 SLDS grant application brings several state agencies together to share de-identified data and coordinate analyses and research using those data. Completion of this project will allow us to fully implement a state-wide, high-quality, longitudinal data system. RTTT funds are needed to conduct activities 5-7. John Brandt, USOE Information Technology Director and Director of Computer Services will have responsibility for managing this project. SLDS grant and RTTT funds are needed to complete this project. **Activity 1:** USOE will work with the partner agencies to answer policy, program, and practices questions, which include, but are not limited to, questions asked by ARRA, SLDS, RTTT, Institute of Educational Sciences, and State Fiscal Stabilization Fund assurances. **2010/11:** Build necessary data infrastructure to conduct data
analysis and research. 2011/12: Populate data share and begin analysis and research. 2012/13: Continue to expand data sharing and individual and collaborative data analysis and research. Activity 2: USOE and LEAs improve vertical SSID/SIS integration through automated assignment of statewide student identifiers to supplement and replace current batch system. 2010/11: Modify systems to accommodate new automated processes. 2011/12: Test and begin using system. 2012/14: Continue to use and perfect system.


Activity 7: USOE integrates Utah SIS2000+ system’s grade book with Utah’s Test Item Pool (UTIPS) formative assessment delivery system via state and national curriculum standards. 2010/11: Hire contractors and lead the integration of the two state owned systems. 2011/12: Test system with the help of LEAs. 2012/13: LEAs fully use system and offer suggestions for enhancements.

Project Two: Effective Data Access for Instructional Improvement

Project Goals (Reform Area Two Goal 1):

- By 2014, Utah will fully implement a state-wide, high-quality longitudinal data system to measure the academic
achievement of students and link their achievement to educator readiness and preparation.

**Rationale:** Utah has a very robust longitudinal data system. For data to be effectively used to improve instruction and increase student learning, the appropriate technology must be used to collect and house the data as well as provide accessibility to the data for all educational stakeholders, including parents, teachers, administrators, researchers, etc. **Project Summary, Responsible Parties, Activities, and Timelines:** USOE will increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems (technology-based tools and other strategies) that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with meaningful support and actionable data to systemically manage continuous instructional improvement that provides teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decisions-making, professional development activities, and overall effectiveness. The original targeted completion date for this project was 2025. SLDS Grant funding will be used to accelerate completion within five years. Dr. Judy Park, Associate Superintendent for Data, Assessment and Accountability will have responsibility for managing this project. This project consists of four (4) activities. **Activity 1:** Increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems. **2010/11:** Explore and determine most appropriate data management system for implementation in each LEA. **2011/12:** Assist LEAs in implementing a data management system. **2012/14:** Provide LEAs with data management system support during ongoing implementation. **Activity 2:** Ensure the state data management tool allows data from multiple sources to be integrated together for effective decision making. **2010/11:** Collaborate with data management tool vendor, LEA Student Information Systems, and the State Data Warehouse to develop the utility that allows data from multiple sources to be integrated. **2011/14:** Implement full capability that allows for integration of multiple data elements. **Activity 3:** Ensure data management tool allows for local data collection that is unique to the LEA to be included in the data set available to stakeholders. **2010/11:** Collaborate with data management tool vendor, LEA Student Information Systems, and the State Data Warehouse to develop the utility that allows data from LEAs to be integrated. **2011/14:** Implement full capability that allows for integration of multiple data elements. **Activity 4:** Ensure 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 data support decision-makers in the continuous improvement of efforts in such areas as policy, instruction, operations, management, resource allocation, and overall effectiveness. **2010/14:** Expand SEA and LEA partnerships with local universities and increase data analysis available on LEA and SEA Web sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)</th>
<th>End of SY 2010-2011</th>
<th>End of SY 2011-2012</th>
<th>End of SY 2012-2013</th>
<th>End of SY 2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion of longitudinal data system</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing of longitudinal data system</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% implementation of completed longitudinal data system in 100% LEAs</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(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
The following narrative addresses all three areas: (C)(3)(i) Increase acquisition, adoption and use of local instructional improvement systems, (C)(3)(ii) Support participating LEAs and schools that are using instructional improvement systems, (C)(3)(iii) Make data from instructional improvement systems and statewide longitudinal data system data available to researchers.

**Project Two: Effective Data Access for Instructional Improvement (also described in (C)(2) above)**

**Project Goals (Reform Area Two Goal 1):**

- **By 2014,** Utah will fully implement a state-wide, high-quality longitudinal data system to measure the academic achievement of students and link their achievement to educator readiness and preparation.

**Rationale:** Utah has a very robust longitudinal data system. For data to be effectively used to improve instruction and increase student learning, the appropriate technology must be used to collect and house the data as well as provide accessibility to the data for all educational stakeholders, including parents, teachers, administrators, researchers, etc.

**Project Summary, Responsible Parties, Activities, and Timelines:** USOE will increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems (technology-based tools and other strategies) that provide teachers, principals, and administers with meaningful support and actionable
data to systemically manage continuous instructional improvement that provides teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decisions-making, professional development activities, and overall effectiveness. The original targeted completion date for this project was 2025. SLDS Grant funding will be used to accelerate completion within five years. Dr. Judy Park, Associate Superintendent for Data, Assessment and Accountability will have responsibility for managing this project. This project consists of four (4) activities. **Activity 1:** Increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems. **2010/11:** Explore and determine most appropriate data management system for implementation in each LEA. **2011/12:** Assist LEAs in implementing a data management system. **2012/14:** Provide LEAs with data management system support during ongoing implementation. **Activity 2:** Ensure the state data management tool allows data from multiple sources to be integrated together for effective decision making. **2010/11:** Collaborate with data management tool vendor, LEA Student Information Systems, and the State Data Warehouse to develop the utility that allows data from multiple sources to be integrated. **2011/14:** Implement full capability that allows for integration of multiple data elements. **Activity 3:** Ensure data management tool allows for local data collection that is unique to the LEA to be included in the data set available to stakeholders. **2010/11:** Collaborate with data management tool vendor, LEA Student Information Systems, and the State Data Warehouse to develop the utility that allows data from LEAs to be integrated. **2011/14:** Implement full capability that allows for integration of multiple data elements. **Activity 4:** Ensure 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 data support decision-makers in the continuous improvement of efforts in such areas as policy, instruction, operations, management, resource allocation, and overall effectiveness. **2010/14:** Expand SEA and LEA partnerships with local universities and increase data analysis available on LEA and SEA Web sites.

**Project Three: Effective Data Use**

**Project Goals (Reform Area Two Goals 2 and 3):**
- By December 2014, all participating LEAs will adopt and implement local instructional improvement systems to support the effective use of student data to inform instruction.
- By December 2014, all LEA data teams, including at minimum Superintendents, Curriculum Directors, and Assessment Directors, will participate in professional development in using the statewide data and create a plan for ongoing LEA training on the system.

**Rationale:** For data to be effectively used to improve instruction and increase student learning, district administrators, principals, and teachers must have the skills, knowledge, and dispositions they need to use data effectively. **Project Summary, Responsible Parties, Activities, and Timelines:** Using lessons learned from Utah’s Data Institute, USOE will provide professional development (PD) to LEAs in the use of data to inform instruction, professional learning communities and school improvement strategies, and in the understanding and use of at-risk, dropout, and graduation data. The original targeted completion date for this project was 2025. RTTT fund will be used to accelerate completion within five years. Dr. Judy Park, Associate Superintendent for Data, Assessment and Accountability will have responsibility for managing this project. This project consists of three (3) activities. **Activity 1:** Provide PD to LEA level data teams in the use of data to inform instruction. LEA teams will include, at minimum superintendents, curriculum directors, and assessment directors. **2010/11:** Implement multi-session Principal Data Institute at the LEA level for 30% of LEAs. Develop electronic data training modules. LEAs participate in training. **2011/12:** Implement Principal Data Institute for 50% of LEAs. Provide 2<sup>nd</sup> year Institute support for the original 30%. Expand electronic data training modules and provide continued support. LEAs participate in training. **2012/13:** Implement Principal Data Institute for remaining 20% of LEAs. Provide 3<sup>rd</sup> year Institute support for original 30% and 2<sup>nd</sup> year support for the 50%. Provide ongoing support for the electronic data training modules. **2013/14:** Provide 3<sup>rd</sup> year Institute support for the original 50% and 2<sup>nd</sup> year support for the 20%. Provide ongoing support for the electronic data training modules. **Activity 2:** Develop and provide support for LEAs and struggling schools in the use of professional learning communities and school improvement strategies. **2010/11:** Develop specific strategies for individualized Data Consultation through the Data Mentor Program. **2011/14:** Expand Data Mentor Program and implementation of individualized Data Consultation strategies. **Activity**
3: Develop and provide PD for understanding and using at-risk, dropout, and graduation data. **2010/11:** Conduct summit on at-risk, dropout, and graduation data. LEAs evaluate at-risk, dropout, and graduation data and develop plans to improve data and services to students. **2011/12:** Provide PD and technical assistance to LEAs regarding data and best practices. LEAs develop plan for improving programs for at-risk, dropout, and graduation using data. **2012/14:** Provide ongoing PD and technical assistance. LEAs implement plans for improving programs for at-risk, dropout, and graduation using data.

### Performance Measures

Performance measures for this criterion are optional. If the State wishes to include performance measures, please enter them as rows in this table and, for each measure, provide annual targets in the columns provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)</th>
<th>End of SY 2010-2011</th>
<th>End of SY 2011-2012</th>
<th>End of SY 2012-2013</th>
<th>End of SY 2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Principal Data Institute professional development for 100% of LEAs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of at-risk intervention and dropout prevention and use of data professional development for 100% of LEAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (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:
  o The elements of the program (as described in the alternative routes to certification definition in this notice).
  o The number of teachers and principals that successfully completed each program in the previous academic year.
  o The total number of teachers and principals certified statewide in the previous academic year.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

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

(D)(1)(i) Provisions that allow alternative routes to certification for teachers and principals

Utah teachers have multiple opportunities to earn licensure through alternative routes to traditional university preparation programs. The Utah Alternative Route to Licensure (ARL) program was created to attract teachers from non-traditional backgrounds to work in shortage areas without the need to return to full-time teacher preparation programs. The ARL program has expanded to meet the needs of schools and LEAs to license teachers from a variety of backgrounds as needed within individual LEAs. Utah State Code 53A-1-402(1)(a) [see Appendix 19] gives the Utah State Board of Education authority to establish rules for the ARL program. The State Board subsequently developed the policies and procedures that govern the current program. These
provisions can be found in Utah State Board Rule 277-503-3 [see Appendix 20]. Revisions to the rule have been made periodically to provide additional licensure pathways, strengthen the screening processes, and provide ongoing support for candidates.

Utah State Board of Education Administrative Rule, R277-503-4, Licensing Routes [see Appendix 21] specifically provides for alternative routes to licensure. R277-503-4B [see Appendix 22] allows an ARL applicant who has a college degree to take an appropriate professional assessment, be employed by a district or charter LEA, and work with the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) to determine specific courses, district professional development classes, and Utah State Board of Education-approved training, that will allow an applicant to be fully licensed. Assistance from the employing LEA and USOE is required throughout the process.

Utah provides for paraeducators who have worked in the public school system without licensing to receive scholarships to move efficiently from a paraeducator role to a licensed educator. State law establishes a state committee to select scholarship recipients who are paraeducators working in public schools and LEAs to receive a scholarship leading to educator licensure as per Utah Code, Section 53A-60-802 [see Appendix 23].

Alternative route to licensure programs have also been established for principals and administrators in Utah Code, Section 53A-6-110 [see Appendix 24]. A local school board may request, and the State Board of Education may grant, a letter of authorization permitting persons with outstanding professional qualifications to serve as a public school administrators. These individuals, working as principals, assistant principals, associate principals, vice principals, assistant superintendents, administrative assistants, directors, specialists, or other district positions, may receive “a letter of authorization permitting a person with outstanding professional qualifications to serve in any position that requires a person to hold an administrative/supervisory license or certificate.” In addition, there are a variety of pathways at both private and public institutions that provide administrative classes and
certifications based on a non-traditional academic calendar [see section ii].

(D)(1)(ii) **Alternative routes to certification in use in Utah**

Alternative Route to Licensure (ARL) is a state-based teacher preparation program for individuals who currently hold a bachelors degree or higher. The Office of Educator Quality and Licensing regulates and administers the program, which functions as a cooperative between traditional university preparation programs and LEAs. ARL Rules allow participants to teach in an accredited Utah school on a temporary license for up to three years while they are fulfilling licensure requirements, which include taking and passing Board approved tests, completion of required coursework, working with a trained mentor, and demonstrating effectiveness based on the employing school’s evaluation system.

The USOE screens all ARL applicants. The process includes a background check, application completion, and transcript review. Qualified candidates are then deemed eligible to participate in the ARL program upon verification of employment in areas of eligibility. This screening process has been a critical factor in high retention rates for candidates who complete the ARL program. USOE statistical reports show that 65% of ARL teachers who started their teaching career in the last three years are still teaching. This is significantly higher than the national average of teacher retention in the first three years.

The ARL program includes the development of a Professional Growth Plan (PGP) that is monitored by an ARL advisor from USOE staff for each program participant. The PGP includes the Praxis II Content Knowledge test(s), possible endorsement courses, and teacher preparation (pedagogy) classes. A thorough analysis of the candidate’s transcript determines the potential content and pedagogy coursework, and this information is explained at the Professional Growth Plan conference held between an ARL advisor and the candidate. The ARL advisor also reviews the program participant's professional performance based on a mid-year progress report from the site administrator.
The ARL program participant is monitored at the school setting by school administrators and LEA human resource staff. Each participant is assigned a trained mentor to help with pedagogy and curriculum. Participants may also receive support through coaching. Several district LEAs are currently providing additional support through trained full-time released coaches and site-based coursework.

To support ARL candidates who are in the southern end of the state and geographically distant from the USOE, the state partners with Dixie State College. Members of the Dixie State College teacher education faculty partner with the USOE to provide coursework, mentoring, and monitoring for ARL candidates. The faculty members act as the ARL advisor for the ARL candidates and work with them to complete their PGP. This ensures that all ARL candidates throughout the state are supported and monitored in a timely and effective manner. The Utah State Office of Education also partners with Utah State University to provide a program called the Alternative Teacher Pathway (ATP) designed for current K-12 teachers who want to certify in Special Education. This program has supported current teachers in making the transition into high-need Special Education classrooms.

Coursework for ARL candidates is limited to five pedagogy courses unless a transcript is found to be lacking in appropriate content for the assigned endorsement area. Coursework can be taken through the Transition to Teaching program offered by USOE, university preparation programs, approved online programs, or district based programs. Pedagogy courses may be waived based on experience or similar coursework in a previous setting.

In order to obtain a Utah Educator Level One license through this program, the ARL candidate must complete the Professional Growth Plan, receive a recommendation for licensure from the employing principal, and complete the licensure application. Upon completion of all requirements, a Level One Utah Educator License is issued. As a Level One educator, the participant is engaged in ongoing mentoring and induction services and provided with additional support as deemed necessary. While most states report losing at least a third of their teaching workforce in the first couple of years, the ARL candidates in the USOE program tend to stay
in the profession at higher rates when they complete the entire program and receive their initial license. ARL candidates also pass State Board required exams at a 95.5% success rate as compared with 90% of our traditionally prepared teachers. An analysis of the data concluded that this is based on our formal screening process, the coursework and mentoring provided to all participants, and demographic factors such as age.

Most Utah preparation institutions provide graduate or fifth year programs for non-education majors, enabling them to become licensed upon completion of appropriate pedagogy coursework and passage of required content exams. A preparation institution does not need to be affiliated with an institute of higher education (IHE) to provide ARL classes in Utah; a provider that operates independently from IHE’s is allowed.

Table 9 – Utah ARL Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utah ARL Programs</th>
<th>Elements of program from definition</th>
<th># completed 2008-2009</th>
<th># enrolled 2009-2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Utah State University Alternative Teacher Preparation for Special Education | (a) various types of qualified providers  
(b) selective in accepting candidates  
(c) provide supervised school-based experiences and ongoing support  
(d) limit coursework and provide options to test out  
(e) award the same level of certification as traditional programs (Level 2) | 69                     | 83                    |
| Utah State University Alternative Route for Secondary Education | (a) various types of qualified providers  
(b) selective in accepting candidates  
(c) provide supervised school-based experiences and ongoing support  
(d) limit coursework and provide options to test out  
(e) award the same level of certification as traditional programs (Level 2) | 6                      | 78                    |
| Weber State University post baccalaureate Masters to Licensure program | (a) various types of qualified providers  
(b) selective in accepting candidates  
(c) provide supervised school-based experiences and ongoing support  
(d) limit coursework and provide options to test out  
(e) award the same level of certification as traditional programs (Level 2) | 10                     | 112                   |
| Westminster College Masters to Licensure program | (a) various types of qualified providers  
(b) selective in accepting candidates | unavailable            | unavailable           |
Qualified candidates who wish to teach in a secondary school must have a degree major from a regionally accredited institution in a subject taught in Utah secondary schools. Qualified candidates who wish to teach elementary school must have a transcript from a regionally accredited institution that documents a broad background of liberal arts content in the areas of language arts, science, social studies, mathematics, the fine arts, physical education, and health. A minimum of 27 semester hours or 40 quarter hours of application credit are required for eligibility. Participants must be employed by a Utah district or charter LEA, or accredited private or parochial school while earning a license and must be teaching in a licensed position at the time a license is earned and issued.

The USOE ARL program Transitions to Teaching, which functions in conjunction with the largest state community college (Salt Lake Community College) program has grown rapidly over the years. Students can take ARL classes at multiple satellite campuses and in distance education centers. In 2005, two full-time staff members were hired to administer the program, collaborate with employing schools, and support ARL educators. A four-year comparison is illustrated below representing interest in and completion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>(a) various types of qualified providers</th>
<th>(b) selective in accepting candidates</th>
<th>(c) provide supervised school-based experiences and ongoing support</th>
<th>(d) limit coursework and provide options to test out</th>
<th>(e) award the same level of certification as traditional programs (Level 2)</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dixie State College—Washington School District Licensure Co-op</td>
<td>(a) various types of qualified providers</td>
<td>(b) selective in accepting candidates</td>
<td>(c) provide supervised school-based experiences and ongoing support</td>
<td>(d) limit coursework and provide options to test out</td>
<td>(e) award the same level of certification as traditional programs (Level 2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Utah Masters to Licensure program</td>
<td>(a) various types of qualified providers</td>
<td>(b) selective in accepting candidates</td>
<td>(c) provide supervised school-based experiences and ongoing support</td>
<td>(d) limit coursework and provide options to test out</td>
<td>(e) award the same level of certification as traditional programs (Level 2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USOE-SLCC Transitions to Teaching</td>
<td>(a) various types of qualified providers</td>
<td>(b) selective in accepting candidates</td>
<td>(c) provide supervised school-based experiences and ongoing support</td>
<td>(d) limit coursework and provide options to test out</td>
<td>(e) award the same level of certification as traditional programs (Level 2)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the ARL program. The following completion data captures those candidates over the last four years who have been successfully employed, completed coursework, and passed appropriate exams for licensure.

Table 10 – Overall ARL data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USOE ARL Program:</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications processed</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicants hired by LEAs</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of ARL teachers hired during the 2008-2009 school year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of all new teachers hired during the 2008-2009 school year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data representing the new teachers hired for the 2008-2009 school year demonstrates that almost 8% of the total number of teachers were prepared through an alternative route.

In addition to the agency-based USOE ARL program, Utah also licenses educators from the national Troops to Teachers program (12 in 2008) and the American Board Certified Teacher program (ABCTE). Applicants for the Troops to Teachers or ABCTE programs are screened by USOE, which includes a background check, application completion, and transcript review. If the candidate is found to be qualified for admission, s/he is then deemed eligible as a participant upon verified employment in the areas of eligibility. ABCTE provides professionals an opportunity to change careers and become teachers, and upon completion of the ABCTE program, teachers are considered highly qualified.

Alternative route to licensure (ARL) is available for principals as well. Utah authorizes the State Board to grant professional licenses to qualified individuals in specific circumstances. Three (3) school principals were licensed using this alternative route in 2008-2009. In addition to being granted a license by the State Board, public and private universities have created evening and online programs throughout the state to provide administrative certification. Other options include a full-time internship program offered
through Brigham Young University that allows LEAs to support teachers on a paid sabbatical while they finished coursework and work experience options within 14 months. This intern program graduates approximately 40 school administrators per year.

(D)(1)(iii) Process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage.

Utah has an electronic teacher credentialing and record keeping system that provides an online method for all licensing procedures [see Appendix 25] and collects records of all demographic and credential information on Utah educators. The Computer Aided Credentials of Teachers in Utah Schools (CACTUS) system enables the USOE to track and analyze data for a variety of reports. Each year, the number of teachers entering and exiting the professional development is tallied and a summary of this information is presented to the Education Interim Committee of the Utah Legislature and the Utah State Board of Education. This report focuses on issues of preparation, recruitment, and retention of Utah's teachers [see Teacher Report in Appendix 26]. One of the reports developed and analyzed each year is called the Criticality Index. This index is developed based on data obtained from the CACTUS system and surveys to LEAs to determine areas of need. Each license area is then assigned a number in the index from high to low indicating critical shortage areas. Utah aligns with national trends in that we continue to experience shortages in the areas of math, physical science and special education [see Criticality Index in Appendix 27].

Several initiatives have been developed to help fill these shortage areas. One of the most significant is the Public Education Job Enhancement Program (PEJEP) which is outlined in Utah Code 53A-1a-601 and funded yearly by the Utah Legislature. This program provides scholarships for advanced degrees, endorsements, and license programs as well as signing bonuses in the content areas of math, science and special education. An annual accountability report on PEJEP is prepared and presented to the Utah legislative Education Interim Committee [see Accountability Report in Appendix 28]. Additional initiatives have included salary supplements for math and science teachers, funded masters programs for special education licensure, full-time coaching support for new math teachers, co-ops with colleges of science and mathematics, and STEM projects that are ongoing to recruit math and
science majors into teaching. Utah is not currently experiencing a shortage of school principals or administrators. Efforts are currently focused on preparing and sustaining high-quality administrators who are leaders in advancing education agendas and effective evaluators of classroom instruction.

Evidence for (D)(1)(i): Utah Code, Section 53A-1-401(1)(a), [see Appendix 12] and Utah State Board of Education Administrative Rule, R277-503, Licensing Routes, [see Appendix 22] includes the following provisions for alternative routes to certification:
- Utah Code, Section 53A-1-401(1)(a)[see Appendix 12].
- Utah State Board of Education Administrative Rule, R277-503, Licensing Routes, [see Appendix 22].
- R277-503-4B [see Appendix 22]
- Utah Code, Section 53A-6-802 [see Appendix 23]

Evidence for (D)(1)(ii):
- See tables in (D)(1)(ii) for a list of ARL programs in Utah, the elements of each program, the number of teachers and principals that have completed each program in 2008-2009, and the number of teachers and principals certified statewide in 2008-2009.

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

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

The creation and sustainability of a strong Utah economy depends largely on the state’s ability to educate and employ citizens at a
level that is competitive nationally and internationally. Quality instruction is the primary influence on student achievement and therefore must be given considerable attention through policy and practice. The Utah State Board of Education supports a comprehensive human capital approach that strategically invests in teachers and principals in order to improve student outcomes. Our approach to improving instructional quality focuses on (1) selectively recruiting prospective teachers and principals to the profession; (2) improving preparation of prospective teachers and principals; (3) and working to retain the most effective teachers and principals.

(D)(2)(i) Measuring student growth for individual students
Utah has the ability to measure growth for each individual student and tie the information to the student’s teacher. Utah’s robust data system is comprised of two major components. First, USOE maintains a student data warehouse that provides all teachers with **criterion referenced data** and **summative data** from content end-of-year exams and enables each LEA to submit substantial local normative data to provide teachers and leaders with **benchmark achievement data**. The second component is Utah's award-winning educator data system CACTUS (Computer Aided Credentials of Teachers in Utah Schools). CACTUS houses all credential information and teacher assignment data, enabling both LEAs and SEAs to make appropriate teacher assignments, track patterns of equitable distribution, and determine where professional development support is needed to ensure teachers are highly qualified for the subjects they teach. These two systems—student academic performance and teacher credentialing information—are bridged to tie student data to individual teachers.

These two systems are effective because each student, teacher, and administrator in Utah is tracked using a **unique personal identification number** that stays with an individual for life. The unique statewide student identifier is a single, non-duplicated number that is assigned to and remains with a student throughout his or her P-12 career. Assignment of a unique statewide student identifier to every student in the P-12 system provides a way to follow students as they move from grade to grade and across campuses and/or districts within the state. This enables USOE to track students' academic data even if they move throughout the state, or leave the state and then return. Utah has procedures in place to prevent two different students from receiving the same ID or
to prevent the same student from getting a different ID when she/he changes districts. This number is not linked to a student’s Social Security number and can be used to link student-level records across all of the state's student-level databases. This identification system is evaluated and certified annually by the national group Data Quality Campaign. Ongoing plans and timelines for improving the system were discussed in detail in Section (B)(3) of this application.

**(D)(2)(ii) Developing rigorous, transparent, fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness and (b) are designed with teacher and principals involvement**

Utah is committed to developing and implementing new evaluation systems for teachers and principals that use student growth, measures of instructional quality, and stakeholder information to fairly assess teacher and principal effectiveness. High-quality instruction is the most important factor to improve student success. It is also, perhaps, the least well measured part of our public education system. Developing and implementing tools to measure and improve high quality instruction is a centerpiece of our plan. Utah’s plan for working with our LEAs to design and implement new evaluation systems for teachers and principals is described below.

**Project One: UCSEE - Utah Continuum of Support for Educator Excellence**

**Goal 1:** By **December 2014**, a new statewide continuum of support for developing practicing teachers and principals will be implemented.

**Rationale:** Utah is in the process of establishing a statewide continuum of support for developing and practicing teachers. This initiative will help ensure that Utah educators will have opportunities for personal advancement and ongoing professional development (PD) and support throughout the scope of their career. It will also help ensure that Utah students have access to high quality instruction in every classroom. **Project Summary, Responsible Parties, Activities, and Timelines:** This project is divided into four parts. Part A addresses pre-practitioner preparation. Part B focuses on the novice practitioner, Part C addresses the needs of the developing practitioner (the teacher who has passed their probationary period and is teaching without assistance of a mentor
teacher). Part D creates a new master practitioner category for highly qualified and highly effective teachers. Dr. Sydnee Dickson, USOE Director of Licensing and Teacher Quality, will have responsibility for managing this project. This project consists of seventeen (17) activities. Part A, Activity 1: USOE will develop and implement teacher preparation program approval standards. 2010/11: Develop standards in collaboration with higher education. 2011/12: Implement standards and provide technical assistance. 2012/14: Monitor implementation. Activity 2: USOE will adopt a statewide performance assessment as an exit requirement from teacher preparation programs. 2010/11: Develop performance assessment. 2011/12: Provide professional development for LEA and IHE representatives on performance assessment. 2012/13: LEA and IHE implementation of performance assessment. 2013/14: Analyze and monitor implementation and effectiveness. Activity 3: USOE will implement a pilot resident professional development school model. 2010/11: Begin initial pilot. 2011/12: Continue implementation of pilot. 2012/13: Evaluate and make necessary changes. 2013/14: Make recommendations and transition leadership of the project to the University of Utah College of Education. Activity 4: USOE will continue the use of the USOE Alternative Route to Licensure Program. 2010/11: Provide start-up funding for additional ARL Program sites and create online coursework for ARL candidates. 2011/14: Work with regional service centers to support ARL candidates in rural settings. Part B, Activity 5: USOE will implement an induction support pilot program. 2010/11: Develop the pilot program. 2011/14: Implement the pilot. Activity 6: USOE will improve LEA induction programs. 2010/11: Develop a request for proposal (RFP) for induction plans. 2011/12: Select LEA RFPs for induction plans and begin implementation. 2012/14: Provide technical assistance, analyze data, and determine success of induction models. Activity 7: USOE will expand rural outreach for educators to meet highly qualified and effective teacher requirements. 2010/11: Develop online coursework. 2011/14: Implement and provide technical assistance to IHEs and LEAs. Activity 8: USOE will administer, analyze, and use the results from the Teaching Working Conditions Survey. 2010/11: Develop survey. 2011/12: Administer survey and analyze results. 2012/13: Develop training materials for sharing data. 2013/14: Share data with LEAs and provide technical assistance to support use of data. Address policy changes that may arise from the data and continue to provide technical assistance to LEAs. Activity 9: USOE will implement and monitor statewide equitable distribution plans. 2010/14: Require an equitable
distribution plan as a part of LEA Utah Consolidated Application (UCA). Provide technical assistance and monitor compliance.

**Part C, Activity 10:** Utah will adopt high quality professional development standards. **2010/11:** Develop professional development standards. **2011/14:** Implement standards. **Activity 11:** USOE will develop and provide resources for LEAs to promote standards-based professional development. **2010/11:** Develop resources and provide support to LEAs. **2011/14:** Provide technical assistance and monitor LEA use of standards. **Activity 12:** Utah will provide standards and Innovation Configurations (ICs) for effective professional learning communities. **2010/11:** Develop ICs. **2011/12:** Provide professional development (PD) use of ICs and evaluation tools to LEAs. **2012/14:** Provide technical assistance to LEAs. **Activity 13:** USOE will implement the PD and use the information from the National Staff Development Council (NSDC) Standards Assessment Inventory (SAI). **2013/2014:** Conduct, analyze, and share results of SAI. **Part D, Activity 14:** USOE will adopt a new teacher licensing system. **2010/11:** Work with key stakeholders to develop new licensing system with accompanying performance standards, performance assessment, coursework, and criteria for advancement. **2011/12:** Continue development work and outreach to LEAs. **2012/13:** Pilot recommendations in participating LEAs. **2013/14:** LEAs implement licensing system. **Activity 15:** USOE will develop a cadre of teacher leaders who are experts in using formative assessments. **2010/11:** Select cadre and begin training. **2011/14:** Support teacher leader cadre with technical assistance. **Activity 16:** USOE will develop models of differentiated staffing options. **2011/12:** Collaborate with IHEs, LEAs, and other experts to develop models of differentiated staffing. **2012/13:** Initiate differentiated staffing model pilot. **2013/14:** Analyze results and provide technical assistance to LEAs who elect to implement differentiated staffing models. **Activity 17:** USOE will provide leadership and STEM opportunities for teacher leaders with community and business leaders. **2010/11:** Develop partnerships with community and business leaders to provide internships for teachers. **2011/13:** Implement internships. **2013/14:** Conduct analysis of project and transition oversight of partnerships to LEAs and businesses.

**Project Two: Principal Leadership Pathway**

**Goal 1:** By **December 2014,** a new statewide continuum of support for developing practicing teachers and principals will be
implemented.

**Rationale:** Utah recognizes that the key to sustaining high quality instruction in every classroom is the school principal. Developing a continuum of support beginning with quality principal preparation and continuing support will ensure that principals will have the skills, knowledge, and dispositions they need to be effective instructional leaders. This will help ensure that Utah students have access to high quality instruction in every classroom. **Project Summary, Responsible Parties, Activities, and Timelines:** This project creates a new principal leadership pathway. Dr. Sydnee Dickson, USOE Director of Licensing and Teacher Quality, will have responsibility for managing this project. This project consists of four (4) activities. **Activity 1:** USOE will improve administrator preparation programs through: (a) development of state standards that include a strong focus on instructional leadership and (b) review and revision of entrance requirements into principal evaluation programs. **2010/11:** Develop instructional leadership preparation and entrance standards. **2011/14:** Implement and monitor new standards. **Activity 2:** USOE will work with LEAs to develop and implement collaborative induction and coaching programs for principals. **2010/11:** Work with IHEs and LEAs to develop effective induction models for new principals. **2011/14:** Implement and provide technical support for adoption of new induction models. **Activity 3:** USOE will develop and implement principal standards of practice focused on instructional leadership. **2010/11:** Work with representative stakeholders to develop instructional leadership standards for practicing principals. **2011/14:** Implement and provide technical assistance to LEAs. **Activity 4:** USOE will provide high quality PD, including online communities, face-to-face instruction, and regional academies for practicing principals. **2010/2011:** Develop high-quality PD for practicing principals. **2011/14:** Implement and provide technical assistance to LEAs.

**Project Three: Measures of Instructional Quality**

**Goal 2:** By December 2014, 90% of Utah's K-12 teachers will participate in LEA evaluation systems that require the use of high-quality instructional strategies as evidenced by appropriate and approved measures of quality instruction (including observations of teaching, student growth data, and stakeholder evaluation).

**Goal 3:** By December 2014, all participating LEAs will have in place a system by which effective and highly effective teachers and principals are identified by the schools and LEAs in which they work.

**Goal 4:** By December 2014, all participating LEAs will have in place a system by which ineffective teachers and principals are
identified by the schools and LEAs in which they work and are remediated or terminated.

**Rationale:** Utah's current evaluation system requires that teachers and principals be evaluated every three years. This system is used to inform full certification, retention, tenure, and potential removal from the profession. This project will add measures of **student growth** and **instructional quality**. It will also change evaluations to annual evaluations, inform professional development, and be used to fairly inform compensation and promotion. **Project Summary, Responsible Parties, Activities, and Timelines:** USOE will develop a model framework for teacher evaluation and support LEA implementation. Dr. Martell Menlove, Deputy Superintendent of Utah Public Instruction, will oversee this project. This project consists of (5) activities. **Activity 1:** USOE will create tools to facilitate measurement of instructional quality in partnership with stakeholders. **2010/11:** Create a model quality instruction evaluation tool that will be technology ready and can be used for multiple short observation and information gathering activities. 2011/12: Pilot the new tools. 2012/13: Develop an instructional practices toolkit and continue pilot. **2013/14:** LEA will implement pilot tool or adapt local tool to meet state framework. **Activity 2:** USOE will develop and implement statewide framework for annual teacher evaluation. **2010/11:** In collaboration with key stakeholders, develop statewide evaluation framework. **2011/12:** Develop and provide PD to ensure compliance and implementation of new educator evaluation framework. **2012/14:** Provide technical assistance. **Activity 3:** USOE will revise Utah Professional Teaching Standards to incorporate measures of instructional quality, stages of career development, expectations for student growth, and rubrics for evaluation. **2010/11:** Work with stakeholders to revise standards. **2011/14:** Finalize and adopt new standards. **Activity 4:** USOE will integrate two online tools to provide models of instructional excellence, online communities, and online teacher resources. **2010/11:** Integrate the two online tools and provide PD on their use to LEAs. **2011/14:** Implement and monitor use. **Activity 5:** USOE will create a state framework for principal evaluation. **2010/11:** Develop education framework with stakeholder input. **2011/12:** Adopt framework and provide technical assistance to LEAs as they update their system of principal evaluation. **2012/14:** Provide technical assistance and monitor implementation.
Project Four: Performance Pay Pilot Program

Rationale: Utah faces teacher shortages in STEM areas and special education. Qualified and effective teachers in these areas are a critical component to improving our achievement. Project Summary, Responsible Parties, Activities, and Timelines: USOE will continue its performance pay pilot program and its Public Education Job Enhancement Program (PEJEP) using state and local funds. These programs are helping Utah recruit, reward, and train effective teachers. Dr. Sydnee Dickson, USOE Director of Licensing and Teacher Quality, will have responsibility for managing this project. This project consists of two (2) activities. Activity 1: USOE will analyze the data and results from the Differentiated Compensation pilots and prepare and implement recommendations. 2010/13: Support and monitor performance pay pilot. Conduct analysis to develop recommendations that address performance pay issues. 2013/14: Provide technical assistance to LEAs engaged in performance pay reform efforts. Activity 2: USOE will continue using the Public Education Job Enhancement Program (PEJEP) to increase the number and percentage of effective teachers teaching mathematics, science, technology, and special education. 2010/11: Examine PEJEP policy and practices and revise as needed. 2011/2014: Monitor and continue PEJEP.

Utah is using a comprehensive approach to educator evaluation. The Utah Professional Teacher Standards are the foundation of educator evaluation systems that start at the pre-service level and follow the educator through to evaluation and development at the LEA level [see Teacher Standards in Appendix 29]. All LEAs in Utah have adopted these standards, and they are implemented in a variety of forms for educator evaluation. During the 2007-2008 school year, a representative group of P-12 LEA-based educators and teacher education faculty met together to study teacher evaluation. The group, known as the Educator Quality Workgroup, conducted a literature review on research-based evaluation practices, examined a variety of evaluation systems used in Utah LEAs, and made policy recommendations to provoke statewide attention to educator evaluation. The group determined its first priority was to work with key legislators and update Utah Statute to reflect research-based evaluation components and include student achievement as a key measure. During the 2009 Utah Legislative Session, a bill (HB264S [see Appendix 30]) was proposed that
included these elements. The bill was passed and signed into law by Governor Jon Huntsman on March 25, 2009.

As a result of HB264S, a Board Rule was established with specific standards for formative and summative evaluation, including the establishment of yearly formative assessments for educators in all LEAs. At this time, Utah is focused on creating a statewide approach to educator evaluation that will include a framework for evaluation based on both formative and summative approaches, use student growth data, and provide tools for ease of use. Most urban/suburban districts have valid comprehensive evaluations systems in place; however, student achievement may or may not be a part of teacher assessments and many districts do not include a formative component. Those districts have agreed to use RTTT funds to modify their existing systems to meet the new state framework. Other suburban districts and rural districts have requested a statewide system that makes transferring teacher employment information easier as well as providing common data sets from which to establish professional development and other improvement efforts. As a part of the RTTT program, these districts will adopt the framework and a state-developed system.

The new evaluation system will be enhanced by revamping our systems of support for educators. The systems explained below were designed and developed with involvement from the Utah Teachers Association (UTA), Utah Association of Elementary School Principals (UAESP), Utah Association of Secondary School Principals (UASSP), and other involved stakeholders who participated in planning discussions, and with the support of USOE. The systems were presented to focus groups throughout the state during the planning stage to ensure widespread support.

For teachers: Utah will designate four (4) levels of teacher licensing, each requiring successful annual evaluations as well as other evidence of professional practice, to maintain a current license or to progress to a higher level. These designations will include rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems using multiple rating categories, of which student growth is a significant factor.

Pre-practitioners (Level 1 teachers) who are entering the field of teaching through traditional university-based routes and those who are entering using an alternative route on a three-year provisional license will participate in a career inventory survey that will help them identify their strengths as a professional. They will also take a complement of professional practice and content area classes. University students will participate in a variety of field experiences and internships to provide them with practical
applications of their studies and introduce them to the realities of the profession. These experiences will be conducted in classrooms with effective and highly effective teachers, and participants will be supported by mentoring and coaching from both the classroom teacher and university professor. ARL candidates will work with their ARL advisor as they teach and complete the coursework designed to assist them in becoming highly effective teachers. In addition to mentoring from the ARL advisor, they will work with school or LEA mentor teachers. Site administrators will also help place ARL candidates in appropriate school, district, or state professional development activities when appropriate. If a pre-practitioner is not able to complete their coursework, practical experiences or internships, or meet the standards of the teacher evaluation process, they will be recommended for dismissal from either their university teacher preparation program or, in the case of an ARL, from their teaching position.

During their first three years of teaching, teachers with a **Novice Practitioner** (Level 2 teaching license) must participate in the Entry Years Enhancement program. The state requires all teachers in years 1-3 of their teaching career to complete the following requirements: (1) work with a trained mentor for three years; (2) achieve a score of 160 or higher on the Praxis II – Principles of Learning and Teaching test (#0522, #0523, or #0524) in their area of educational preparation and assignment; (3) successfully satisfy district evaluations demonstrating effective teaching for three years; (4) complete a portfolio review; and (5) be considered No Child Left Behind Highly Qualified in at least one license area or endorsement area. LEAs and schools are mandated to provide access to trained mentors to work with these new teachers. Site administrators will conduct formative and summative assessment of these teachers to provide feedback and opportunities for professional development or support. Teachers who do not meet these requirements and/or cannot demonstrate effective teaching practices and appropriate student growth will be terminated.

After completing three years of successful teaching, the teacher will be granted a **Developing Practitioner** (Level 3 license). Level 3 teachers are expected to develop and demonstrate mastery of targeted skills, possibly as a part of the research and work they do within their professional learning community (PLC). They will set and explain their goals to the site administrator who is
responsible for their evaluation. The Level 3 teacher evaluation process will include formative feedback as administrators conduct evaluation procedures each year.

Highly effective Level 3 teachers are qualified to apply to become Master Teachers (Level 4). Level 4 teachers will be evaluated using the same process as a Level 3 teacher. Level 4 teachers may be granted up to fourteen (14) additional days in an extended contract. The additional days will be used in accordance with a plan developed by the teacher and the site administrator and approved by the district. The Master Teacher will provide professional development, focused mentoring, or student support through afterschool or summer programs. This will ensure that students and other teachers have access to the best teachers in the school and will recognize those teachers monetarily for the work they do. The extended contract will also provide the financial incentive that may keep many highly effective teachers in the classroom.

For principals: Principals will also have two (2) levels of licensure to support their ongoing professional development. These designations include rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems using multiple rating categories, of which school academic growth is a significant factor. Principals in Utah must have five years of teaching experience and have earned an administrative credential before they can serve as a site administrator. Administrator preparation programs include internship requirements as well as coursework on various aspects of school leadership. As a part of the new statewide evaluation plan, administrators in their first three years of service will be provided with a trained mentor to assist them in providing the leadership needed to ensure the development and maintenance of an effective or highly effective school.

Principal also must develop a Personal Growth Plan. New principals will develop this plan in conjunction with their mentors. Experienced principals will develop and review their leadership plans with their evaluating administrator. As principals grow in
experience and leadership ability, they will become eligible to serve as mentor principals. They may have days added to their contract to include time for meeting with new principals and attending, preparing, and presenting professional development.

(D)(2)(iii) **Conducting annual evaluations that include timely feedback about student, classes, and schools**

Currently, provisional educators are required by state statute and Board Rule to be evaluated annually using formative and summative data. Non-provisional teachers must be evaluated every three years at a minimum, but may be evaluated annually for advancement to the next level or if a previous evaluation of performance did not show appropriate performance. Evaluation information is then used for purposes of professional growth, employment decisions, and licensure upgrade. Current Utah statute outlines provisions for summative evaluation and corrective discipline. With the development and implementation of the new statewide framework for teacher evaluation, **evaluations will become annual** for all educators. Elements of the evaluation will be standardized across the state, including the appropriate **use of student growth data** to evaluate teacher performance.

Data on student growth is provided to schools and teachers annually based on state assessments in mathematics and language arts. This information will be refined as a part of our assessment and data activities described earlier in this application.

To enable accurate student growth data to be collected over time, each student in Utah schools is issued a unique student identification number that is different than a government-issued Social Security number that is recognized by every LEA data system in the state. In this way, students can be tracked over multiple years and multiple schools. If the student leaves Utah and returns, the same number is assigned to the student upon his/her return to ensure continuity of data collection. This data can be used to provide timely and constructive feedback for teachers' and principals' evaluations.

(D)(2)(iv) **Using evaluations to inform key decisions**

(D)(2)(iv)(a) **Developing teachers and principals using relevant coaching, induction support, and professional development**
The information provided by the evaluations of teachers and principals described in (D)(iii) will be used to provide responsive professional development that includes induction support for teachers and principals in years 1-3 of their professional career; coaching for teachers and principals after their successful induction support; and ongoing professional development targeted at identified needs or new initiatives.

**Coaching:** Level 1 and 2 teachers and principals in their first three (3) years of service will be required to participate in mentoring programs. Teachers and principals who successfully complete the phase of their teaching but who are identified through formative or summative assessments as struggling in one or more areas will work with a coach, an experienced practitioner or administrator—to create a professional development plan with site, district, or state professional development offerings or with individual support. Teachers or principals who have identified specific areas on their professional growth plans may also request and work with a coach to develop new skills for their classroom or school practice. All teachers and principals will participate in school site professional learning communities, which will also provide support for the development of new skills and understanding.

**Induction support for teachers:** The *Entry Years Enhancement (EYE)* is a structured support program for Level 2 educators. All Level 2 educators are required to participate during years 1-3 of their career as they fulfill the requirements for a Level 3 professional license. EYE provides novice teachers with school, LEA, and state support for a three-year period, including the support of a trained mentor. All new educators are required to participate and all requirements must be completed within the first three years of service. The goal of the EYE program is to encourage Level 2 educators to develop successful teaching skills and strategies as described in the Utah Professional Teacher Standards (UPTS) with assistance from experienced colleagues.

**Induction support for principals:** Level 1 principals will work with an experienced principal for the first three years of their tenure. During that time, they will participate in mentoring relationships and engage in professional conversations with an experienced principal. **Professional development (PD):** Professional development plans for Utah's teachers and principals will be directed using recommendations from the Dean's Council, which includes all ten Deans of Education in the state and representatives from the USOE. Their recommendations will be based on information provided by two online systems currently in use in the State.
One of the systems is a statewide teacher development management, tracking, and reporting solution that enables local districts to improve the effectiveness of their PD programs. It provides a single, personalized entry point to online administrator and teacher development resources; distributes time-sensitive, targeted announcements; manages, tracks, and reports on PD; creates customizable educator assessments and surveys; aligns PD to state and local standards; and provides individualized portfolio management and mentor support. All teachers and principals in the state can use this system to manage their Professional Growth Plans (PGP), record PD activities, and track relicensure hours.

Currently, USOE also provides access for all teachers to a PD tracking system. The system is an on-demand professional development resource that allows subscribers to instantly access nearly 1,000 research-based video segments. Segments address highly relevant educational issues by presenting advice from the leading experts and showing real best-practice classroom examples. Because video segments are searchable and instantly available, educators can always access information that answers their questions and provides timely support. In addition to its extensive content library, the system provides integrated follow-up tools, reflection activities, tracking, and collaboration and community discussion forums and file sharing to promote greater implementation of learning.

USOE will integrate and implement the use of the two online systems to help all LEAs implement an effective system for developing and monitoring the professional growth plans of all educators. Ongoing determinations of course content and areas of focus will be advised by ongoing data collection from career inventory surveys, teacher working condition surveys, student academic growth data, and information from the professional development tracking system. This information will be considered by the USOE and the Dean's Council, which includes the Deans of Education from every college in Utah; they will coordinate IHE offerings for pre-service and ARL teachers as well as ongoing opportunities for partnership professional development with university and district faculties. A successful model for this university-public school partnership model is the Brigham Young
University-Public School Partnership, which over the last 25 years has collaborated with five public school districts representing 1/3 of Utah’s students and teachers to provide innovative, research-based professional development programs, curriculum development, and research opportunities. Using this model, universities throughout Utah have entered and will continue to develop collaborative teams to provide PD to support the PGPs of all educators. **Utah’s Comprehensive Reform Plan** [see Appendix 3] includes the improved integration of both of these systems to support professional development, mentoring, and coaching. This will include enhanced training in all districts throughout the state to better equip all teachers and principals to access and use both systems in conjunction with their professional portfolios.

(D)(2)(iv)(b) **Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities** The system of teacher and principal compensation promotes professionals who are determined to have mastery levels of professional conduct and who demonstrate a willingness to undertake additional responsibilities. The designation Master Practitioner or Principal will provide professional recognition and may also provide opportunities for extended contracts (up to 14 days for teachers; 15 days for principals). Additional contract days may be used to provide (1) induction support for teachers or administrators in years 1-3 of their careers; (2) coaching support for professionals who have completed their first three years or who have been identified as needing additional support; (3) PD as needed at a site or district level; or (4) additional targeted support to students before or after school or during the summer to ensure appropriate academic growth.

(D)(2)(iv)(c) **Whether to grant tenure or full certification to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures** The decision to grant tenure after the completion of the third year of professional employment as a teacher or principal will be based on successful evaluations of the elements described in (D)(ii), which are: the use of scientifically recognized teaching methods, including the use of formative and summative data and appropriate technologies in instruction; student growth; and stakeholder input. Teachers and principals will receive formative feedback culminating in annual evaluations during the first three years designed to provide sufficient time and information to improve practice. A teacher or
principal will be expected to show growth through the first and second year; if s/he does not demonstrate proficiency by the end of the third year, s/he will not be granted tenure and will not continue in that position.

(D)(2)(iv)(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

Under Utah’s Orderly Termination Act, teachers cannot be dismissed without due process. They must receive notice of the reasons their contract may not be renewed; have an opportunity to correct the problem; and have a fair hearing at which the teacher is entitled to hear the evidence against him, examine witnesses and the evidence, be represented by legal counsel, and present his side of the case. Through the process of formative and summative evaluation described in the application, teachers and principals will have ample opportunities to be presented with evidence of any needed improvements and time and support to make those improvements. Teachers or principals who do not demonstrate competency through the evaluation system and who do not show appropriate growth in their professional portfolios towards competency will be dismissed and denied the renewal of their Utah teaching or administrative license. Tenured teachers may have up to two years to demonstrate competency after their initial evaluation indicating the need for improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Baseline data and annual targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>General goals to be provided at time of application:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(i)</td>
<td>Percentage of participating LEAs that measure student growth (as defined in this notice).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Data to be requested of grantees in the future:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(ii)</td>
<td>Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General data to be provided at time of application:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of participating LEAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of principals in participating LEAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of teachers in participating LEAs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Counts of principals includes vice principals.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(D)(2)(iii)$</th>
<th>Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iii)</td>
<td>Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(b)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(b)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(c)</td>
<td>Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were eligible for tenure in the prior academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(c)</td>
<td>Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform tenure decisions in the prior academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(d)</td>
<td>Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs who were removed for being ineffective in the prior academic year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

(D)(3)(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high poverty or high minority schools
Utah’s Teacher Equity Plan in 2006 considered schools as high minority if their student enrollment exceeded 45.75 percent. This was 2½ times the current state minority enrollment percentage of 18.3 percent. Utah’s SY 2008-09 minority enrollment percentage was 20.7. Using the logic in the Teacher Equity Plan, a school was considered high minority if the student enrollment for SY 2008-09 exceeded 51.75% (2 ½ times 20.7%). Low minority was calculated by dividing the SY 2008-09 minority enrollment percentage of 20.7 by 2 ½. Thus, a school was considered low minority if the student enrollment for SY 2008-09 was less than 8.28%.

In accordance with sections 114(b) and 115(c)(1)(E) of the ESEA act, the Utah State Board of Education must ensure that LEAs are in compliance with equitable distribution of highly qualified and experienced teachers in settings where there are high concentrations of poor and minority children. Utah complies with this act by analyzing and reporting on the number teachers who are highly qualified and the experience level of teachers in each school. This information is disaggregated by poverty quartiles and fall enrollment data indicating high concentrations of ethnic minority students.

Utah will begin adding the designation of "effective" teachers to the SEA and LEA equitable distribution plan in 2010. As effective teachers and principals are identified, that data will be analyzed to ensure equitable distribution into high poverty or high minority schools.

In order to ensure that all children are taught by highly qualified and effective teachers, the USOE closely monitors teacher qualification and experience data through the CACTUS database that houses comprehensive credentialing data on all Utah educator license holders. Most importantly, USOE requires that each LEA conduct thorough analysis of their own growth data and develop an equitable distribution plan in order to show compliance and be proactive in ensuring that all of their students have access to qualified and effective teachers.
Each LEA must submit a yearly plan as part of their Utah Consolidated Application (UCA). The UCA is a public document that is posted yearly on both the LEA and our USOE website. Beginning in 2010, each LEA plan must include the following: updated HQT (Federal Title IIA) data for each school; effective teacher and principal data for each school based on student academic performance as defined in this application; detailed analysis of HQT, effective teacher, and experience data for their LEA; detailed plans with actions steps (i.e., incentives, transfers, professional development activities) and timelines; professional development plans to ensure that out of field, under-qualified, ineffective, or inexperienced teachers are getting the proper content and pedagogical support needed to improve their instructional skills; and budget alignment of Title IIA and other ESEA Title funds with instructional quality initiatives. The review of data from the UCA will enable the USOE to review trends and identify any deficient schools or LEAs. Any identified LEA will be asked to submit a plan to amend inequitable distribution within 90 days.

The Utah State Office of Education has partnered with Teachers-Teachers.com to manage a statewide educator recruitment initiative since April 2007. This initiative was established to help all LEAs recruit highly qualified teachers and administrators by accumulating a statewide pool of applicants that can be accessed by school recruiters. By giving all LEAs equal access to the statewide pool, Utah takes the first initial step in providing for the equitable distribution of highly qualified educators. This service includes, but is not limited to, the following features:

1) **Membership** A full membership to Teachers-Teachers.com is provided to all LEAs within Utah. Each LEA is entitled to post an unlimited number of positions, conduct an unlimited number of searches for candidates, and hire an unlimited number of teachers, administrators, and related service providers. The current Utah database consists of 19,409 licensed candidates.

2) **Technical Assistance** Teachers-Teachers.com provides thorough technical assistance for the Utah LEAs and candidates.
The Utah recruitment coordinator provides training by telephone and ongoing support and assistance to each school user in posting positions, conducting searches, and sending mass emails designed to advertise vacancies, incentive programs and recruitment fairs to targeted groups of candidates. The candidate support representative responds to candidate questions and/or concerns through email and phone calls. Both representatives are available by a toll-free number during regular business hours.

3) **Candidate Recruitment** The Teachers-Teachers.com recruitment team has developed and implemented a campaign designed to increase the number of qualified candidates interested in Utah positions. The campaign includes, but is not limited to: creating, producing, and distributing customized marketing pieces; building relationships with education faculty and career centers at institutions of higher education within Utah; promoting and attending state and regional recruitment fairs; placing online advertisements, links, and job board postings; and contacting representatives from partner associations (e.g. Kappa Delta Pi, National Education Association) to distribute information to affiliate/chapter members.

4) **Reporting** Teachers-Teachers.com provides quarterly and annual reports on candidate database growth, registered users, LEA usage, hire data, and other relevant information that USOE can use to evaluate the program and establish the basis for future funding.

**(D)(3)(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subject and specialty areas**

In addition to the information provided by Teachers-Teachers.com to all districts in the Utah, USOE conducts a survey each year in each LEA to determine areas of need in staffing. This survey, along with additional credentialing data, is developed into a list of teaching areas that are placed into a “criticality index” of teaching shortage areas. In Utah, these areas continue to be in the areas of mathematics, physical sciences, and special education. The Terrel H. Bell Teaching Incentive Loan Program, which provides low interest students loans and/or scholarships to education students in areas identified as shortage areas, helps to recruit outstanding students to teach in prioritized critical areas of need in Utah’s public schools, as defined by USOE criticality.
index, and to recognize teaching as a positive career choice.

Programs of support, such as PEJEP (Public Educator Job Enhancement Program), provide funding opportunities for under-qualified teachers to receive advanced credentials as well as providing signing bonuses in these shortage areas. University programs are working with LEAs to provide credentialing coursework for cohorts of teachers. Rural schools continue to struggle in finding teachers in shortage areas. Most rural teachers are required to teach multiple subjects, inevitably teaching a subject they are not qualified for. RTTT funding, in addition to Title IIA funding, will be used to ensure that rural educators and districts are supported in the professional development needed for appropriate credentials.

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

- Utah’s Teacher Equity Plan in 2006 considered schools as high minority if their student enrollment exceeded 45.75 percent. This was 2½ times the current state minority enrollment percentage of 18.3 percent. Utah’s SY 2008-09 minority enrollment percentage was 20.7. Using the logic in the Teacher Equity Plan, a school was considered high minority if the student enrollment for SY 2008-09 exceeded 51.75% (2½ times 20.7%). Low minority was calculated by dividing the SY 2008-09 minority enrollment percentage of 20.7 by 2½. Thus, a school was considered low minority if the student enrollment for SY 2008-09 was less than 8.28%.

**Performance Measures for (D)(3)(i)**

*Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures for (D)(3)(i)</th>
<th>Baseline data and annual targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General goals to be provided at time of application:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Currently Utah has in place a growth calculation which is aggregated at the school level (for description of growth calculation see below). The data reported in (D)(3)(i) uses the school level growth calculation for percentages of principals leading schools that are high/low poverty, high/low minority, or both. Growth data is generated at the student level and in the future can be aggregated at the teacher level to determine teacher effective status (highly effective, ineffective). However, teacher level aggregation could not be made in time for this grant application. The percentages for teachers were estimated using manually calculated aggregated class level growth data from a large LEA (Alpine District). We will set targets when we are confident that are data is accurate.

**Progress/Growth**

Utah has employed a “value table” approach for holding schools accountable for student longitudinal growth. The table provides incentives to schools to increase the performance of matched students, especially those scoring below proficient as they move through the school. Due to the large amount of progress that can occur within levels one and two, those levels were divided to award students points for moving from the lower portion of that proficiency level to the higher portion of the proficiency level. These levels were dividing by finding the mid-point on the score scale for the base year and then using that equated scale score in subsequent years to divide the performance levels. The value table approach for capturing student progress is based on the theory that accountability can best motivate behavior on the part of school personnel if the expectations are very transparent to the educators. Importantly, the value table approach is one of the few standards based methods for calculating student growth. Unlike many complex models, educational leaders can calculate their progress scores—as well as what they need to do to meet the state goals—with a hand calculator. Schools are awarded points based on students’ scores in year-one compared to their scores in the next grade in year-two. For example, a student starting in Level 1b in year-one who reaches Level 2a in the next year will generate 225 points for that school. The total number of points for each school is then divided by the number of students for which there is matched data to arrive at the school’s value table score.

**Low/High Minority Schools**

Utah’s Teacher Equity Plan in 2006 considered schools as high minority if their student enrollment exceeded 45.75 percent. This was 2 ½ times the current state minority enrollment percentage of 18.3 percent. Utah’s SY 2008-09 minority enrollment percentage was 20.7. Using the logic in the Teacher Equity Plan, a school was considered high minority if the student enrollment for SY 2008-09 exceeded 51.75% (2 ½ times 20.7%). Low minority was calculated by dividing the SY 2008-09 minority enrollment percentage of 20.7 by 2 ½. Thus, a school was considered low minority if the student enrollment for SY 2008-09 was less than 8.28%.

**General data to be provided at time of application:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority,</td>
<td>6,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or both (as defined in this notice).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority,</td>
<td>9,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or both (as defined in this notice).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority, or both (as defined in this notice).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority, or both (as defined in this notice).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The total numbers of teachers in schools that are high/low poverty, high/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low minority, or both are not estimated from data from a large LEA (Alpine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District). They are actual counts from SY 2008-09.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data to be requested of grantees in the future:**

- Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high- minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as highly effective (as defined in this notice) in the prior academic year.
- Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as highly effective (as defined in this notice) in the prior academic year.
- Number of teachers and principals in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.
- Number of teachers and principals in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.
Performance Measures for (D)(3)(ii)

Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General goals to be provided at time of application:</th>
<th>Baseline data and annual targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of mathematics teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of science teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of special education teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.</td>
<td>see below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of teachers in language instruction educational programs who were evaluated as effective or better.</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currently Utah has in place a growth calculation which is aggregated at the school level (for description of the growth calculation see note in (D)(3)(i)). Growth data is generated at the student level and in the future can be aggregated at the teacher level to determine teacher effective status (highly effective, ineffective). However, teacher level aggregation could not be made in time for this grant application. The percentages for teachers were estimated using manually calculated aggregated class level growth data from a large LEA (Alpine District). Due to how this data was compiled, special education teachers were not identified and that percentage could not be reported at this time. We will set targets when we are confident that accurate data is available. In the future Utah will also be able to report growth for special education teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General data to be provided at time of application:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of mathematics teachers.</td>
<td>1,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of science teachers.</td>
<td>1,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of special education teachers.</td>
<td>2,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of teachers in language instruction educational programs.</td>
<td>3,105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The total numbers of teachers in schools that are high/low poverty, high/low minority, or both are not estimated from data from a large LEA (Alpine District). They are actual counts from SY 2008-09. Mathematics and science teachers are defined as regular education teachers providing specific instruction in the content area. Utah has defined “teachers in language instruction educational programs” as teachers of either English language arts or foreign language consistent with the federal guidelines designating both areas as NCLB subjects. Multi-subject elementary teachers are not included in the mathematics, science or language instruction teacher counts.

Data to be requested of grantees in the future:

| 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

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs
(D)(4)(i) Linking student achievement and student growth data to the students’ teachers and principals, 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.

Research at the national (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Wilson, Floden & Ferrini-Mundy, 2001) and state levels (Sanders, 1996) confirms that there is a significant relationship between teacher quality and student achievement, and that interventions in both teacher education and teacher professional development successfully affect student learning. Utah has developed the Continuum of Support for Educator Excellence [see Appendix 31] to provide standards for effective pre-service and in-service teacher education and development. This continuum will be used to provide a standard for continuous improvement in teacher preparation program. The development of similar standards for principal preparation programs is under way. All teacher and principal preparation programs in the state of Utah are taught at fully accredited institutions.

Improving teacher preparation Utah uses the CACTUS program to connect student growth data to teacher programs in the annual Teacher Quality Report. This report includes information about each teacher's degree and credentialing, enabling the USOE to disaggregate student and teacher performance data by degree granting or credentialing institution. This information is reviewed annually by the State Board oversight committee for approval of teacher preparation programs. In the event that a trend in data was to indicate that a program was not adequately preparing teachers, that program would be reviewed by the Dean’s Council and USOE. The program would be required to present a program improvement plan and be monitored to ensure implementation and improvement.
The Dean's Council, LEA EYE coordinators, district leaders, and USOE are developing Utah Standards for teacher preparation programs that include proficiency with technology infusion in instruction, focus on instructional strategies, and differentiated instruction. These standards will be based on new 2010 Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards that will detail the needs of millennial teachers.

USOE is observing data from a pilot integrated teacher preparation model underway between the University of Utah and the Salt Lake School District that provides experience for teacher candidates in integrating coursework from special education and regular education, focusing on field-based coursework and multiple field-based experiences in an urban setting. Teacher coursework is based on student achievement data and the curriculum focus of district in addition to research-based coursework. If this model demonstrates positive results, the results will be disseminated to all teacher preparation programs in the state.

Utah is also engaged in the updating of the Utah Professional Teaching Standards to focus on high-quality instructional practices and attend to needs of millennial teachers. Changes also include the use of teacher portfolios to ensure the use of methods that lead to improved instructional practices and student achievement. Teacher preparation programs use these standards to adjust their curriculums and ensure that their programs prepare teachers to create successful classrooms.

**Improving principal preparation** USOE also uses the CACTUS system to track the placement of principals at all Utah schools and link effective principals to the principal preparation program from which they graduated. In addition to this data, the **School Leadership Preparation and Practice Survey (SLPPS)** is administered annually in all Utah leadership preparation programs to solicit feedback from their graduates and alumni about: program features; leadership learning; outcomes; leadership career intentions and advancement; leadership practices; school improvement work; school climate; student, parent and teacher engagement; and student learning outcomes.
The survey was developed through the UCEA/LTEL-SIG Taskforce (University Council for Educational Administration/Learning and Teaching in Educational Leadership Special Interest Group) on Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs. It has been field tested in a wide variety of programs and institutions nationwide, has demonstrated strong content validity, and its scales have robust measurement reliability.

Data from the CACTUS system and the SLPPS are reviewed annually by the Dean's Council and the USOE and are used to recommend changes in curriculum, intern experiences, and administrative program requirements. The Dean's Council and USOE are developing standards for principal preparation that are focused on instructional leadership. Reformation of principal preparation programs includes an examination of current courses as aligned with ISSLLC standards and current research-based practices. The new standards will require that internships include emphasis on analyzing and utilizing student data to inform instructional practices. The new standards will also examine requirements for entrance into principal preparation programs in order to inform program revisions. This analysis will result in upgrading the current Board Rule to establish new standards for program admittance and standards for program approval and performance based licensure.

(D)(4)(ii) Expanding preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals

The longitudinal data show that the existing preparation and credentialing programs in the state are, overall, producing roughly equivalent groups of well prepared teacher and principal candidates. As data are collected on effective and highly effective teachers and principals, those programs that demonstrate the most success will be identified and expanded. Of particular interest would be any program that produces significantly more teachers in hard-to-fill areas, especially math and science, and their recruiting and retention tools. Elements of the successful programs will be identified and presented in meetings with the Dean’s
Council in order to enable all programs to identify and use successful strategies, provide appropriate academic support, and support meaningful site-based learning opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Baseline data and annual targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General goals to be provided at time of application:</td>
<td>End of SY 2010-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General data to be provided at time of application:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of teacher credentialing programs in the State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of principal credentialing programs in the State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of teachers in the State.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of principals in the State.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Counts of principals includes vice principals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data to be requested of grantees in the future:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of teacher credentialing programs in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(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
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals

(D)(5)(i) Provide effective, data-informed professional development, coaching, induction, and common planning and collaboration time for teachers

Professional development plans for Utah's teachers and principals will be directed using recommendations from the Dean's Council and the USOE. Their recommendations will be based on information provided by two online systems: one system is a statewide teacher development management, tracking, and reporting solution that enables local districts to improve the effectiveness of their professional development programs. It provides a single, personalized entry point to online administrator and teacher development resources; distributes time-sensitive, targeted announcements; manages, tracks, and reports on professional development; creates customizable educator assessments and surveys; aligns professional development to state and local standards; and provides individualized portfolio management and mentor support. All teachers and principals in the state will use this system to manage their Professional Growth Plans (PGP), record professional development activities, and track re-licensure hours into CACTUS.

USOE also provides access for all teachers to another online tool, which provides an on-demand professional development resource that allows subscribers to instantly access nearly 1,000 research-based video segments. Segments provide video models of educator standards and quality instruction. Because video segments are searchable and instantly available, educators can always access information that answers their questions and provides timely support. In addition to its extensive content library, the tool provides integrated follow-up tools, reflection activities, tracking, and collaboration and community discussion forums and file sharing to promote greater implementation of learning.

USOE will **integrate** and implement use of these online tools and create appropriate professional development to help all LEAs in the state implement an effective system for developing and monitoring the PGPs of all educators in the state. Ongoing determinations of course content and areas of focus will be advised by ongoing data collection from career inventory surveys,
teacher working condition surveys, student academic growth data, and information from the professional development tracking system. This information will be considered by the USOE and the Dean's Council and will be used to coordinate IHE offerings for pre-service and ARL teachers as well as ongoing opportunities for partnership professional development with university and district faculties.

As all schools in Utah move to a professional learning communities model, LEAs are moving toward schedules that enable teachers to have late start or early out days to provide common planning and collaboration time. Teacher and principal preparation programs provide background and training in the PLC model to ensure all candidates are grounded in the philosophy and practice of PLCs.

**For principals** In addition to new standards and pre-service preparation, a collaborative project between Utah State University, Brigham Young University, and USOE has created a principal in-service program that challenges traditional approaches to school improvement. The focus of the Institute is on developing leaders who can facilitate collaborative decision-making models for school improvement efforts. The Utah School Leadership Institute takes advantage of the current culture of a school to adopt and sustain effective practices and to establish the most potent teaching and learning environments. This new context will emphasize tools for measuring both a school’s capacity to bring about student achievement as well as its accomplishments in each of several critical areas of school quality, which are themselves related to student achievement. Furthermore, the Institute will create a support system that will not only build leadership knowledge and skills, but will also ensure that continual improvement will be sustained over time. It will acknowledge and take full advantage of the current social structures that exist within each school, and create a new collaborative structure—a “professional learning community” for school leaders. Lastly, the Institute will reward school leaders for accepting the challenge to be accountable for school improvement efforts and will recognize significant positive outcomes that result from collaborations across and within schools.

This strategy is based upon three important recent developments resulting from research conducted or compiled by the Center for
the School of the Future at Utah State University and the David O. McKay School of Education at Brigham Young University. First, the research demonstrates a relationship between four pedagogical variables that uniquely account for as much as 50% of the variance of academic achievement, with the strongest relationships documented for young and disadvantaged learners. These variables have to do with teacher-student relationships and specific instructional procedures that are independent of content knowledge and curriculum. They are found in all truly effective instructional settings but are largely ignored in preparation programs for teachers and school leaders. However, when these variables are not systematically included in school and classroom practice, academic achievement may be severely limited.

The Institute has developed measurement tools, now used in more than 1,300 schools, that allow researchers to quantify the instructional and management practices in a school that predict important outcomes, such as academic achievement, school safety, and student attendance. Using information from the tool, specific remediation strategies can be prescribed and used to promote overall school success.

(D)(5)(ii) Measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of those supports in order to improve student achievement

The USOE will contract with an outside reviewing agency to monitor and report on all RTTT activities and collected data. This will include an annual review of data of student achievement, effective teachers and principal preparation, and professional development. Data will be collected from multiple sources, including the two online systems described above, district reports, and student academic achievement scores. The annual review will measure and evaluate to determine (1) the level of implementation of program activities and (2) the level of effectiveness of program activities. The outside evaluator will make recommendations to continuously improve the program at the end of each year and work with the USOE to create a plan to remediate any needed areas. All efforts will focus on the continuing improvement of student achievement for all Utah students.
**Performance Measures**
Performance measures for this criterion are optional. If the State wishes to include performance measures, please enter them as rows in this table and, for each measure, provide annual targets in the columns provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Actual Data (Current school year or most recently)</th>
<th>End of SY 2010-2011</th>
<th>End of SY 2011-2012</th>
<th>End of SY 2012-2013</th>
<th>End of SY 2013-2014</th>
<th>End of SY 2014-2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combine the services of two current online programs (1) to provide online tracking of professional development from all sources and (2) provide models of instructional excellence.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide professional development for all state LEAs to ensure appropriate use of the system to create professional development goals and plans to effectively meet those goals.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAs provide professional development to all schools to ensure teachers understand the methods by which they will complete their licensure requirements and portfolios for evaluation.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold meetings with stakeholders and develop framework for teacher and principal evaluation focused on instructional leadership with technical support and professional development for effective implementation.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt framework for evaluation in Board Rule.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide technical assistance to LEAs through implementation process.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor implementation efforts.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(E) Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools *(50 total points)*

State Reform Conditions Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs <em>(10 points)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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*

(E)(1) *Intervening in lowest-achieving schools and LEAs:* Please see evidence below.

**Evidence for (E)(1):**
- Utah state law and Board of Education rules have several provisions that allow the State Board to intervene in persistently lowest-achieving schools.
- Utah Code, Section 53A-1-401(1) [see Appendix 12] allows the Utah State Board of Education to “interrupt disbursements of state aid to any district which fails to comply with rules adopted in accordance with this subsection.”
- On January 7, 2010, the Utah State Board of Education reviewed and passed on first and second reading R277-114, Corrective Action and Withdrawal or Reduction of Program Funds [see Appendix 32] that allows the Utah State Board of Education Auditor, in conjunction with program specialists, to monitor and withdraw or reduce program funding to schools or programs within a school or school district that act inconsistent with state law, administrative rule, and the express
purposes of the program. The rule provides for investigation, corrective action, monitoring, and possible withholding of education funding if programs do not comply with state or federal financial standards. Any corrective action or withholding of funds would only take place under the supervision of the State Superintendent or other high level state education administrators and following adequate notice to entities that are noncompliant.

- Utah Code, Sections 53A-1a-509 [see Appendix 33] and 53A-1a-510 [see Appendix 34] allow the school’s chartering entity (the State Board of Education or a school district) to intervene in a charter school or terminate a charter if the school violates its charter, fails to meet generally accepted standards of fiscal management or “for other good cause shown.”

- These provisions have been used rarely by the Utah State Board of Education and/or the State Charter Board. Both the State Board of Education and the State Charter Board have used their authority and these provisions to more closely monitor two small school districts during the summer of 2009 (Grand and Garfield) and two charter schools in the past year (Monticello Academy and Beehive Academy). Another charter (Emerson Alcott Academy) was revoked by the Utah State Board of Education (with support from the State Charter Board) because the school failed to progress toward opening in its preparatory year.

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
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

(E)(2)(i) Identify persistently lowest-achieving Title I and non-eligible secondary schools

Utah has been using the method recommended by the United States Department of Education for identifying the lowest performing schools. We are proposing a new, more accurate procedure that places more emphasis on longitudinal data. Because, under current requirements, schools are identified as in need of improvement based upon two or more consecutive years of not achieving AYP in the same subject area, a number of schools that achieve AYP based on Safe Harbor or other data quality measures are never identified as lowest achieving. In addition, very few Utah secondary schools receive Title I funding. Therefore, most of the lowest performing secondary schools are not Title I schools. As a result of AYP determination that does not completely measure school success, many of our Title I schools identified for improvement are significantly outperforming other schools that have not been identified. For example, there are sixteen (16) elementary schools in Utah whose four-year average of Language Arts and Mathematics CRT performance is lower that the lowest achieving Title I schools currently identified as in need of improvement. Table 11 below compares a list of the potential lowest performing schools based on the U.S. Department of Education guidelines to other schools not identified but achieving a lower level of performance. The percent for each school is based on the four-year average of the percent of
students that are proficient on CRTs for mathematics and language arts combined. The asterisk indicates schools that are too new to have a four-year average. We believe we should use the four-year average because it more accurately identifies schools that are struggling.

Table 12, identifies the lowest performing secondary schools based on the percent for each school’s four-year average of proficiency on combined Mathematics and Language Arts CRTs. Based on the current U. S. Department of Education recommendations, only two districts, Granite and Salt Lake City, would qualify for school improvement funds. Therefore, only six of our consistently lowest achieving schools would receive help.

**Table 11 - Title I and State Identified Elementary Schools for Improvements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title I Schools Identified for Improvement</th>
<th>State Identified Lowest Achieving Elementary Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midvale Elementary (Canyons SD)</td>
<td>Orchard Hills Elementary (Nebo SD) 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Middle (Salt Lake City SD)</td>
<td>Eagle View Elementary (Uintah SD) 36%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redwood Elementary (Granite SD)</td>
<td>James Madison Elementary (Ogden SD) 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsdale Elementary (Granite SD)</td>
<td>Dual Immersion (Charter) 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oquirrh Hills Elementary (Granite SD)</td>
<td>Mexican Hat Elementary (San Juan SD) 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaPoint Elementary (Uintah SD)</td>
<td>Edison Elementary (Salt Lake City SD) 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrer Elementary (Provo SD)</td>
<td>Gramercy Elementary (Ogden SD) 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midvale Elementary (Canyons SD)</td>
<td>Lincoln Elementary (Granite SD) 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Elementary (Canyons SD)</td>
<td>Bluff Elementary (San Juan SD) 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timpanogos Elementary (Provo SD)</td>
<td>Odyssey Elementary (Ogden SD) 45%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heber Valley Elementary (Wasatch SD)</td>
<td>Guadalupe School (Charter) 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Mountain Elementary (Washington SD)</td>
<td>Dee Elementary (Ogden SD) 46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 12 – State Identified Lowest Achieving Secondary Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Identified Lowest Achieving Secondary Schools</th>
<th>Title I</th>
<th>Title I eligible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whitehorse HS (San Juan SD)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Title I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granger HS (Granite SD)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>Title I eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendover HS (Tooele SD)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Title I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus HS (Granite SD)</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Not Title I eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our suggested approach for identifying persistently struggling schools is summarized in the Table 13 below.

### Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary Schools</th>
<th>Comprehensive Secondary Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(not a special purpose school)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(not a special purpose school)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Analyze the combined performance in math and language arts over four years as determined by the percent of students who are proficient on the Utah Criterion Referenced Tests (CRTs). Consideration will be given to whole school and sub-group performance. Rank order from lowest to highest performance the lowest performing 5% of elementary schools.</td>
<td>1. Analyze the combined performance in math and language arts over four years as determined by the percent of students who are proficient on the Utah Criterion Referenced Tests (CRTs). For high schools, graduation rate trends will be identified as a factor for determining low performing schools. Consideration will be given to whole school and sub-group performance. Rank order from lowest to highest performance the lowest performing 5% of secondary schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Determine if Title I or Title I eligible</td>
<td>2. Determine if Title I or Title I eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Yes: Require the Title I school improvement process (regardless of AYP determination). Provide Title I school improvement grant.</td>
<td>If Yes: If Title I, require the Title I school improvement process (regardless of AYP determination). Provide Title I and/or Title I ARRA school improvement grant(s). If eligible, but not Title I, recommend the LEA apply for Title I ARRA school improvement grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If No: Recommend the LEA provide supports for school improvement consistent with the Title I school improvement model.</td>
<td>If No: Recommend the LEA apply for RTTT school improvement support and funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. SEA will annually review the trend data (CRT) to determine if the school continues to be among the lowest 5% of elementary schools.</td>
<td>3. SEA will annually review the trend data (CRT and graduation rate) to determine if the school continues to be among the lowest 5% of secondary schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Yes: Determine if the school has made significant progress in improvement. If yes, require continued participation in the Title I school improvement process</td>
<td>If Yes: Determine if the school has made significant progress in improvement. If yes, require continued participation in the Title I school improvement process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If No: Recommend continued LEA support for school improvement.</td>
<td>If No: Recommend continued LEA support for school improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
until no longer in the 5% of lowest performing elementary schools. Provide Title I school improvement grant.

school improvement process until no longer in the 5% of lowest performing secondary schools. Provide Title I and/or Title I ARRA school improvement grant(s). If eligible, but not Title I, recommend the LEA apply for Title I ARRA school improvement grant.

(E)(2)(ii) Turning around these schools by implementing one of the four school implementation models

Implementation of the following projects will allow Utah to meet Reform Area Four Goals.

Project One: System of Support for Title I Struggling Schools

Project Goals (Reform Area Four Goal 1):

- All Title I schools identified as persistently lowest achieving will immediately begin one of the four school intervention models.

Rationale: Utah’s System of Support has been very effective in preventing Title I schools from reaching the persistently low-performing schools designation. This program is helping turn around Utah Title I schools by focusing resources on research-based strategies that lead to increased achievement. Project Summary, Responsible Parties, Activities, and Timelines: USOE will continue its established System of Support for Title I School Improvement Schools using Title I School Improvement and ARRA School Improvement Grant funds. Karl Wilson, Director of Federal Programs and Title I, will have responsibility for managing this project. RTTT funds are not needed for this project. This project consists of four (4) activities. Activity 1: Identify lowest-achieving Title I schools in accordance with ARRA RTTT guidelines. 2010/14: Review AYP determinations. Activity 2: Work with LEAs to implement the Utah Title I System of Support for identified Title I schools. 2010/14: Provide support. Identified Title I schools establish school leadership teams, select members for School Support Teams, conduct school appraisal, revise school improvement plan, implement plan and monitor progress. Activity 3: Work with LEAs to implement a higher level of mandatory SEA support for identified Title I schools that have not made significant progress. 2010/14: If improvement plan strategies do not result in significant improvement, schools continue to implement strategies in activity #2 and receive mandatory SEA support. LEAs with Title I schools
in need of improvement that do not improve conduct thorough Instructional Audit and implement instructional coaching. **Activity 4:** Support turning around schools that do not respond to the Utah Title I System of Support by implementing one of the four ARRA RTTTT identified school intervention models. **2011/14:** SEA and LEA collaboratively select which intervention model is most appropriate for the school community. LEA develops plan and applies for Title I ARRA School Improvement Grant and implements one of the four school intervention models.

**Project Two: Preventing Low-Achieving Secondary Schools**

**Project Goals (Reform Area Four Goal 2):**

- **By July 2010,** Utah will have a system in place to identify secondary non-Title I schools that are at risk of becoming persistently lowest achieving and begin school improvement intervention.

**Rationale:** Utah’s System of Support has been very effective in preventing Title I schools from reaching the persistently low-performing schools designation. This program is helping turn around Utah Title I schools by focusing resources on research-based strategies that lead to increased achievement. **Project Summary, Responsible Parties, Activities, and Timelines:** USOE will use lessons learned and RTTT funds to prevent select non-Title I secondary schools from becoming persistently low-performing schools. Karl Wilson, Director of Federal Programs and Title I, will have responsibility for managing this project. RTTT funds are needed for this project. This project consists of three (3) activities. **Activity 1:** Identify secondary schools that are at risk of becoming persistently low achieving schools. **2010/14:** Annual review of language arts and mathematics achievement results and graduation rate. **Activity 2:** Using Utah’s State System of Success process, ensure that these schools complete and implement a comprehensive school improvement plan, form and utilize professional learning communities effectively, address and pursue rigorous efforts in the desired student outcomes and the other three reform areas, demonstrate school commitment by signing an MOU that includes a binding agreement to fully comply with the terms and conditions and scope of work description of the State plan and contains signatures from the LEA superintendent, principal, a teacher leader representative, and local school community president. **2010/11:** Provide training
and support. SEA, LEA, and school establish RTTT school improvement MOU, establish school leadership teams, select members of School Support Team, conduct school appraisal, begin work with Utah State/Brigham Young University Leadership Academy, revise school improvement plan, and begin plan implementation. 2011/14: Provide training and support. LEA and school continue plan implementation and monitor progress. **Activity 3:** Require LEAs to allow identified schools to create the conditions for reform and innovation by providing them with flexibility and autonomy in selecting staff, implementing new structures and formats for the school day, control the school’s budget, provide comprehensive services to high need students, create school climate and culture that remove obstacles and actively support student engagement and achievement, and implement strategies that actively engage families and communities in supporting the academic success of their students. 2010/14: LEAs allow identified struggling schools the flexibility and autonomy as stated.

**Evidence for (E)(2):**

- See table below for evidence of (E)(2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach Used</th>
<th># of Schools Since SY2004-05</th>
<th>Results and Lessons Learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turnaround Model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The restructured school made AYP the following year. Utah used a collaborative approach. All stakeholders participated in determining what kind of model would be used for restructuring. The collaboration resulted in all parties working to make the restructuring work. We intend to replicate this successful process in other restructuring situations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evidence**
**Evidence:** Utah has had only one school, West Middle School in the Uintah School District, that has gone through a restructuring process. Under the direction of the USOE Support Team, the district leadership considered closing the school and sending the students to a school in another town 30 miles away. The Uintah School Board held a public hearing that was well attended by the Ute Tribal Council and parents of the students attending the school. During the course of the meeting, there was a commitment by the parents and the Tribal Council that they would increase the level of intervention in the case of truant students if a school could remain in their community. The School Board decided to use a turnaround model. The Board tore down the older, existing middle school and built a new K-8 school. The District hired one of the most dynamic principals in the district to open the new school with a staff that was hand picked. The adjacent elementary school, R. Todd Elementary, was also closed. The newly constituted school, Eagle Elementary, opened as a K-8 school using an elementary model, which kept students primarily with one teacher for the school year. There are new curriculum areas of emphasis and focus, a stronger data driven delivery system, and much greater school to community collaboration. The school made AYP its first year of operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The number of schools for which one of the four school intervention models (described in Appendix C) will be initiated each year.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following schools were identified in Utah’s SFSF Phase 2 application as meeting the criteria for secondary schools that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds, that are identified as persistently lowest-achieving schools: Granger High School, Granite School District; Kearns High School, Granite School District; Ogden High School, Ogden School District; Ben Lomond High School, Ogden School District; East High School, Salt Lake School District; Highland High School, Salt Lake School District; Wendover
High School, Tooele School District. We will work with these schools and, if we receive permission, with three more that are at risk of becoming persistently low achieving: Glendale Middle School, Salt Lake School District; Cyprus High School, Granite School District; and White Horse High School, San Juan School District. We will begin with two years of intensive intervention. If positive change does not occur, all ten schools will proceed to restructuring.

(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.
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority

(F)(1)(i) The percentage of total revenues available to the State used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY2009 was greater than or equal to the percentage of total revenues available to the State for FY2008.

The State of Utah increased its support for public and higher education as defined in this notice. Total state revenues are a combination of both the State General Fund and Education Fund that are available to fund general operations of the state and public education.

Table 14 – State Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Total State Revenues</th>
<th>Public Ed Budget</th>
<th>Higher Ed Budget</th>
<th>Combined Budgets</th>
<th>Education Budget as a Percentage of State Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual 2008</td>
<td>$5,943,136,000</td>
<td>$2,432,363,600</td>
<td>$761,747,200</td>
<td>$3,194,110,800</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriated 2009</td>
<td>$5,016,154,000</td>
<td>$2,237,231,200</td>
<td>$733,359,600</td>
<td>$2,970,590,800</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State support is comprised of Education Funds appropriated to the Minimum School Program, Utah’s primary funding formula for public education. Data for FY 2008 actual and FY 2009 appropriated levels are documented in the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget, Fiscal Year 2009 Budget Summary. Data for current FY 2009 are documented in:

- Senate Bill 2, Minimum School Program Budget Amendments (General Session 2008)
- Senate Bill 2001, Current Fiscal Year Budget Adjustments (2nd Special Session, 2008)
- Senate Bill 4, Current School Year Supplemental Minimum School Program Budget Adjustments (General Session, 2009)
- House Bill 3, Current Fiscal Year Supplemental Appropriations Act (General Session, 2009)
- House Bill 2, Minimum School Program Budget Amendments (General Session, 2009)
• Senate Bill 1004, Supplemental Appropriations Adjustments (1st Special Session, 2009)
• House Bill 1003, Appropriations Adjustments Related to Federal Funds (1st Special Session, 2009)

Data for current FY 2008 and FY 2009 is also available in the Governor’s FY 2010 Budget Summary book and supporting budget work papers. Due to the size of these documents (over 1000 pages), they are not provided in an Appendix but are available upon request.

(F)(1)(ii) The State's policies lead to equitable funding between high-need LEAs and other LEAs, within LEAs, between high-poverty and other schools.

(F)(1)(ii)(a) Policies that lead to equitable funding between high-need LEAs and other LEAs

The State of Utah is nationally recognized for the equity and equalization formulas for the State’s basic school program. Utah is one of only five states where no court case challenging the equity of the state's education finance system has ever been filed. When last measured by the GAO, Utah was one of only two states whose fiscal neutrality score was not statistically significant from zero, indicating that “on average, per pupil funding is the same in wealthy as in poor districts and that no income-related funding gap exists.”

The state of Utah distributes funding for public and higher education according to statute under the Utah Code, Titles 53A. State System of Public Education, 53B State System of Higher Education, and 53C School and Institutional Trust Lands Management Act and Article 10 of the Utah State Constitution. The State provides most of the funding for Utah’s public schools. For example, during FY 2008, in order to serve the educational needs of just under 540,000 students in over 900 public schools, including charter schools, nearly $3.5 billion were used. Roughly 70% of those funds came from state revenue, 23% from local revenue, and 7% from federal resources. The bulk of state revenues come from individual and corporate income taxes collected and distributed through the Uniform School Fund (USF). The USF currently accounts for approximately 70% of all public education financing in Utah. State USF funds are “equalized” in that they are distributed to LEAs based primarily on the entity’s proportionate share of all students
enrolled in the State public education system. In practice, the formulas for these funds are complicated, but the aim is to provide an equivalent amount of funding for each student in the state. For example, Park City School District, which is located in the State’s highest taxable income tax area, does not keep all of the revenue. Revenue from LEAs in wealthy income tax areas is redistributed by a complicated formula to LEAs in areas with lower than average income taxes. The purpose of this redistribution to provide equitable funding for all Utah school children.

The law that governs the use of these funds is called the Minimum School Program (MSP) Act. For FY08, the MSP Act was contained in House Bill 3. The Utah State Legislature annually reviews this act and appropriates the funds to support its provisions. In general, for each fiscal year, the MSP Act establishes the dollar amount of the maximum State contribution to the MSP and establishes the value of the weighted pupil unit (WPU). The WPU is used as a basis for determining specific funding amounts for different types of students and programs within the MSP funding categories. For example, because Utah kindergarten students attend half-day programs, the rate of funding for these students is currently .55 WPU, which means the school receives 55% of the full WPU value per student per year. Conversely, because special education students require additional services, the WPU factor for special education students provides annual per student funding greater than one WPU, depending on the disability of each student in sponsored programs.

(F)(1)(ii)(b) Polices that lead to equitable funding within LEAs

Equitable funding within LEAs is outlined by statute in the Utah Code Title 53A and in the State Constitution.

a. Utah Code Title 53A:

(1) The purpose of this chapter is to provide a minimum school program for the state in accordance with the constitutional mandate. It recognizes that all children of the state are entitled to reasonably equal educational opportunities regardless of their place of residence in the state and of the economic situation of their respective school districts or other agencies.
(2) It further recognizes that although the establishment of an educational system is primarily a state function, school districts should be required to participate on a partnership basis in the payment of a reasonable portion of the cost of a minimum program.

(3) It is also the purpose of this chapter to describe the manner in which the state and the school districts shall pay their respective share of the costs of a minimum program. This chapter also recognizes that each locality should be empowered to provide educational facilities and opportunities beyond the minimum program and accordingly provide a method whereby that latitude of action is permitted and encouraged.

b. The Utah State Constitution

The Utah Constitution (Art. X Sections 1 and 2) provides:

**Article X, Section 1. [Free nonsectarian schools.]**

The Legislature shall provide for the establishment and maintenance of the state's education systems including: (a) a public education system, which shall be open to all children of the state; and (b) a higher education system. Both systems shall be free from sectarian control.

**Article X, Section 2. [Defining what shall constitute the public school system.]**

The public education system shall include all public elementary and secondary schools and such other schools and programs as the Legislature may designate. The higher education system shall include all public universities and colleges and such other institutions and programs as the Legislature may designate. Public elementary and secondary schools shall be free, except the Legislature may authorize the imposition of fees in the secondary schools.

**(F)(1)(ii)(c) Polices that lead to equitable funding between high-poverty schools and other schools**

Equitable funding within LEAs is covered by the formulas outlined by statute in the Utah Code Title 53A and described above.

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

- See (F)(1)(i) for evidence of this section.
Evidence for (F)(1)(ii):

- See (F)(1)(ii) for evidence of this section.

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

The extent to which—

(i) The State has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State, measured (as set forth in Appendix B) by the percentage of total schools in the State that are allowed to be charter schools or otherwise restrict student enrollment in charter schools;

(ii) The State has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools; in particular, whether authorizers require that student achievement (as defined in this notice) be one significant factor, among others, in authorization or renewal; encourage charter schools that serve student populations that are similar to local district student populations, especially relative to high-need students (as defined in this notice); and have closed or not renewed ineffective charter schools;

(iii) The State’s charter schools receive (as set forth in Appendix B) equitable funding compared to traditional public schools, and a commensurate share of local, State, and Federal revenues;

(iv) The State provides charter schools with funding for facilities (for leasing facilities, purchasing facilities, or making tenant improvements), assistance with facilities acquisition, access to public facilities, the ability to share in bonds and mill levies, or other supports; and the extent to which the State does not impose any facility-related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than those applied to traditional public schools; 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
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
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools

(F)(2)(i) State charter school law does not prohibit or effectively inhibit the number of high-performing charter schools

There is no limit to the number of charter schools in Utah. The percentage of charter schools in the state is 7.3% serving 6% of the public school age population. Current Utah Code 53A-1a-502.5 [see Appendix 24] does define the maximum number of authorized students in charters. The law states:

(1) The State Charter School Board and local school boards may only authorize a combined maximum student capacity of:
   (a) 32,921 students for the charters schools in the 2008-09 school year; and
   (b) Beginning in the 2009-2010 school year, an annual increase in charter school enrollment capacity equal to 1.4% of total school district enrollment as of October 1 of the previous school year.

(2) (a) The State Board of Education, in consultation with the State Charter School Board, shall allocate the students under Subsection (1) between the State Charter School Board and local school boards.
   (b) One-third of the student capacity described under Subsection (1)(b) shall be allocated to increase the maximum student capacity of the operating charter schools.
   (c) If the operating charter schools do not use the allocation described under Subsection (2)(b), the remaining student capacity may be used by new charter schools.

The purpose of this section is to facilitate the Legislature’s financial planning, not to inhibit the number of charter schools in the state. As explained above, Utah allows an unlimited number of charter schools. There are 994 public schools operating in Utah this year, of which 72 are charter schools (in 70 charter school LEAs). This represents 7.2% of Utah’s public schools. Successfully operating charter schools are given the first opportunity to absorb and enroll new students. A charter school application has never been denied because of lack of students available to fill the school. Rather, only quality schools that meet reasonable management and preparation requirements are approved.

(F)(2)(ii) State laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools

Utah Law (Utah Code, Section 53A-1a-501 through Utah Code, Section 53A-1a-520) [see Appendix 35] allows the formation of charter schools and describes the creation of charter school boards, processes outlined for charter school applications, evaluations, terminations, and accountability. Utah State Board of Education Administrative Rule R277-470 defines the State Charter School Board’s oversight and monitoring responsibilities. (R277-470-13) [see Appendix 36]. Under Utah law, the State Charter Board has responsibility to authorize and promote responsible growth of charter schools, with final approval by the Utah State Board of Education that has final constitutional responsibility for public schools. Specific purposes of charter schools are outlined in Utah law: (1) new public school models; (2) unique learning opportunities providing increased choice in education; (3) innovative teaching practices; (4) opportunities for educators to participate in design and implementation of learning programs; (5) new forms of accountability specifically emphasizing the measurement of learning outcomes; and other purposes. Utah law also provides specifically for consequences if charters fail to meet their charter purposes, fail to meet expected financial practices, and/or fail to serve the lowest performing students by failing to meet Adequate Yearly Progress. Utah law provides for a continuum of consequences for underperforming or unsatisfactory charter schools. (Utah Code, Section 53A-1a-509) [see Appendix 33]. State law provides for an appeal process for charter schools that are subject to termination of charter. (Utah Code, Section 53A-1a-510(2) [see Appendix 34]. Utah charter schools have proven remarkably successful. There are 72 charter schools currently operating in Utah. The charter of only one charter school has been terminated. Another charter school closed voluntarily. Two additional charter schools are
being closely monitored by the State Charter School Board. The table below details the number of charter applications made in the state, the number approved, the number of charter application denied and the reasons for the denials.

**Table 15 – Charter Applications in Utah**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Charter Applications</th>
<th>Number Approved</th>
<th>Number Denied</th>
<th>Reason for Denial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lack of readiness for opening; poor unfocused applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Financial difficulties; poor application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Applications withdrawn; poor application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Poor application; lack of readiness for opening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lack of readiness for opening; applications withdrawn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(F)(2)(iii) Equitable funding
Utah charter schools receive equitable funding compared to other public schools. They receive their commensurate share of federal funding; receive an annual state appropriation that is divided among all charter schools on a per student basis; and, as of 2008 legislation, receive a portion of local school district revenues determined by the number of district students that leave traditional schools to attend charter schools. Additionally, Utah Board of Education Rules encourage school districts to authorize charter schools locally by allowing locally chartered school students to receive equal funding to students attending traditional schools in the district [see Appendix 37].

(F)(2)(iv) Charter school facility funding
Utah law does not provide charter schools with funding specifically for facilities. However, Utah law provides assistance to charter schools for facilities in other ways: (1) 10% of local replacement funds must be used for facilities; (2) a state-funded revolving loan is available to charter schools (Utah Code, Section 53A-21-401(5) [see Appendix 38]; and (3) Utah law requires local school districts to
allow charter school students, for a nominal fee, to participate in traditional school athletic programs that use traditional school athletic facilities. (Utah Code, Section 53A-1a-519) [see Appendix 39]. Utah law does not impose any facility-related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than those applied to traditional public schools. In fact, the Utah legislature has made considerable effort to require local zoning ordinances to treat charter schools similarly to traditional public schools in zoning decisions and practices.

(F)(2)(v) State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools other than charter schools

Utah has a long-standing commitment to enabling innovative, autonomous approaches to education reform that pre-date its charter school law. The following largely autonomous programs are operated cooperatively with our LEAs:

- Education programs for youth in custody of the Utah Department of Corrections. These programs encourage cooperation among various education and social services agencies that have responsibility for children and their families including public and private schools, and Utah Department of Social Services.
- Career and technical education programs.
- Adult Education Programs, which provide classes and opportunities for adults who did not earn high school diplomas, but who desire to complete high school through a variety of open-entry/open-exit programs.
- Early College High Schools, which offer students an opportunity to complete college credits and earn associate degrees while also completing high school.
- International Baccalaureate (IB) Schools and programs within schools. Utah currently has 10 operating and successful IB schools.
- Year-round schools. Utah currently has approximately 61 elementary schools that are operating under year-round programs. The schools started operating on year-round schedules because of overcrowding in specific neighborhoods and some have continued because the communities supported the use of school buildings year round.
• Four-day week schools. Currently, one school district and (4) individual schools operate four longer school days in one week. The schools receive specific permission from the Utah State Board of Education to provide an alternate schedule and are closely monitored by the State Board. To date, the schools demonstrate significant savings in transportation costs, energy savings, lower absentee rates among students and staff, and consistent student achievement. Additionally, the schedule significantly reduces the time spent on school buses on country roads by school children.

Utah Electronic High School provides funding for 9-12 level courses delivered via the Internet and coordinated by the Utah State Board of Education. Approximately 35,600 students have accounts for participation in online courses through the Electronic High School. Courses are consistent with those offered in traditional public high schools to enable a student to obtain the required credits necessary for graduation. The American Academy (TAA) is a partnership between a private distance learning company and the Utah State Board of Education where each partner benefits from the accomplishments and resources of the other. Consistent with an agreement signed in August 2007, distance learning courses are offered to non-Utah students and the Utah Electronic High School benefits directly from new innovations designed and experimented with by TAA.

Evidence for (F)(2)(i) through (F)(2)(v):
• Evidence is shown throughout sections above.

(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

(F)(3) and Evidence for (F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions

Under Utah law (Utah Code, Section 53A-1a-511(2)(a) [see Appendix 40], the State Board of Education may waive any rule, upon request, that the Board is convinced inhibits innovation, efficiency, and productivity in a public school, charter school, or school district. In addition, Utah Code, Section 53A-1-402(1)(e) [see Appendix 41] allows the State Board of Education to support “school productivity and effectiveness measures.” These provisions of the law has allowed Utah to encourage innovative, autonomous public schools and programs as described (F)(2)(v) above. Other pertinent Utah Code and State Board Rules that have assisted in creating innovative schools include:

1. Utah Code, Section 53A-1-403.5 [see Appendix 42] (Education programs for youth in custody of the Utah Department of Corrections)

2. Utah Code, Section 53A-15-202 [see Appendix 43] (Career and Technical Education Programs)

3. Utah Code, Section 53A-15-401 [see Appendix 44] (Adult Education Programs)

4. Senate Bill 138, 2002 General Session (Early College High Schools)

5. Utah Code, Section 53A-17a-120 [see Appendix 45] (International Baccalaureate (IB) Schools and programs within schools)

6. Utah Code, Section 53A-15-1001 [see Appendix 46] (Utah Electronic High School)
VII. 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

(i) offer a rigorous course of study

As a part of Utah’s Comprehensive Reform Plan, Utah will create rigorous and relevant math courses; begin development of Web-based lesson plans for mathematics that ensure alignment
across schools/classrooms regardless of variations in materials and which capture the experience and talents of master teachers and the use of best practice; and prepare and implement recommendations for a state K-6 mathematics initiative and an Algebra mathematics initiative. Using lessons learned from our successful 4-6 Mathematics Initiative, we will use professional development and coaching to help us implement the new Mathematics Common Core State Standards. Expanding our mathematics initiative, while implementing the new core, will help us increase our capacity to deliver high quality mathematics instruction, which will, in subsequent years, increase our high school graduation rate and increase college enrollment. Utah will also create annual information for students and parents regarding STEM career and college pathways and aligned coursework beginning at the end of sixth grade and continuing through twelfth grade; revise and add academic pathways to the career pathway materials; coordinate with higher education to review and ensure that STEM courses are vertically and horizontally aligned and that other current courses required for graduation are aligned to student needs for career and college readiness; review the data and reports from current STEM initiatives and propose continued, enhanced, or new initiatives, including CTE initiatives, that increase student participation in the study of STEM fields; and work with business, industry, and higher education partners to define needs for a quality workforce and develop instruction to support acquisition of skills to meet those needs.

(ii) cooperate with 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

Preparing teachers to teach, use and understand STEM content across grades is an essential part of our current efforts and Utah’s Comprehensive Reform Plan. Using creative scheduling and adding STEM courses to summer offerings is another way that Utah is offering more STEM classes for students.

Utah’s secondary Utah Science Technology and Research (USTAR) Program extends teacher pay for math and science educators and extends the school year and school day for STEM students. Through signing bonuses and tuition scholarships, our PEJEP program has been very successful in recruiting and retaining teachers in STEM content areas. Utah’s ARL system gives non-
traditional teacher STEM candidates multiple ways to become teachers. Our retention rates for
ARL candidates are higher than the national average, and such licensure routes are supported in
state statutes and through USOE sponsored courses and ongoing monitoring.

Utah has also created partnerships with STEM community and business leaders in order to
provide internships for practicing teacher leaders that will enhance their content knowledge and
skills and provide real world/hands-on experience with STEM outside the classroom.

(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

Utah’s Pathways information outlining high school to college career pathways is used by
counselors to encourage students from underrepresented groups to enroll in STEM courses. Early
College High Schools, which offer students an opportunity to complete college credits and earn
STEM associate degrees while completing high school, target and recruit girls and other students
from underrepresented groups.

Our CTE program has resulted in increased participation in applied STEM courses. New
programs, such as engineering, biotech, and information technology, have been successfully
started and will be expanded.

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
Utah will hire an early literacy specialist; create and implement PK academic standards; review the data and reports from Utah's K-3 Reading Initiative and use the data to identify and replicate high-performing projects and practices; maintain and expand full-day kindergarten to eligible students and use data to identify and replicate high-performing projects and practices; and support early intervention programs for high-need Pre-K children by reviewing the data and reports from the (UPSTART) Early Learning Initiative, CTE sponsored preschools, and other state preschool programs.

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

Utah has joined four (4) consortia that are working toward preparing high-quality assessments aligned with the common set of K-12 standards. The first consortium is the Summative Multi-State Resources for Teachers and Education Researcher Consortium (SMARTER). This consortium will develop a high-quality assessment system that is aligned to the standards and uses online adaptive tests, innovative item design, and open-ended items to address the full breadth of cognitive demand by the Common Core State Standards. The assessments will report student, school, LEA, and state results and will include benchmarks to a variety of other
achievement standards, including NAEP, international assessments, and other benchmarks predictive of student success in college and careers. The assessments will be designed based upon principles of universal design and will be consistent with professional standards as described by the APA/AERA/NCME Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. The SMARTER Consortium will coordinate with MOSAIC Consortium so that schools and LEAs will have access to a variety of high-quality, instructionally supportive assessment options. Utah will serve as the lead state with Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Nebraska, Oregon, Tennessee, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. Utah will also be one of the lead states in the Multiple Options for Student Assessment and Instruction Consortium (MOSAIC). MOSAIC is established to add complexity and depth of use to summative assessment systems. MOSAIC will include curricular frameworks, formative and local assessment items customized for local use, timely data turnaround, and reports generated in parent and teacher friendly formats. A major effort of this consortium will be to develop an item bank that can be used to diagnose student strengths and deficiencies and serve as an early warning system. Presently there are four states in the MOSAIC consortium: Wisconsin, Nebraska, Missouri, and Utah. Utah has also joined the Balanced Assessment Consortium. This consortium will bring together leading curriculum and assessment experts to evaluate the new Common Core and build the most credible and well-vetted assessments in the field. The results of this effort will be made available online in a digital platform that offers materials for curriculum building, model syllabi for specific courses linked to the standards, and formative and summative assessments. An electronic scoring platform will support training, calibration, benchmarking and reporting. This consortium will create a common reference examination, which includes selective response, constructive response, and performance components aimed at higher-order skills linked to the Common Core Standards. All components of the system will incorporate principles of universal design. In addition, designers who are skilled at developing linguistically support assessments for students with learning disabilities and non-native English speakers will be engaged from the beginning in developing the assessments for maximum access. The emphasis on the evaluations will be assessing student growth over time and on tying standards to a concept of learning progressions. The Achieve Consortium is the final group Utah has joined. This group will work on international benchmarking and alignment issues.
**Utah** will design and implement testing systems and high-quality assessments that are aligned to the new Common Core State Standards and evaluate both student growth and status, including testing systems for English Language Learners (ELLs) and students with disabilities; design and implement testing systems that use computer technology; continue the current testing pilot and expand the pilot; revise the high school "exit" exam requirements; provide assistance and recommendations for informal, ongoing formative assessment of math and reading in all schools; create a common, standard kindergarten entry and post assessment; create new special education assessments; and develop technology driven dropout prevention tools.

**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**

Utah’s longitudinal data system already tracks data P-16. Utah is working to enhance the capabilities of the system through partnerships with Higher Education and Work Force Services. Utah’s K-16 Alliance was established in 2006 with representatives from the Utah System of Higher Education, Utah State Office of Education, the Governor’s Office, and the Utah House and Senate. The overarching vision of the alliance was to more nearly approximate a *system* approach to education in Utah. The major objective of the Alliance was to establish a working
relationship and processes that unify and minimize boundaries between K-12 and college. Additionally, the Alliance was established to engender a united perspective designed to enable students from secondary schools to transition easily into higher education and to make certain these students are prepared for college work. The biggest milestone for the K-16 Alliance has been the implementation of the common student identifier. The common student identifier will allow for both offices (USOE and USHE) to track how students progress from preschool through college.

Since the initiation of the Alliance, much has been accomplished. Significant progress has been made:

- A Blue Ribbon Committee was established to examine testing practices.
- The Concurrent Enrollment Subcommittee implemented a formula for funding concurrent enrollment instruction that was ratified by both Utah State Office of Education (USOE) and Utah System of Higher Education (USHE). Also, research was conducted during this time period under the direction of the Alliance indicating that:
  1. College students with prior concurrent enrollment credit had higher 2nd year retention rates than students without prior concurrent enrollment credit;
  2. Concurrent enrollment students also had a higher on-time college graduation rate than non-concurrent enrollment students.
- The Teacher Education Committee conducted a study under the direction of Dr. David Sperry that addressed supply and demand for teachers in Utah. Important data were collected that reinforced the criticality of the teacher shortage and that recommended strategies for recruiting students into education programs. The report also recommended strategies for addressing teacher attrition issues.
- The Developmental/Remedial Subcommittee and the eLearning Connection has received $50,000 from USOE and $50,000 from USHE to design and implement a developmental online course to address learning deficiencies before students enter college.
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

Utah’s plans for struggling secondary schools include provisions for the autonomy described above.
VIII. BUDGET
(Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))

Applicants should use their budgets and budget narratives to provide a detailed description of how they plan to use their Federal grant funds, and how they plan to leverage other Federal (e.g. School Improvement Grant, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems grant, Teacher Incentive Fund grant, Title I), State, and local funds to achieve their reform goals. The budget narrative should be of sufficient scope and detail for the Department to determine if the costs are necessary, reasonable, and allowable. For further guidance on Federal cost principles, an applicant may wish to consult OMB Circular A-87. (See www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars).

For the purpose of the budget, we expect that the State will link its proposed reform plans to projects that the State believes are necessary in order to implement its plans. Proving additional budget detail through a project-level table and narrative will allow the State to specifically describe how its budget aligns with its reform plans in all four areas and how its budget supports the achievement of the State’s goals. Some projects might address one Reform Plan Criterion, while others might address several similarly-focused criteria as one group. For example, the State might choose to have one “management project” focused on criterion (A)(2), Building Strong Statewide Capacity. It might have another “human capital project” that addresses criteria (D)(2) through (D)(5) in the Great Teachers and Leaders section.

To support the budgeting process, the following forms and instructions are included:

1. Budget Summary
   a. Budget Summary Table. This is the cover sheet for the budget. States should complete this table as the final step in their budgeting process, and include this table as the first page of the State’s budget. (See Budget Part I: Budget Summary Table.)
   b. Budget Summary Narrative. A budget narrative that accompanies the Budget Summary Table should provide an overview of the projects that the State has included in its budget. The State should also describe how other Federal, State, and local funds will be leveraged to further support Race to the Top education reform plans. (See Budget Part I: Budget Summary Narrative.)

2. Project-Level Detail. This is the supporting, project-level detail required as back-up to the budget summary. For each project that the State is proposing in order to implement the plans described in its application, the State should complete the following:
   a. Project-Level Budget Table. This is the budget for each project, by budget category and for each year for which funding is requested. (See Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table.)
   b. Project-Level Budget Narrative. This is the narrative and backup detail associated with each budget category in the Project-Level Budget. (See Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Narrative.)
**Budget Part I: Budget Summary Table**

**Instructions:**
In the Budget Summary Table, the State should include the budget totals for each budget category and each year of the grant. These line items are derived by adding together the line items from each of the Project-Level Budget Tables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Project Year 1</th>
<th>Project Year 2</th>
<th>Project Year 3</th>
<th>Project Year 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td>7,596,131</td>
<td>6,166,631</td>
<td>5,900,354</td>
<td>5,855,198</td>
<td>25,518,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td>1,201,767</td>
<td>1,328,707</td>
<td>1,311,425</td>
<td>1,435,327</td>
<td>5,277,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Travel</td>
<td>563,177</td>
<td>547,645</td>
<td>475,052</td>
<td>436,909</td>
<td>2,022,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equipment</td>
<td>4,300,909</td>
<td>2,263,978</td>
<td>298,000</td>
<td>268,000</td>
<td>7,130,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supplies</td>
<td>396,810</td>
<td>470,601</td>
<td>437,569</td>
<td>391,996</td>
<td>1,696,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Training Stipends</td>
<td>1,326,387</td>
<td>1,600,221</td>
<td>906,221</td>
<td>668,721</td>
<td>4,501,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td>158,165</td>
<td>256,765</td>
<td>108,865</td>
<td>10,265</td>
<td>534,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)</td>
<td>29,009,217</td>
<td>24,573,975</td>
<td>19,170,237</td>
<td>18,481,166</td>
<td>91,234,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indirect Costs*</td>
<td>523,884</td>
<td>579,969</td>
<td>573,245</td>
<td>627,075</td>
<td>2,304,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Funding for Involved LEAs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs</td>
<td>6,724,484</td>
<td>8,245,582</td>
<td>8,245,582</td>
<td>8,245,582</td>
<td>31,461,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)</td>
<td>36,257,586</td>
<td>33,399,526</td>
<td>27,989,065</td>
<td>27,353,824</td>
<td>125,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Funding Subgranted to Participating LEAs (50% of Total Grant)</td>
<td>31,250,000</td>
<td>31,250,000</td>
<td>31,250,000</td>
<td>31,250,000</td>
<td>125,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Total Budget (lines 13-14)</td>
<td>67,507,586</td>
<td>64,649,526</td>
<td>59,239,065</td>
<td>58,603,824</td>
<td>250,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

- See Appendix 47 for Budget Summary Narrative.
BUDGET PART I: BUDGET SUMMARY NARRATIVE

Instructions:
Describe, in an Appendix, the overall structure of the State’s budget for a Race to the Top grant, including the list of projects for which there is a project-level budget, and a rationale for how these will be organized and managed.

The State should also describe how other Federal (e.g. School Improvement Grant, Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems grant, Teacher Incentive Fund grant, Title I), State, and local funds will be leveraged to further support Race to the Top education reform plans.

The State must include, on Line 14 of the Budget Summary Table, the amount of funding to be subgranted to its participating LEAs based on their relative shares of funding under Part A of Title I of the ESEA for the most recent year (that is, FY 2009), as required under section 14006(c) of the ARRA. States are not required to provide budgets for how the participating LEAs would use their funds. However, the Department expects that, as part of the administration and oversight of the grant, States will monitor and track all expenditures to ensure that participating LEAs spend these funds in accordance with the State’s plan and the scope of work described in the agreement between the State and the participating LEA.

- See Appendix 47 for Budget Summary Narrative.
Instructions:
For each project the State has proposed in its Budget Summary Narrative, the State should submit a Project-Level Budget Table that includes the budget for the project, for each budget category and each year of the grant.

- See Appendix 47 for Project-level Budget tables and Project-level Budget Narrative.
BUDGET PART II: PROJECT-LEVEL BUDGET NARRATIVE

Instructions:
For each project the State has proposed in its Budget Summary Narrative, the Department strongly recommends that the State submits the following information for each budget category.

1) Personnel
Provide:
• The title of each position to be compensated under this project.
• The salary for each position under this project.
• The amount of time, such as hours or percentage of time, to be expended by each position under this project.
• Any additional basis for cost estimates or computations.

Explain:
• The importance of each position to the success of the project, and connections back to specific project plans. If curriculum vitae, an organizational chart, or other supporting information will be helpful to reviewers, attach in the Appendix and describe its location.

For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel: The following requested personnel will all be hired as employees of the project.</th>
<th>% FTE</th>
<th>Base Salary</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Director (1): Jane Doe will be responsible for the overall leadership and management of the Performance-Based Teacher and Principal Compensation Program. She is an expert in this area and has worked on this issue for six years. She will report to the Race to the Top project director and be responsible for negotiating details related to the performance-based programs proposed in the plan associated with (D)(2). Her qualifications are described in detail in the project management plan on page A-24 of the Appendix.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Fringe Benefits
Provide:
• The fringe benefit percentages for all personnel in the project.
• The basis for cost estimates or computations.

3) Travel
Provide:
• An estimate of the number of trips.
• An estimate of transportation and/or subsistence costs for each trip.
• Any additional basis for cost estimates or computations.
Explain:
- The purpose of the travel, how it relates to project goals, and how it will contribute to project success.

For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel: Travel expenses include the average mile reimbursements of $100 each, in addition to an amount of per diem of $50.</th>
<th># Trips</th>
<th>$ per Trip</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A kick-off conference will provide technical assistance to our participating 325 districts. The conference will last two full days. A more detailed justification for this trip is explained in the narrative for selection criterion (A)(2).</td>
<td>325x3 people (1 Project Dir. &amp; 3 staff per district.)</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$195,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) **Equipment**

Provide:
- The type of equipment to be purchased.
- The estimated unit cost for each item to be purchased.
- The definition of equipment used by the State.
- Any additional basis for cost estimates or computations.

Explain:
- The justification of the need for the items of equipment to be purchased.

For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment: Consistent with SEA policy, equipment is defined as tangible, non-expendable, personal property having a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost of $1,000 or more per unit.</th>
<th>Cost of Item</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desktop Computers (3): Three desktop computers will be needed to expand our current office and supply the needs of 3 new employees.</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>Computer including monitor &amp; printer</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) **Supplies**

Provide:
- An estimate of materials and supplies needed for the project, by nature of expense or general category (e.g., instructional materials, office supplies).
- The basis for cost estimates or computations.

6) **Contractual**

Provide:
- The products to be acquired and/or the professional services to be provided.
• The estimated cost per expected procurement.
• For professional services contracts, the amounts of time to be devoted to the project, including the costs to be charged to this proposed grant award.
• A brief statement that the State has followed the procedures for procurement under 34 CFR Parts 74.40 - 74.48 and Part 80.36.
• Any additional basis for cost estimates or computations.

Explain:
• The purpose and relation to the project.

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

7) Training Stipends
Note:
• The training stipend line item only pertains to costs associated with long-term training programs and college or university coursework, not workshops or short-term training supported by this program.
• Salary stipends paid to teachers and other school personnel for participating in short-term professional development should be reported in Personnel (line 1).

Provide:
• Descriptions of training stipends to be provided, consistent with the “note” above.
• The cost estimates and basis for these estimates.

Explain:
• The purpose of the training.

8) Other
Provide:
• Other items by major type or category (e.g., communications, printing, postage, equipment rental).
• The cost per item (printing = $500, postage = $750).
• Any additional basis for cost estimates or computations.

Explain:
• The purpose of the expenditures.

9) Total Direct Costs
Provide:
• The sum of expenditures, across all budget categories in lines 1-8, for each year of the budget.

10) Indirect Costs
Provide:
• Identify and apply the indirect cost rate. (See the section that follows, Budget: Indirect Cost Information.)

11) **Funding for Involved LEAs**

Provide:

- The specific activities to be done by involved LEAs (as defined in this notice).
- The estimated cost of each activity.
- The approximate number of LEAs involved in each activity.
- The total cost of each activity (across all involved LEAs).
- Any additional basis for cost estimates or computations.

Explain:

- The purpose of each activity.

For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th># LEAs involved</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stipends for teachers to participate in statewide professional development during summer 2011</td>
<td>Implementing new standards</td>
<td>$100 per teacher x 2,500 teachers (across all involved LEAs)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12) **Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs**

a) For each of the specific activities to be done by selected participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), and for which the State is compensating the LEAs beyond their Title I shares under section 14006(c) of the ARRA:

Provide:

- The type of activity
- The estimated cost of each activity, and its cost basis.
- The approximate number of LEAs involved in each activity.

Explain:

- The purpose of the activity.
For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Approx. # of LEAs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay-for-performance pilot program</td>
<td>Fund the performance bonuses for 200 teachers</td>
<td>$5,000 per teacher x 100 teachers/LEA x 3 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) For each participating LEA (as defined in this notice) whose Title I share is being supplemented by the State in order for the LEA to participate fully in the State’s Race to the Top plans:

Provide:
- The name of the participating LEA whose share is being supplemented
- The amount of the supplement to the LEA’s subgrant

Explain:
- The rationale for the supplement to the subgrant.

For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Supplemental Subgrant Cost</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC District</td>
<td>Based on its Title I share, this LEA would receive $X of the State’s Race to the Top grant; this subgrant from the State’s 50% increases the LEA’s funding to allow it to fully participate in all State plans</td>
<td>$100,000/year x 4 years</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13) Total Costs
Provide:
- The sum of expenditures in lines 9-11, for each year of the budget.
# Budget: Indirect Cost Information

To request reimbursement for indirect costs, please answer the following questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the State have an Indirect Cost Rate Agreement approved by the Federal government?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:** _X_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 percent 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.
IX. PARTICIPATING LEA MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
(Appendix D in the Notice of Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria; and in the Notice Inviting Applications)

Background for Memorandum of Understanding

Participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) in a State’s Race to the Top plans are required to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or other binding agreement with the State that specifies the scope of the work being implemented by the participating LEA (as defined in this notice).

To support States in working efficiently with LEAs to determine which LEAs will participate in the State’s Race to the Top application, the U.S. Department of Education has produced a model MOU, which is attached. This model MOU may serve as a template for States; however, States are not required to use it. They may use a different document that includes the key features noted below and in the model, and they should consult with their State and local attorneys on what is most appropriate for their State that includes, at a minimum, these key elements.

The purpose of the model MOU is to help to specify a relationship that is specific to Race to the Top and is not meant to detail all typical aspects of State/LEA grant management or administration. At a minimum, a strong MOU should include the following, each of which is described in detail below: (i) terms and conditions; (ii) a scope of work; and, (iii) signatures.

(i) Terms and conditions: Each participating LEA (as defined in this notice) should sign a standard set of terms and conditions that includes, at a minimum, key roles and responsibilities of the State and the LEA; State recourse for LEA non-performance; and assurances that make clear what the participating LEA (as defined in this notice) is agreeing to do.

(ii) Scope of work: MOUs should include a scope of work (included in the model MOU as Exhibit I) that is completed by each participating LEA (as defined in this notice). The scope of work must be signed and dated by an authorized LEA and State official. In the interest of time and with respect for the effort it will take for LEAs to develop detailed work plans, the scope of work submitted by LEAs and States as part of their Race to the Top applications may be preliminary. Preliminary scopes of work should include the portions of the State’s proposed reform plans that the LEA is agreeing to implement. (Note that in order to participate in a State’s Race to the Top application an LEA must agree to implement all or significant portions of the State’s reform plans.)

If a State is awarded a Race to the Top grant, the participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) will have up to 90 days to complete final scopes of work (which could be attached to the model MOU as Exhibit II), which must contain detailed work plans that are consistent with the preliminary scope of work and with the State’s grant application, and should include the participating LEA’s (as defined in this notice) specific goals, activities, timelines, budgets, key personnel, and annual targets for key performance measures.
(iii) Signatures: The signatures demonstrate (a) an acknowledgement of the relationship between the LEA and the State, and (b) the strength of the participating LEA’s (as defined in this notice) commitment.

- With respect to the relationship between the LEA and the State, the State’s counter-signature on the MOU indicates that the LEA’s commitment is consistent with the requirement that a participating LEA (as defined in this notice) implement all or significant portions of the State’s plans.
- The strength of the participating LEA’s (as defined in this notice) commitment will be demonstrated by the signatures of the LEA superintendent (or an equivalent authorized signatory), the president of the local school board (or equivalent, if applicable) and the local teacher’s union leader (if applicable).

Please note the following with regard to the State’s Race to the Top application:

- In its application, the State need only provide an example of the State’s standard Participating LEA MOU; it does not have to provide copies of every MOU signed by its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice). If, however, States and LEAs have made any changes to the State’s standard MOU, the State must provide description of the changes that were made. Please note that the Department may, at any time, request copies of all MOUs between the State and its participating LEAs.
- Please see criterion (A)(1)(ii) and (A)(1)(iii), and the evidence requested in the application, for more information and ways in which States will be asked to summarize information about the LEA MOUs.
This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is entered into by and between ______________________________ ("State") and _____________________________ ("Participating LEA"). The purpose of this agreement is to establish a framework of collaboration, as well as articulate specific roles and responsibilities in support of the State in its implementation of an approved Race to the Top grant project.

I. SCOPE OF WORK
Exhibit I, the Preliminary Scope of Work, indicates which portions of the State’s proposed reform plans ("State Plan") the Participating LEA is agreeing to implement. (Note that, in order to participate, the LEA must agree to implement all or significant portions of the State Plan.)

II. PROJECT ADMINISTRATION
A. PARTICIPATING LEA RESPONSIBILITIES
In assisting the State in implementing the tasks and activities described in the State’s Race to the Top application, the Participating LEA subgrantee will:

1) Implement the LEA plan as identified in Exhibits I and II of this agreement;
2) Actively participate in all relevant convenings, communities of practice, or other practice-sharing events that are organized or sponsored by the State or by the U.S. Department of Education ("ED");
3) Post to any website specified by the State or ED, in a timely manner, all non-proprietary products and lessons learned developed using funds associated with the Race to the Top grant;
4) Participate, as requested, in any evaluations of this grant conducted by the State or ED;
5) Be responsive to State or ED requests for information including on the status of the project, project implementation, outcomes, and any problems anticipated or encountered;
6) Participate in meetings and telephone conferences with the State to discuss (a) progress of the project, (b) potential dissemination of resulting non-proprietary products and lessons learned, (c) plans for subsequent years of the Race to the Top grant period, and (d) other matters related to the Race to the Top grant and associated plans.

B. STATE RESPONSIBILITIES
In assisting Participating LEAs in implementing their tasks and activities described in the State’s Race to the Top application, the State grantee will:

1) Work collaboratively with, and support the Participating LEA in carrying out the LEA Plan as identified in Exhibits I and II of this agreement;
2) Timely distribute the LEA’s portion of Race to the Top grant funds during the course of the project period and in accordance with the LEA Plan identified in Exhibit II;
3) Provide feedback on the LEA’s status updates, annual reports, any interim reports, and project plans and products; and
4) Identify sources of technical assistance for the project.

C. JOINT RESPONSIBILITIES
1) The State and the Participating LEA will each appoint a key contact person for the Race to the Top grant.
2) These key contacts from the State and the Participating LEA will maintain frequent communication to facilitate cooperation under this MOU.
3) State and Participating LEA grant personnel will work together to determine appropriate timelines for project updates and status reports throughout the whole grant period.
4) State and Participating LEA grant personnel will negotiate in good faith to continue to achieve the overall goals of the State’s Race to the Top grant, even when the State Plan requires modifications that affect the Participating LEA, or when the LEA Plan requires modifications.

D. STATE RECURSE FOR LEA NON-PERFORMANCE
If the State determines that the LEA is not meeting its goals, timelines, budget, or annual targets or is not fulfilling other applicable requirements, the State grantee will take appropriate enforcement action, which could include a collaborative process between the State and the LEA, or any of the enforcement measures that are detailed in 34 CFR section 80.43 including putting the LEA on reimbursement payment status, temporarily withholding funds, or disallowing costs.

III. ASSURANCES
The Participating LEA hereby certifies and represents that it:
1) Has all requisite power and authority to execute this MOU;
2) Is familiar with the State’s Race to the Top grant application and is supportive of and committed to working on all or significant portions of the State Plan;
3) Agrees to be a Participating LEA and will implement those portions of the State Plan indicated in Exhibit I, if the State application is funded,
4) Will provide a Final Scope of Work to be attached to this MOU as Exhibit II only if the State’s application is funded; will do so in a timely fashion but no later than 90 days after a grant is awarded; and will describe in Exhibit II the LEA’s specific goals, activities, timelines, budgets, key personnel, and annual targets for key performance measures (“LEA Plan”) in a manner that is consistent with the Preliminary Scope of Work (Exhibit I) and with the State Plan; and
5) Will comply with all of the terms of the Grant, the State’s subgrant, and all applicable Federal and State laws and regulations, including laws and regulations applicable to the Program, and the applicable provisions of EDGAR (34 CFR Parts 75, 77, 79, 80, 82, 84, 85, 86, 97, 98 and 99).

IV. MODIFICATIONS
This Memorandum of Understanding may be amended only by written agreement signed by each of the parties involved, and in consultation with ED.

V. DURATION/TERMINATION
This Memorandum of Understanding shall be effective, beginning with the date of the last signature hereon and, if a grant is received, ending upon the expiration of the grant project period, or upon mutual agreement of the parties, whichever occurs first.

VI. SIGNATURES
LEA Superintendent (or equivalent authorized signatory) - required:

___________________________________________________________
Signature/Date

___________________________________________________________
Print Name/Title
President of Local School Board (or equivalent, if applicable):

___________________________________________________________
Signature/Date
___________________________________________________________
Print Name/Title

Local Teachers’ Union Leader (if applicable):

___________________________________________________________
Signature/Date
___________________________________________________________
Print Name/Title

Authorized State Official - required:
By its signature below, the State hereby accepts the LEA as a Participating LEA.

___________________________________________________________
Signature/Date
___________________________________________________________
Print Name/Title
A. **EXHIBIT I – PRELIMINARY SCOPE OF WORK**
LEA hereby agrees to participate in implementing the State Plan in each of the areas identified below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of State Reform Plans</th>
<th>LEA Participation (Y/N)</th>
<th>Comments from LEA (optional)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Standards and Assessments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Data Systems to Support Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Use of local instructional improvement systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Professional development on use of data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Availability and accessibility of data to researchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Great Teachers and Leaders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Measure student growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Design and implement evaluation systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Conduct annual evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)(a) Use evaluations to inform professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)(b) Use evaluations to inform compensation, promotion, and retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)(c) Use evaluations to inform tenure and/or full certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)(d) Use evaluations to inform removal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) High-poverty and/or high-minority schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Quality professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Measure effectiveness of professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Participating LEA

Authorized LEA Signature/Date

Print Name/Title

For the State

Authorized State Signature/Date

Print Name/Title
X. SCHOOL INTERVENTION MODELS
(Appendix C in the Notice of Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria; and in the Notice Inviting Applications)

There are four school intervention models referred to in Selection Criterion (E)(2): turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model. Each is described below.

(a) **Turnaround model.** (1) A turnaround model is one in which an LEA must--

(i) Replace the principal and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach in order to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates;

(ii) Use locally adopted competencies to measure the effectiveness of staff who can work within the turnaround environment to meet the needs of students,

(A) Screen all existing staff and rehire no more than 50 percent; and

(B) Select new staff;

(iii) Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in the turnaround school;

(iv) Provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure that they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies;

(v) Adopt a new governance structure, which may include, but is not limited to, requiring the school to report to a new “turnaround office” in the LEA or SEA, hire a “turnaround leader” who reports directly to the Superintendent or Chief Academic Officer, or enter into a multi-year contract with the LEA or SEA to obtain added flexibility in exchange for greater accountability;

(vi) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and “vertically aligned” from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards;

(vii) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students;

(viii) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and

(ix) Provide appropriate social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports for students.

(2) A turnaround model may also implement other strategies such as—

(i) Any of the required and permissible activities under the transformation model; or

(ii) A new school model (e.g., themed, dual language academy).
(b) **Restart model.** A restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected through a rigorous review process. (A CMO is a non-profit organization that operates or manages charter schools by centralizing or sharing certain functions and resources among schools. An EMO is a for-profit or non-profit organization that provides “whole-school operation” services to an LEA.) A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.

(c) **School closure.** School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving. These other schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

(d) **Transformation model.** A transformation model is one in which an LEA implements each of the following strategies:

1. Developing and increasing teacher and school leader effectiveness.
   
   i. **Required activities.** The LEA must--
   
   1. Replace the principal who led the school prior to commencement of the transformation model;
   
   2. Use rigorous, transparent, and equitable evaluation systems for teachers and principals that--
   
   1. Take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor as well as other factors such as multiple observation-based assessments of performance and ongoing collections of professional practice reflective of student achievement and increased high-school graduations rates; and
   
   2. Are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement;
   
   3. Identify and reward school leaders, teachers, and other staff who, in implementing this model, have increased student achievement and high-school graduation rates and identify and remove those who, after ample opportunities have been provided for them to improve their professional practice, have not done so;
   
   4. Provide staff with ongoing, high-quality, job-embedded professional development (e.g., regarding subject-specific pedagogy, instruction that reflects a deeper understanding of the community served by the school, or differentiated instruction) that is aligned with the school’s comprehensive instructional program and designed with school staff to ensure they are equipped to facilitate effective teaching and learning and have the capacity to successfully implement school reform strategies; and
   
   5. Implement such strategies as financial incentives, increased opportunities for promotion and career growth, and more flexible work conditions that are designed to recruit, place, and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school.
   
   ii. **Permissible activities.** An LEA may also implement other strategies to develop teachers’ and school leaders’ effectiveness, such as--
   
   1. Providing additional compensation to attract and retain staff with the skills necessary to meet the needs of the students in a transformation school;
(B) Instituting a system for measuring changes in instructional practices resulting from professional development; or
(C) Ensuring that the school is not required to accept a teacher without the mutual consent of the teacher and principal, regardless of the teacher’s seniority.

(2) Comprehensive instructional reform strategies.
(i) Required activities. The LEA must--
(A) Use data to identify and implement an instructional program that is research-based and “vertically aligned” from one grade to the next as well as aligned with State academic standards; and
(B) Promote the continuous use of student data (such as from formative, interim, and summative assessments) to inform and differentiate instruction in order to meet the academic needs of individual students.

(ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement comprehensive instructional reform strategies, such as--
(A) Conducting periodic reviews to ensure that the curriculum is being implemented with fidelity, is having the intended impact on student achievement, and is modified if ineffective;
(B) Implementing a schoolwide “response-to-intervention” model;
(C) Providing additional supports and professional development to teachers and principals in order to implement effective strategies to support students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment and to ensure that limited English proficient students acquire language skills to master academic content;
(D) Using and integrating technology-based supports and interventions as part of the instructional program; and
(E) In secondary schools--
(1) Increasing rigor by offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate; or science, technology, engineering, and mathematics courses, especially those that incorporate rigorous and relevant project-, inquiry-, or design-based contextual learning opportunities), early-college high schools, dual enrollment programs, or thematic learning academies that prepare students for college and careers, including by providing appropriate supports designed to ensure that low-achieving students can take advantage of these programs and coursework;
(2) Improving student transition from middle to high school through summer transition programs or freshman academies;
(3) Increasing graduation rates through, for example, credit-recovery programs, re-engagement strategies, smaller learning communities, competency-based instruction and performance-based assessments, and acceleration of basic reading and mathematics skills; or
(4) Establishing early-warning systems to identify students who may be at risk of failing to achieve to high standards or graduate.

(3) Increasing learning time and creating community-oriented schools.
(i) Required activities. The LEA must--
(A) Establish schedules and implement strategies that provide increased learning time (as defined in this notice); and
(B) Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement.

(ii) Permissible activities. An LEA may also implement other strategies that extend learning time and create community-oriented schools, such as--
(A) Partnering with parents and parent organizations, faith- and community-based organizations, health clinics, other State or local agencies, and others to create safe school environments that meet students’ social, emotional, and health needs;
(B) Extending or restructuring the school day so as to add time for such strategies as advisory periods that build relationships between students, faculty, and other school staff;
(C) Implementing approaches to improve school climate and discipline, such as implementing a system of positive behavioral supports or taking steps to eliminate bullying and student harassment; or
(D) Expanding the school program to offer full-day kindergarten or pre-kindergarten.

(4) Providing operational flexibility and sustained support.

(i) Required activities. The LEA must--
(A) Give the school sufficient operational flexibility (such as staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student achievement outcomes and increase high school graduation rates; and
(B) Ensure that the school receives ongoing, intensive technical assistance and related support from the LEA, the SEA, or a designated external lead partner organization (such as a school turnaround organization or an EMO).

(ii) Permissible activities. The LEA may also implement other strategies for providing operational flexibility and intensive support, such as--
(A) Allowing the school to be run under a new governance arrangement, such as a turnaround division within the LEA or SEA; or
(B) Implementing a per-pupil school-based budget formula that is weighted based on student needs.

If a school identified as a persistently lowest-achieving school has implemented, in whole or in part within the last two years, an intervention that meets the requirements of the turnaround, restart, or transformation models, the school may continue or complete the intervention being implemented.
XI. SCORING RUBRIC
(Appendix B in the Notice of Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria; and in the Notice Inviting Applications)

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

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

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

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

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

In this appendix there is information about the point values for each criterion and priority, guidance on scoring, and the rubric that will be provided to reviewers.
II. Points Overview
The chart below shows the maximum number of points that may be assigned to each criterion.

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

Subtotal: Accomplishments 260 52%
Subtotal: Plans 240 48%
III. About Scoring

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

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

- A high-quality plan. In determining the quality of a State’s plan for a given Reform Plan Criterion, reviewers will evaluate the key goals, the activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, the timeline, the parties responsible for implementing the activities, and the credibility of the plan (as judged, in part, by the information submitted as supporting evidence). States are required to submit this information for each Reform Plan Criterion that the State addresses. States may also submit additional information that they believe will be helpful to peer reviewers.

- Ambitious yet achievable annual targets (only for those criteria that specify this). In determining whether a State has ambitious yet achievable annual targets for a given Reform Plan Criterion, reviewers will examine the State’s targets in the context of the State’s plan and the evidence submitted (if any) in support of the plan. There is no specific target that reviewers will be looking for here; nor will higher targets necessarily be rewarded above lower ones. Rather, reviewers will reward States for developing targets that – in light of the State’s plan – are “ambitious yet achievable.”

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Point Value</th>
<th>Quality of Applicant’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0 – 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0 – 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 – 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0 – 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Point Value</td>
<td>Quality of Applicant’s Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0 – 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0 – 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0 – 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0 – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0 – 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0 – 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

- The absolute priority cuts across the entire application and should not be addressed separately. It will be assessed, after the proposal has been fully reviewed and evaluated, to ensure that the application has met the priority. If an application has not met the priority, it will be eliminated from the competition.

- The competitive priority also cuts across the entire application. It is worth 15 points. Applicants will earn all or none of it, making it truly a competitive preference. In those cases where there is a disparity in the reviewers’ determinations on the priority, the Department will award the competitive priority points only if a majority of the reviewers on a panel determine that an application should receive the priority points.

- The invitational priorities are addressed in their own separate sections. While applicants are invited to write to the invitational priorities, these will not earn points.

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

**IV. Reviewer Guidance for Criteria**

**A. State Success Factors**

*General Reviewer Guidance for (A)(1):* In judging the quality of the applicant’s response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (d).

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

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

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

**(i) (maximum subpoints: 5)** The State has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that clearly articulates its goals for implementing reforms in the four education areas described in the ARRA and improving student outcomes statewide, establishes a clear and credible path to achieving these goals, and is consistent with the specific reform plans that the State has proposed throughout its application;
The participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) are strongly committed to the State’s plans and to effective implementation of reform in the four education areas, as evidenced by Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) (as set forth in Appendix D) or other binding agreements between the State and its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) that include—

(a) Terms and conditions that reflect strong commitment by the participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to the State’s plans;

(b) Scope-of-work descriptions that require participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to implement all or significant portions of the State’s Race to the Top plans; and

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

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

(a) Increasing student achievement in (at a minimum) reading/language arts and mathematics, as reported by the NAEP and the assessments required under the ESEA;

(b) Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, as reported by the NAEP and the assessments required under the ESEA;

(c) Increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice); and

(d) Increasing college enrollment (as defined in this notice) and increasing the number of students who complete at least a year’s worth of college credit that is applicable to a degree within two years of enrollment in an institution of higher education.

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

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

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

(a) Providing strong leadership and dedicated teams to implement the statewide education reform plans the State has proposed;

(b) Supporting participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) in successfully implementing the education reform plans the State has proposed, through such activities as identifying promising practices, evaluating these practices’ effectiveness, ceasing ineffective practices, widely disseminating and replicating the effective practices statewide, holding participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) accountable for progress and performance, and intervening where necessary;

(c) Providing effective and efficient operations and processes for implementing its Race to the Top grant in such areas as grant administration and oversight, budget reporting and monitoring, performance measure tracking and reporting, and fund disbursement;
(d) Using the funds for this grant, as described in the State’s budget and accompanying budget narrative, to accomplish the State’s plans and meet its targets, including where feasible, by coordinating, reallocating, or repurposing education funds from other Federal, State, and local sources so that they align with the State’s Race to the Top goals;

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

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

(a) The State’s teachers and principals, which include the State’s teachers’ unions or statewide teacher associations; and

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

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

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

(i) **(maximum subpoints: 5)** Make progress over the past several years in each of the four education reform areas, and used its ARRA and other Federal and State funding to pursue such reforms;

(ii) **(maximum subpoints: 25)** Improve student outcomes overall and by student subgroup since at least 2003, and explain the connections between the data and the actions that have contributed to—

(a) Increasing student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA;

(b) Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA; and

(c) Increasing high school graduation rates.

**B. Standards and Assessments**

*State Reform Conditions Criteria*

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

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

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

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (B)(1)(ii):
• “High” points are earned for: Phase 1 applicants’ commitment to and progress toward adoption by August 2, 2010; and Phase 2 applicants’ adoption by August 2, 2010.
• No “Medium” points are assigned for this criterion.
• “Low” points are earned for a high-quality plan to adopt by a later specified date in 2010.
• No points are earned for a plan that is not high-quality or for a plan to adopt later than 2010.

(B)(1) (maximum total points: 40) Developing and adopting common standards: The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to adopting a common set of high-quality standards, evidenced by (as set forth in Appendix B)—
(i) (maximum subpoints: 20) The State’s participation in a consortium of States that—
(a) Is working toward jointly developing and adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) that are supported by evidence that they are internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation; and
(b) Includes a significant number of States; and
(ii) (maximum subpoints: 20) (a) For Phase 1 applications, the State’s high-quality plan demonstrating its commitment to and progress toward adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) by August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 specified by the State, and to implementing the standards thereafter in a well-planned way; or
(b) For Phase 2 applications, the State’s adoption of a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) by August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 specified by the State in a high-quality plan toward which the State has made significant progress, and its commitment to implementing the standards thereafter in a well-planned way.7

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

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (B)(2)(ii) – Significant Number of States:
• “High” points for a significant number of States are earned if the consortium includes a majority of the States in the country.
• “Medium” or “low” points are earned if the consortium includes one-half of the States in the country or less.

(B)(2) (maximum total points: 10) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments: The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to improving the quality of its assessments, evidenced by (as set forth in Appendix B) the State’s participation in a consortium of States that—
(i) Is working toward jointly developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) aligned with the consortium’s common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice); and
(ii) Includes a significant number of States.

7 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.
Reform Plan Criteria

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

(B)(3) (maximum total points: 20) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments: The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan for supporting a statewide transition to and implementation of internationally benchmarked K-12 standards that build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation, and high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) tied to these standards. State or LEA activities might, for example, include: developing a rollout plan for the standards together with all of their supporting components; in cooperation with the State’s institutions of higher education, aligning high school exit criteria and college entrance requirements with the new standards and assessments; developing or acquiring, disseminating, and implementing high-quality instructional materials and assessments (including, for example, formative and interim assessments (both as defined in this notice)); developing or acquiring and delivering high-quality professional development to support the transition to new standards and assessments; and engaging in other strategies that translate the standards and information from assessments into classroom practice for all students, including high-need students (as defined in this notice).

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

State Reform Conditions Criteria

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

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (C)(1):
• Applicants earn two (2) points for every element the State has, out of 12 elements possible.

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

Reform Plan Criteria

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

(C)(2) (maximum total points: 5) Accessing and using State data: The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan to ensure that data from the State’s statewide longitudinal data system are accessible to, and used to inform and engage, as appropriate, key stakeholders (e.g,
parents, students, teachers, principals, LEA leaders, community members, unions, researchers, and policymakers); and that the data support decision-makers in the continuous improvement of efforts in such areas as policy, instruction, operations, management, resource allocation, and overall effectiveness.8

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

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

(i) Increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decision-making, and overall effectiveness;

(ii) Support participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) and schools that are using instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) in providing effective professional development to teachers, principals, and administrators on how to use these systems and the resulting data to support continuous instructional improvement; and

(iii) Make the data from instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice), together with statewide longitudinal data system data, available and accessible to researchers so that they have detailed information with which to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional materials, strategies, and approaches for educating different types of students (e.g., students with disabilities, English language learners, students whose achievement is well below or above grade level).

D. Great Teachers and Leaders
State Reform Conditions Criteria

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

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (D)(1):
• The criterion must be judged for both teachers and principals.

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (D)(1)(i):
• “High” points are earned by States that have alternative routes that (a) permit providers who operate independently of institutions of higher education (IHEs), and (b) include at least 4 of the 5 elements listed in the definition of alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice).

8 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.
• “Medium” points are earned by States that have alternative routes that (a) permit providers who operate independently of IHEs, and (b) include at least 2 of the 5 elements listed in the definition of alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice).

• “Low” points are earned by States that have alternative routes that (a) do not permit providers who operate independently of IHEs, OR (b) include only 1 of the 5 elements listed in the definition of alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice).

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

(i) Legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions that allow alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) for teachers and principals, particularly routes that allow for providers in addition to institutions of higher education;

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

(iii) A process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage.

Reform Plan Criteria

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

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (D)(2):

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

(D)(2) (maximum total points: 58) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance: The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice)—

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

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

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

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

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

(b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;
(c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and

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

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

(D)(3) **(maximum total points: 25)** Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals: The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

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

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

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

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

**Reviewer Guidance Specific to (D)(4):**

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

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

(i) Link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in this notice) data to the students’ teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State; and

(ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice).
(D)(5) (maximum total points: 20) Providing effective support to teachers and principals: The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan for its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to—

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

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

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools
State Reform Conditions Criteria

(E)(1) (maximum total points: 10) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs: The extent to which the State has the legal, statutory, or regulatory authority to intervene directly in the State’s persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and in LEAs that are in improvement or corrective action status.

(E)(2) (maximum total points: 40) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools: The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—
(i) **(maximum subpoints: 5)** Identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and, at its discretion, any non-Title I eligible secondary schools that would be considered persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) if they were eligible to receive Title I funds; and

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

### F. General

#### State Reform Conditions Criteria

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer Guidance Specific to (F)(1)(i):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **“High”** points are earned if the percentage of the total revenues available to the State that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education increased from FY2008 to FY2009.
- **“Medium”** points are earned if the percentage of the total revenues available to the State that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education were substantially unchanged from FY2008 to FY2009.
- **“Low”** points are earned if the percentage of the total revenues available to the State that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education decreased from FY2008 to FY2009.

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

(i) The percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2009 was greater than or equal to the percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2008; and

(ii) The State’s policies lead to equitable funding (a) between high-need LEAs (as defined in this notice) and other LEAs, and (b) within LEAs, between high-poverty schools (as defined in this notice) and other schools.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer Guidance Specific to (F)(2)(i):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **“High”** points are earned if the State either has no cap on the number of charter schools, or it has a “high” cap (defined as a cap such that, if it were filled, ≥10% of the total schools in the State would be charter schools); and the State does not have restrictions, such as those referenced in the “note to reviewers” below, that would be considered even mildly inhibiting.
- **“Medium”** points are earned if the State has a “medium” cap on the number of charter schools (defined as a cap such that, if it were filled, ≥5% and <10% of the total schools in the State would be charter schools); or the
charter school law has sufficient flexibility to allow for an increase in the number of charter schools as if it were a medium or higher cap (e.g. by allowing for the creation of multiple campuses under the same charter); and the State does not have restrictions, such as those referenced in the “note to reviewers” below, that would be considered moderately or severely inhibiting.

• “Low” points are earned if the State has a “low” cap on the number of charter schools (defined as a cap such that, if it were filled, <5% of the total schools in the State would be charter schools) OR if the State has restrictions, such as those referenced in the “note to reviewers” below, that would be considered severely inhibiting.

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

• Note to reviewers: Charter school laws are so complex that it is hard to write rules to capture each possible obstacle to charter school growth; therefore, this rubric is meant to guide reviewers, not to bind them. For example, if a State limits the number of charter schools by limiting the share of statewide or district-level funding that can go to charter schools, rather than by explicitly limiting the number of charter schools, reviewers should convert the funding restriction into an approximately equivalent limit on the number of schools and fit that into the guidelines here. As reviewers assess the inhibitions on charter schools, they should look for restrictions such as: disallowing certain types of charter schools (e.g., startups or conversions); restricting charter schools to operate in certain geographic areas; and limiting the number, percent, or demographics of students that may enroll in charter schools. Some States have “smart caps” designed to restrict growth to high-performing charter schools; this is not a problem unless it effectively restricts any new (i.e., unproven) charter schools from starting.

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

• “High” points are earned if the per-pupil funding to charter school students is ≥90% of that which is provided to traditional public school students.

• “Medium” points are earned if the per-pupil funding to charter school students is 80-89% of that which is provided to traditional public school students.

• “Low” points are earned if the per-pupil funding to charter school students is ≤79% of that which is provided to traditional public school students, or the State does not have a charter school law.

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

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

(i) The State has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State, measured (as set forth in Appendix B) by the percentage of total schools in the State that are allowed to be charter schools or otherwise restrict student enrollment in charter schools.

(ii) The State has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools; in particular, whether authorizers require that student achievement (as defined in this notice) be one significant factor, among others, in authorization or renewal; encourage charter schools that serve student populations that are similar to local district student populations, especially relative to high-need students (as defined in this notice); and have closed or not renewed ineffective charter schools.

(iii) The State’s charter schools receive (as set forth in Appendix B) equitable funding compared to traditional public schools, and a commensurate share of local, State, and Federal revenues.

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

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

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

(F)(3) (maximum total points: 5) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions: The extent to which the State, in addition to information provided under other State Reform Conditions Criteria, has created, through law, regulation, or policy, other conditions favorable to education reform or innovation that have increased student achievement or graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps, or resulted in other important outcomes.

V. Reviewer Guidance for Priorities

Absolute Priority Guidance: The application will be judged to ensure that it has met the absolute priority set forth below. The absolute priority cuts across the entire application and should not be addressed separately. It is assessed, after the proposal has been fully reviewed and evaluated, to ensure that the application has met the priority. If an application has not met the priority, it will be eliminated from the competition.

Priority 1: Absolute Priority – Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.
XII. APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

(a) The State’s application must be signed by the Governor, the State’s chief school officer, and the president of the State board of education (if applicable). States will respond to this requirement in the application, Section III, Race to the Top Application Assurances. In addition, the assurances in Section IV must be signed by the Governor.

(b) The State must describe the progress it has made over the past several years in each of the four education reform areas (as described in criterion (A)(3)(i)).

(c) The State must include a budget that details how it will use grant funds and other resources to meet targets and perform related functions (as described in criterion (A)(2)(i)(d)), including how it will use funds awarded under this program to--

(1) Achieve its targets for improving student achievement and graduation rates and for closing achievement gaps (as described in criterion (A)(1)(iii)); the State must also describe its track record of improving student progress overall and by student subgroup (as described in criterion (A)(3)(ii)); and

(2) Give priority to high-need LEAs (as defined in this notice), in addition to providing 50 percent of the grant to participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) based on their relative shares of funding under Part A of Title I of the ESEA for the most recent year as required under section 14006(c) of the ARRA. (Note: Because all Race to the Top grants will be made in 2010, relative shares will be based on total funding received in FY 2009, including both the regular Title I, Part A appropriation and the amount made available by the ARRA).

(d) The State must provide, for each State Reform Conditions Criterion (listed in this notice) that it chooses to address, a description of the State’s current status in meeting that criterion and, at a minimum, the information requested as supporting evidence for the criterion and the performance measures, if any (see Appendix A).

(e) The State must provide, for each Reform Plan Criterion (listed in this notice) that it chooses to address, a detailed plan for use of grant funds that includes, but need not be limited to--

(1) The key goals;

(2) The key activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, which should include why the specific activities are thought to bring about the change envisioned and how these activities are linked to the key goals;

(3) The timeline for implementing the activities;

(4) The party or parties responsible for implementing the activities;

(5) The information requested in the performance measures, where applicable (see Appendix A), and where the State proposes plans for reform efforts not covered by a specified
performance measure, the State is encouraged to propose performance measures and annual targets for those efforts; and

(6) The information requested as supporting evidence, if any, for the criterion, together with any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers in judging the credibility of the State’s plan.

(f) The State must submit a certification from the State Attorney General that—

(1) 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; and

(2) At the time the State submits its application, the State does not have any legal, statutory, or regulatory barriers at the State level to linking data on student achievement or student growth to teachers and principals for the purpose of teacher and principal evaluation.

(g) When addressing issues relating to assessments required under the ESEA or subgroups in the selection criteria, the State must meet the following requirements:

(1) For student subgroups with respect to the NAEP, the State must provide data for the NAEP subgroups described in section 303(b)(2)(G) of the National Assessment of Educational Progress Authorization Act (20 U.S.C. 9622) (i.e., race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, disability, and limited English proficiency). The State must also include the NAEP exclusion rate for students with disabilities and the exclusion rate for English language learners, along with clear documentation of the State’s policies and practices for determining whether a student with a disability or an English language learner should participate in the NAEP and whether the student needs accommodations;

(2) For student subgroups with respect to high school graduation rates, college enrollment and credit accumulation rates, and the assessments required under the ESEA, the State must provide data for the subgroups described in section 1111(b)(2)(C)(v)(II) of the ESEA (i.e., economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency); and

(3) For the assessments required under the ESEA, refer to section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA; in addition, when describing this assessment data in the State’s application, the State should note any factors (e.g., changes in cut scores) that would impact the comparability of data from one year to the next.
XIII. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

A State receiving Race to the Top funds must submit to the Department an annual report which must include, in addition to the standard elements, a description of the State’s and its LEAs’ progress to date on their goals, timelines, and budgets, as well as actual performance compared to the annual targets the State established in its application with respect to each performance measure. Further, a State receiving funds under this program and its participating LEAs are accountable for meeting the goals, timelines, budget, and annual targets established in the application; adhering to an annual fund drawdown schedule that is tied to meeting these goals, timelines, budget, and annual targets; and fulfilling and maintaining all other conditions for the conduct of the project. The Department will monitor a State’s and its participating LEAs’ progress in meeting the State’s goals, timelines, budget, and annual targets and in fulfilling other applicable requirements. In addition, the Department may collect additional data as part of a State’s annual reporting requirements.

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

A State that receives Race to the Top funds must also meet the reporting requirements that apply to all ARRA-funded programs. Specifically, the State must 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)).

In addition, 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 English language learners 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).
XIV. OTHER REQUIREMENTS

Evaluation

The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) will conduct a series of national evaluations of Race to the Top’s State grantees as part of its evaluation of programs funded under the ARRA. The Department’s goal for these evaluations is to ensure that its studies not only assess program impacts, but also provide valuable information to State and local educators to help inform and improve their practices.

The Department anticipates that the national evaluations will involve such components as—

- Surveys of States, LEAs, and/or schools, which will help identify how program funding is spent and the specific efforts and activities that are underway within each of the four education reform areas and across selected ARRA-funded programs;
- Case studies of promising practices in States, LEAs, and/or schools through surveys and other mechanisms; and
- Evaluations of outcomes, focusing on student achievement and other performance measures, to determine the impact of the reforms implemented under Race to the Top.

Race to the Top grantee States are not required to conduct independent evaluations, but may propose, within their applications, to use funds from Race to the Top to support such evaluations. Grantees must make available, through formal (e.g., peer-reviewed journals) or informal (e.g., newsletters, websites) mechanisms, the results of any evaluations they conduct of their funded activities. In addition, as described elsewhere in this notice and regardless of the final components of the national evaluation, Race to the Top States, LEAs, and schools are expected to identify and share promising practices, make work available within and across States, and make data available in appropriate ways to stakeholders and researchers so as to help all States focus on continuous improvement in service of student outcomes.

Participating LEA Scope of Work

The agreements signed by participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) must include a scope-of-work section. The scope of work submitted by LEAs and States as part of their Race to the Top applications will be preliminary. Preliminary scopes of work should include the portions of the State’s proposed reform plans that the LEA is agreeing to implement. If a State is awarded a Race to the Top grant, its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) will have up to 90 days to complete final scopes of work, which must contain detailed work plans that are consistent with their preliminary scopes of work and with the State’s grant application, and should include the participating LEAs’ specific goals, activities, timelines, budgets, key personnel, and annual targets for key performance measures.

Making Work Available

Unless otherwise protected by law or agreement as proprietary information, the State and its subgrantees must make any work (e.g., materials, tools, processes, systems) developed under
its grant freely available to others, including but not limited to by posting the work on a website identified or sponsored by the Department.

**Technical Assistance**

The State must participate in applicable technical assistance activities that may be conducted by the Department or its designees.

**State Summative Assessments**

No funds awarded under this competition may be used to pay for costs related to statewide summative assessments.
XV. CONTRACTING FOR SERVICES

Generally, all procurement transactions by State or local educational agencies made with Race to the Top grant funds must be conducted in a manner providing full and open competition, consistent with the standards in Section 80.36 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR). This section requires that grantees use their own procurement procedures (which reflect State and local laws and regulations) to select contractors, provided that those procedures meet certain standards described in EDGAR.

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

SUBMISSION INFORMATION

The deadline for submission of Program applications is January 19, 2010 for Phase 1 applicants, and June 1, 2010 for Phase 2 applicants.

Applications for grants under this competition must be submitted by mail or hand delivery. The Department strongly recommends the use of overnight mail. Applications postmarked on the deadline date but arriving late will not be read.

a. Application Submission Format and Deadline.

Applications for grants under this competition, as well as any amendments regarding adoption of common standards that Phase 2 applicants may file after June 1 and through August 2, 2010, must be submitted in electronic format on a CD or DVD, with CD-ROM or DVD-ROM preferred. In addition, they must submit a signed original of Sections III and IV of the application and one copy of that signed original. Sections III and IV of the application include the Race to the Top Application Assurances and the Accountability, Transparency, Reporting and Other Assurances.

All electronic application files must be in a .DOC (document), .DOCX (document), .RTF (rich text), or .PDF (Portable Document) format. Each file name should clearly identify the part of the application to which the content is responding. If a State submits a file type other than the four file types specified in this paragraph, the Department will not review that material. States should not password-protect these files.

The CD or DVD should be clearly labeled with the State’s name and any other relevant information.

The Department must receive all grant applications by 4:30:00 p.m., Washington DC time, on the application deadline date. We will not accept an application for this competition after 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, on the application deadline date. Therefore, we strongly recommend that applicants arrange for mailing or hand delivery of their applications in advance of the application deadline date.

b. Submission of Applications by Mail.

States may submit their application (i.e., the CD or DVD, the signed original of Sections III and IV of the application, and the copy of that original) by mail (either through the U.S. Postal Service or a commercial carrier). We must receive the applications on or before the application deadline date. Therefore, to avoid delays, we strongly recommend sending applications via overnight mail. Mail applications to the Department at the following address:

U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center
Attention: (CFDA Number 84.395A)
LBJ Basement Level 1
400 Maryland Avenue, SW.
Washington, DC  20202-4260
If we receive an application after the application deadline, we will not consider that application.

c. Submission of Applications by Hand Delivery.
States may submit their application (i.e., the CD or DVD, the signed original of Sections III and IV of the application, and the copy of that original) by hand delivery (including via a courier service). We must receive the applications on or before the application deadline date, at the following address:

U.S. Department of Education
Application Control Center
Attention: (CFDA Number 84.395A)
550 12th Street, SW.
Room 7041, Potomac Center Plaza
Washington, DC  20202-4260

The Application Control Center accepts hand deliveries daily between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, except Saturdays, Sundays, and Federal holidays.

If we receive an application after the application deadline, we will not consider that application.

d. Envelope requirements and receipt:
When an applicant submits its application, whether by mail or hand delivery--
(1) It must indicate on the envelope that the CFDA number of the competition under which it is submitting its application is 84.395A; and
(2) The Application Control Center will mail to the applicant a notification of receipt of the grant application. If the applicant does not receive this notification, it should call the U.S. Department of Education Application Control Center at (202) 245-6288.

In accordance with EDGAR §75.216 (b) and (c), an application will not be evaluated for funding if the applicant does not comply with all of the procedural rules that govern the submission of the application or the application does not contain the information required under the program.
XVII. APPLICATION CHECKLIST

Please use the following checklist to ensure that your application is complete.

Formatting Recommendations (page 3)
- Are all pages 8.5” x 11”, on one side only, with 1” margins at the top, bottom, and both sides?
- Are all pages numbered?
- Is the line space set to 1.5 spacing using 12 point Times New Roman font?

Race to the Top Application Assurances (page 12)
- Is all of the requested information included on the Race to the Top Application Assurances page?
- SIGNATURE REQUIRED – Has the Governor or an authorized representative signed and dated the Race to the Top Application Assurances?
- SIGNATURE REQUIRED – Has the Chief State School Officer signed and dated the Race to the Top Application Assurances?
- SIGNATURE REQUIRED – Has the President of the State Board of Education signed and dated the Race to the Top Application Assurances?

State Attorney General Certification (page 13)
- SIGNATURE REQUIRED – Has the State Attorney General or an authorized representative signed and dated the Race to the Top Application Assurances?

Accountability, Transparency, Reporting, and Other Assurances and Certifications (pages 14-16)
- SIGNATURE REQUIRED – Has the Governor or his/her authorized representative signed and dated the other Assurances and Certifications?

Eligibility Requirements (page 17)
- Has the State provided explanatory information for eligibility requirement (b)? (Note that the Attorney General certification addresses this requirement, so the explanatory information is optional.)

Selection Criteria: Progress and Plans in the Four Education Reform Areas (pages 18-50)
- Has the State responded to all of the selection criteria to which it plans to respond?
- For each selection criterion to which the State is responding, has the State provided the necessary:
  - Narrative response?
  - Performance measures?
  - Evidence?
- Has the State organized the Appendix properly such that each attachment in the appendix is described in the narrative text of the relevant selection criterion?
Competition Priorities (pages 51-54)
  - [Optional] Has the State responded to all the competitive preference and invitational priorities to which it plans to respond?

Budget (see pages 55-64)
  - Has the State completed the following elements of the budget?
    - Budget Part I: Summary Table (page 56)
    - Budget Part I: Budget Summary Narrative (page 57)
    - Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Table (page 58)
    - Budget Part II: Project-Level Budget Narrative (page 59)
    - [If requested] Indirect Costs (page 64)

Application Requirements (see pages 92-93)
  - Has the State fulfilled all of the application requirements?

Application Submission Procedures (pages 98-99)
  - Has the State complied with the submission format requirements, including the application deadline for submission?

Appendix (page 102)
  - Has the State created a table of contents for its appendix?
  - Has the State included all required appendix documents per the instructions in the application, as well as any other documents it refers to in its narratives?
## XVIII. APPENDIX TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Appendix must include a complete Table of Contents, which includes the page number or attachment number, attachment title, and relevant selection criterion. A sample table of contents form is included below. Each attachment in the Appendix must be described in the narrative text of the relevant selection criterion, with a rationale for how its inclusion supports the narrative and the location of the attachment in the Appendix.
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