Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 2

California Application #2200CA-8

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	**65**	**60**	**60**	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	40	40	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	15	15	

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

The state presents a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda where each RTTT framework area is presented in an interdependent way to address the state's reform of agenda. A theory of change is presented that clearly explains how the state perceives elements of the reform agenda and how they are interconnected. The state intends for its agenda to be transformative, and there are multiple indicators throughout the application where the transformative vision is evident. The state presents a credible path for achieving goals identified throughout the application.

The state's proposed reform agenda was developed by a working group of seven Leadership LEAs. The scope of work descriptions are explicit and detailed, making it clear the specific actions expected of LEAs signing on to implement reform strategies. Participating LEAs would be expected to implement all strategies that are a part of the reform plan. An impressive scope of work with specific actions aligned with each RTTT reform is included. In total, 302 LEAs will partner to implement the reform plan. The memorandum of understanding is signed by 100% of the LEA's superintendents, 91% of local school boards, but only 33% of local teachers' unions. The state concedes that LEAs without initial union support would need to continue to work with these unions to gain support. The state has letters of support where unions indicate a willingness to negotiate in good faith regarding changes. Still, the lack of firm commitment from unions representing two thirds of participating LEAs could prove problematic and may interfere with the state implementing aspects of the proposed reform agenda, particularly aspects that relate to recruiting, rewarding, and retaining teachers and principals.

The state intentionally decided to focus on a limited, yet highly committed number of LEAs. The group of participating LEAs however represents a credible percentage of students living in poverty (more than one third) and students of color (more than one third African American and one third Hispanic). It is possible that the broad statewide impact will not rely solely on individual LEAs successfully reaching goals outlined in the state's reform agenda, although their success will certainly have an impact on a significant number of students. Rather the extensiveness of the impact is possible through the state's plan to have participating LEAs generate systems and practices that can be replicated by other LEAs, thus accomplishing a broad statewide impact.

Increases in NAEP and state assessments in reading and math scores are reasonable. A universal expected level of improvement on state assessments has been set for all participating LEAs, while allowing LEAs to set goals beyond this level. This flexibility will likely lead to levels of improvement beyond the state's expectations as LEAs generate contextualized strategies based on the particular needs of their respective communities. The state's use of a systematic process for setting growth targets by student subgroup as a means for reducing the achievement gap increases the probability that they will reach their goals. There is a minor concern that there is no discussion of whether or not LEAs are currently showing increases in high school graduation and college enrollment rates, although clear goals have been

set for increasing both. However this concern is not enough to affect point awards. The state suggests that their goals will remain the same even if they are not chosen for an RTTT award.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	**30**	**28**	**28**	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	20	20	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	8	8	

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

The state proposes an impressive leadership structure and framework that supports its capacity to implement, scale up and sustain the proposed reform plan. A Race to the Top Implementation Team, governed by an independent Board of Directors, will be organized. The Team will be accountable to the state for fiscal and programmatic reporting, but will otherwise work independently. The state intends for the Team and its expert committees to focus exclusively on RTTT initiatives, which strengthens the state's capacity to carry out its proposed reform agenda. This group will be headed by a director and three additional pivotal positions, all of which are adequately accounted for over a four year period in the submitted budget. Responsibilities for each position are structured so that components of the reform plan (e.g., management and operations of the grant; grant requirement compliance; research and data collection; LEA/Team liaison) are effectively addressed. In this way, the state has accounted for efficient operations and processes for grant management and plan implementation. The state plans for the Team to have non-profit status, which is a creative strategy for supporting the sustainability of the group and its work beyond the RTTT grant award years, since the Team will be able to seek funds beyond the grant. The state presents a plan for strategic use of RTTT, federal, state, and LEA funds, along with investment funds from private foundations to support its reform agenda. RTTT funds will be used for one-time investments—e.g., implementation of assessments and standards, while state and federal funds will be use for elements of the reform that are ongoing (e.g., professional development). RTTT funds will also be used to initiate strategies to turn around struggling schools, with ongoing financial support coming from recurring state and federal funds. State interest and support for the reform agenda proposed in the application are evidenced by legislative mandates for update reports on how LEAs are addressing reform strategies and early impact indicators. A Blue Ribbon Panel will be chosen which will recommend legislative changes based on outcomes and finding from RTTT reform initiatives. These efforts, in addition the ability of the Race to the Top Implementation Team to seek donations, grants, and other funding for initiatives begun during the grant award years, contribute to the sustainability of reform efforts beyond the RTTT award years.

As mentioned above, a significant number of local unions have not signed on for elements of the state's agenda plan that relate to changes in the evaluation and compensation of teachers, although discussions with these groups at the state and local levels persist, and the state expresses confidence that this issue will be resolved. The state received over 200 letters of support and non-LEA MOUs from an impressive array of legislators, governors (past and present), community organizations, business leaders and organizations, institutions of higher education, and private foundations that represent a tremendous level of support from a diverse group of stakeholders for the state's reform agenda. Representative letters indicate a willingness to advocate for political capital needed for change; work as a partner with the state; collaborate with the state; and generally support and endorse state efforts to change education in the state. The state should be able to leverage this level of support to better implement reform plans.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	**30**	**28**	**28**	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5	5	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	23	23	

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

The applicant has made impressive progress in each of the four education reform areas. In many instances, the state's work in the four reform areas either informs or serves as springboard for components of the proposed reform agenda. Standards in the core content areas have been adopted and are used as a basis for adopting instructional materials. A state assessment system is in place which measures student performance against standards, and assessments are used as early indicators for college readiness. The state is making progress on a longitudinal data system for student achievement and teacher data. Demographic information and performance data are already available to researchers, practitioners, parents and communities, and other interested stakeholders. A set of professional standards for both teachers and administrators are in place and these will figure into the state's work toward developing standards-based evaluations systems. The state has a history of supporting alternative routes to licensure for both teachers and principals. Professional development program exists for first and second year teachers and the state has made headway in tracking teacher placements as a support for increasing equitable distribution of effective teachers. California has invested in a number of school improvement programs.

The state has experienced improvement in academic performance of students since 2003. NAEP performance for both 4th and 8th grade reading and mathematics for all students and across all subgroups improved. Similar performance outcomes are evident on the California Standards Test (CST), the state assessment. Improved performance in grades 2-11 English-Language Arts and grades 2-7 mathematics was evident for all students and across all subgroups. The state has experienced a decrease in the achievement gap between white, and Hispanic and African American students. Overall graduation rates have increased and the there has been a decline in dropout rates among African American, American Indian, Hispanic/Latino, and Pacific Islander students. The state does not discuss actions that may have contributed to the gains discussed above.

Total	125	116	116	

B. Standards and Assessments

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

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

The state is one of 48 states, 2 territories, and the District of Columbia working on common core standards in English/language arts and mathematics.

The state plans to provide evidence that a common core of standards have been adopted by August 2, 2010. A process for adopting the standards is specified by law. If the standards are adopted by the State Board of Education by the August date, a plan for integrating the standards into the State education system will be submitted to the Governor and the Legislature. It is assumed that the state will be committed to implementing the standards, given the role of the governor and legislature in the standards adoption process. A well-planned set of goals and a timeline are presented for implementing the standards.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	**10**	**10**	**10**	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5	5	
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5	5	

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

The state has signed a non-binding MOU to participate with other states in jointly developing assessments.

The consortium consists of 26 states.

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

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

The state's transition into the use of enhanced standards and quality assessments will be facilitated by an existing infrastructure. Elements of the transition process include the development and adoption of standards aligned curriculum frameworks, development of instructional materials, professional development, teaching standards that are aligned with student learning and content standards, and assessment and accountability. The state's strategies for the transition are comprehensive and detailed.

Total	70	70	70	

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	**24**	**10**	**10**	

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

The state's longitudinal data system meets five of the America COMPLETE elements. While 11 of the 12 elements are listed on a table, only five are currently being implemented in the state's longitudinal data system.

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

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

The state has developed a set of comprehensive strategies to ensure that the state's longitudinal data system provides data that are useful (given individual stakeholder needs), accessible, of high quality, and provides for plans to address future stakeholder data needs.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	**18**	**18**	**18**	
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	6	6	
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	6	6	
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	6	6	

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

The state's strategies to increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems hold promise in terms of impacting instructional practices and increasing overall effectiveness. Teachers' instructional decisions will be advantaged by the use of interim assessments linked to content standards. The level and immediacy of this type of feedback is invaluable in terms of the impact it will have on teachers' approach to instruction. An additional innovative strategy will be the existence of a best practices area where student achievement is linked to specific instructional practices. These exemplars, along with curriculum resources will be made available to teachers as online resources. A final example of a strategy to improve instruction is the incorporation of e-portfolios as tools to facilitate teacher's ability to address students' individual learning needs. Overall, the state outlines a series of cutting edge strategies that will have a positive impact on teacher instructional practices, decisions made about instruction, and teachers' overall effectiveness.

The state plans to support LEAs and schools who are using instructional improvement systems by ensuring that staff have the skills needed to make data driven instructional decisions. The state has chosen a professional development model that relies on school-based data coaches to work with staff as they learn to use data for decision making and planning. Data coaches and the development of professional learning communities will be used as vehicles to engender a climate for the use of data for all levels of decision making and planning. School-based data coaches will provide technical support, and sustain the use of data driven decision making through development of school based-learning communities. The use of data coaches is an effective means for providing professional development.

The state will make available sub-awards to researchers interested in conducting research on the implementation and outcomes of state strategies and resources to improve instruction. Researchers will be directed to focus on areas of interest to the state so that evaluation and information are generated on the usefulness of instructional materials and strategies. The applicant's plan includes a useful process for engaging researches in this aspect of the reform agenda.

Total	47	33	33	

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	**21**	**16**	**16**	
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	7	7	
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	3	3	
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	6	6	

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

There are three laws that allow for alternative routes to licensure programs for teachers and administrators to be established. The Education and Internship Act of 1967 allows local districts, and colleges and universities to establish internship programs that lead to licensure. AB1161 is legislation that allows schools districts, county offices of education, and colleges and universities to design licensure programs to address geographic and subject matter shortages. The most recent legislation, Race to the Top, passed in January 2010 established the STEM and CTE Educator Credentialing Program which authorizes community-based and non-governmental organizations, in addition to public education units to establish alternative routes. Alternative programs for teachers and principals meet or partially meet all five elements required of alternative licensure programs.

There are currently 70 teacher intern programs and 40 administrator programs operating in the state. Of the 17,797 teachers prepared in the state, 399 or 2% were prepared in alternative programs. For principals, 140 or 4% of the 2,816 principals were prepared through alternative programs. The state is not taking advantage of the number of programs that are available to them.

The state has a well-developed method for determining teacher shortages. The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning provides the state with annual reports on teachers. This information figures into decisions about teacher distribution. The California Department of Education and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) track information on the current and future supply of teachers, and in the process identify areas of shortage. The CTC and public and private colleges and universities have developed programs in licensure areas where shortages occur. The State has also addressed shortage areas by streamlining the credentialing process as a means for encouraging career changers to enter the teaching profession. The process for monitoring principal shortages is not as developed as the teacher monitoring process. The state has developed partnerships to establish the status of principal shortages, and focused programs for principals (e.g., those for low performing schools) have been established for principals.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**54**	**57**	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	5	5	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	15	15	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	7	10	[redacted]
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	27	27	

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

Legislation passed in 2009 required the state to move away from traditional measures used to determine if schools had met growth targets. Previous targets of student growth relied on annual outcomes of student performance on assessments in specified grades and on end of course assessments in core subjects at individual schools. The state plans to embark upon an innovative process to develop a "student growth model" that defines student growth through a "longitudinally valid achievement assessment system" by August 2011. It is evident that the state's plan will provide richer and more in depth information on student growth.

The state plans a process where each LEA will develop local teacher and leadership evaluations, with all adhering to guidelines that teachers and principals be involved in work groups to develop the system; that systems be based on multiple measures, using student growth as a significant factor (minimum 30 percent) in order to differentiate effectiveness; and that effectiveness take into consideration success in closing the achievement gap. Each LEA would also develop rubrics and protocols that are aligned with teacher and principal professional standards, and have four levels of performance. LEAs will be assisted in this process by information derived from a number of projects that piloted both qualitative and quantitative measures that might become part of an evaluation system. It is important that the state has assigned two state level bodies (Technical Advisory Committee and the RttT Research Consortium) to assist in the process as well. The feedback, monitoring and dissemination roles of these entities will contribute to the rigor of developing systems and ensure that implementation proceeds as proposed by the state. This process for designing a multiple measurement evaluation system honors local control over the process, while at the same time assures consistency in terms of required evaluation system components. The state's approach may have a positive impact on local unions who have yet to completely sign onto the state's reform plan.

The state will shift to a process where all teachers and principals will be evaluated each year. The process of giving and receiving feedback will be improved by the state's design of reciprocal training related to evaluations, where school leaders learn to provide high quality evaluations based on multiple measures systems and teachers learn what to expect from evaluations. A more explicit discussion is needed on how student growth data will be provided to teachers and principals as part of the evaluation process.

The state plans to continue existing practices regarding induction and mentor support for new teachers and structured support for principals, in order to increase skills and knowledge. Also, teachers will be identified for professional development, based on the outcomes of evaluations. These practices are not bold or innovative, and are commonly used in districts across the country. A practice that holds promise as being innovative is the implementation of graduated support for teachers and principals who are ineffective. While the state reports that these professionals will have no more than two years to improve or be removed, specific information about the graduated approach is not included in the application.

The state will implement practices related to teacher and leader compensation that currently exist in many districts. An example would be the development of Teacher Leader Pathways where effective and highly effective teachers are given additional opportunities, such as becoming coaches or providing professional development in areas of need for a given LEA. The state also has several fresh and innovative plans to compensate effective teachers and leaders for work that leads to improvement in student growth. The notion of transferring only effective or highly effective principals to high need schools is in keeping with the transformative vision for reform desired by the state. It changes assumptions about who will have "opportunities" to work at high need schools—working at these schools become tantamount to promotion.

The states plan to seek LEAs to pilot alternative compensation models is also a novel idea. This allows teachers and principals (and their unions) to have a voice in how innovative compensation can materialize in the state A final innovative plan is the state's desire to implement Site-Based Alternative Compensation models where funds will be directed to schools that show a track record of raising achievement and closing the achievement gap.

The state plans to move to a system where tenure will be based on evaluations of performance and effectiveness. This system will require that principals who evaluate teachers and administrators who evaluate principals are effective evaluators when using the multiple measures evaluation system. The state has set the foundation for this practice by providing training and professional development based on the new evaluation system, so that all parties (those evaluating and those being evaluated) are clear about of evaluation and the pivotal role it plays in teacher compensation and tenure. The state has the commitment of all participating LEAs that they will support this process by not granting tenure to those who are evaluated as ineffective for a two year period. LEAs will also remove tenured teachers who receive ineffective ratings in a two year period, and principals who are rated as ineffective twice during their employment in a district. These actions will send strong messages to teachers, families, communities and other stakeholders about the state's and participating LEAs' value of effective teaching and leadership in the state.

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

During the question and answer section, the State clarified that teachers and administrators will have access to student achievement data though the state longitudinal data portal.

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

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

The state's plan to address equitable distribution of teachers and principals is focused and based on evaluation of teacher tracking data. Based on review of these data, the state surmised that simultaneous attention must be given to teacher and principal recruitment and retention, in order to address equitable distribution of the state's most effective teachers and leaders. The multiple and simultaneous strategies planned to address the issue should have a positive impact on equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals in the state. For example, incentive-based recruitment of effective teachers will be accompanied by attention to specialized professional development, and monitoring and improving the work environment. Ineffective teachers will not be allowed to transfer to high poverty/high minority schools, while teachers completing preparation programs having training components focused on working in high need schools will be sought. Incentives will also be used to recruit highly effective principals, and those without highly effective ratings will not be allowed to lead in high need schools. Principals in these schools will

receive support to ensure retention, such as assistance in staffing their schools through a talent management system.

The state plans to approach the need for teachers in hard-to-staff and shortage areas in ways similar to the approach to ensure equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals. In this way, they intend to recruit effective teachers, work with IHEs and LEAs to increase the number and percentage of teachers in these areas, and focus on the issue of retaining teachers in these areas once they are placed. Review of teacher shortage data revealed shortages in the areas of science, mathematics, special education, and in teachers of English Language Learners. While the strategies used to increase and retain the number of teacher in these areas are fairly widespread, the states multifaceted approach to the problem bodes well for improvement in this area.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	**14**	**11**	**11**	
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	4	4	
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	7	7	

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

The state has entered into an agreement with all state college and university systems that will allow data from teachers and principals in participating LEAs to be linked to the schools where the teacher or principal completed their professional program. The applicant states that this agreement is in the form of a MOU, which will provide institutions of higher education with information needed to improve their programs. There is no evidence of the MOU in the application. .

The state plans to add teacher effectiveness data as one of the sources of evidence used to accredit teacher and leadership preparation programs. The use of these data will result in the expansion of effective programs and the requirement that less effective programs engage policies and practices that will lead to improvement.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	**20**	**19**	**19**	
(i) Providing effective support	10	9	9	
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	10	10	

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

The state addresses professional development from a systemic approach, which enhances the possibility that comprehensive data driven professional development will be operating in the state. The state plans to ensure that teachers and leaders have available to them data that are relevant to their evaluations; that different levels of professional development are available based on the needs of individual principals or teachers, and that a range of opportunities for skill development exist (e.g., coaching, online courses, sharing best practices). This systemic approach ensures that professional development will be ongoing and specific to the needs of teachers and principals. All LEAs will play a role in developing and refining professional development. As a result, barriers to implementation of practices deemed to be effective in improving student learning outcomes should be minimized. Support for professional development for principals is currently in the form of funds to attend training from approved providers. Programs have been

also been identified to support new administrators The state concedes that administrator professional development programs will require further development.

It will be the responsibility of participating LEAs to make sure teachers and principals are aware of professional development opportunities. Data will be collected on professional development participation, and teacher and principal effectiveness. The state' professional development evaluation framework will provide data to be used to evaluate and make improvements when needed on the effectiveness of the professional development system. In this sense, the state has ensured an useful process for measurement, evaluation, and continuous improvement in professional development designed to support improved teacher and administrator practices.

Total	138	125	128	

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

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

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

While California recognizes that LEAs must take the lead in turning around low achieving schools, the state has designated that the State Board of Education has legal authority to intervene in these schools, and to work with LEAs to improve these schools. The state has the authority to intervene in persistently low achieving schools.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	**40**	**40**	**40**	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	35	35	

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

The state has workable process for identifying persistently low achieving schools that begins with the identification of Title I schools in school improvement, corrective actions, or restricting and eligible but non-Title one secondary schools. Through a series of calculations that involved schools' English-Language Arts and mathematics proficiency rate over a three year period and the exclusion of a group of schools meeting special conditions, the state arrive a total of 188 persistently low achieving schools. Of this number, 78 are located in participating LEAs.

The state clearly supports the notion that turnaround efforts must take place at the LEA level. This perspective is evident throughout the detailed list of strategies and actions geared toward support for LEAs which have persistently low performing schools. While many decisions are made at the LEA level the state makes certain requirements as the turnaround process begins, which provide a foundation for success. These include an incubation and planning year; an assessment of the LEAs capacity to engage a successful turnaround effort; and a LEA self-assessment to determine turnaround readiness. The state is poised to support critical changes that need to occur at the LEA level by providing resources, tools, and research to support the turnaround effort . Human resources in the form of support for family and

community engagement, and teachers and leaders prepared to work in a turnaround environment are critical areas of support. A key support which exemplifies once again the strong commitment the state has to LEA level turnaround efforts is the state developed Turnaround Partnerships and Learning Communities. Here the state connects successful turnaround schools/LEAs with LEAs having low achieving schools. The modeling and support at this level provide potential turnaround LEAs with both a vision of what can be, and practical and tactical strategies that result in reaching the vision. The possibility exists that a LEA's effort will not be successful. The state gives schools/LEAs five years (with required annual reports) for the change to take place. Schools/LEAs unable to manage a successful turnaround must choose a different RTTT turnaround model.

Total	50	50	50	

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	**10**	**10**	**10**	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5	5	

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

The percentage of total revenues available to the state used to support education in the state was greater in FY 2009 than it was in 2008.

The state has established policies to ensure equitable funding between high need and other LEAs. In terms of distribution of funds, 68% of LEAs' funding is based on average daily attendance. The state also allocates funds to a number of categorical programs, many of which provide funds for issues likely to be more prominent in high need LEAs. For example, funding is allocated for expelled and at risk youth, English Language Learners, foster youth, class size reduction, and students with disabilities. It is through this process the state ensures that funding is available to address the needs of low income youth.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	**40**	**37**	**39**	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8	8	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8	8	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8	8	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	8	8	

(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	5	7	[redacted]

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

The state has a high cap in terms of the number of allowable charter schools. Currently there are 810 charter schools operating in the state, which represents 8 percent of the state's schools. These schools are categorized by curriculum type (e.g., traditional, science-math, technology); instructional strategy (e.g., site-based, independent); and source of funding (e.g., directly funded by the state, directly funded by the district).

Charters in the state may be granted to individual schools, a total LEA, an entire county, or for state-wide benefit. As a result, there are multiple authorizers in the state. Authorizers provide oversight for the school, and organizations such as the Charter School Association and the Charter School Development Association provide resources and training. As a measure of quality, all charter schools must meet all state-wide academic standards and administer state required assessments. They are also required to meet a number of identified student achievement goals. Charters can be revoked if statutory requirements are not met. The state has a strong history of working with charter schools. While the flexibility and number of authorizers may be problematic for some states, this structure for authorizing and providing oversight for charter schools seems appropriate for a state as large and diverse as is California. The state's record for closing charters over the last four years is: 2005-06 /31 schools; 2006-07/ 39 schools; 2007- 08/ 25 schools; and 2008-09/ 35 schools. The low student performance and lack of financial viability were frequent reasons for closure.

Charter schools are funded just as the state's traditional schools are funded. Categorical and general funds are used in the same way, which the state believes ensures equitable funding between charter and traditional schools

California law requires that public school facilities must be shared among all students. As a result charter schools have equitable access to school facilities. The state also provides funding for charter school facilities through grants and other funding sources.

LEAs are able to establish alternative schools of choice by law. The expectation of these schools is that innovative ideas and methods which go beyond the traditional curriculum will be tried. The state lists an impressive array of alternative schools that are not charter schools. Insufficient information makes it difficult to determine whether or not these schools meet to total definition for innovative, autonomous schools.

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

Based on the State's response to a question focused on innovative, autonomous schools, it is clear that the state enables LEAs to operate schools that have components of innovative and autonomous schools as defined by the notice. Schools exist that are able to define instructional models, implement new structures, and have flexible budgets.

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

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

A number of laws and other conditions exist in the state that support education reform or innovation. These include legislation to strengthen the role of parents in the education of children, flexibility in education codes and funding strategies in order to encourage local innovation, and legislation that supports early childhood education and after school programs. Taking advantage of the flexibility, funding, and possibilities to create programs made possible by these legislative acts could result in improved achievement and subsequent reduction of the achievement gap.

Total	55	52	54	

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

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

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state describes principles that guide current STEM initiatives in the state, and principles that would guide reform-based initiatives. These include STEM-related curriculum and instruction aligned with core academic standards; exposure for all students, but especially students from groups who are underrepresented in STEM-related careers (e.g., women, minority, and economically disadvantaged students) to engaging content and instruction; a K-20+ vision for STEM learning experience as a mechanism to provide a pathway to college or career success; and the belief that STEM should serve as the basis for building strong partnerships between the schools, communities, business and the local governments. Six initiatives that address the RTTT reform areas are listed.

Total	15	15	15	

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		**Yes**	**Yes**	[redacted]

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

California presents a comprehensive and coherent approach to all four education reform areas specified in ARRA. The consistency with which the state was able to advance its theory of change and weave it into the discussion of the six RTTT criteria suggest a deeply embedded set of beliefs that will serve as an anchor throughout the reform process. The state clearly intends to be transformative in its approach to education reform, and in many cases innovative and creative strategies are presented. The state has a foundation of innovation and reform and is able to draw from multiple initiatives that have been piloted in the state. There is tremendous support in the state for reform from a diverse group of stakeholders. In as state as large as California, the decision to work with a limited number of highly committed LEAs seems prudent. Just as the seven Leadership LEAs are able to provide lessons learned and models from their involvement in reform activities as the RTTT application was being generated, so will the remaining 295 LEAs generate models and exemplars that will have a broader impact on education in the state. Student growth and achievement are at the center of the proposals included in the application. The state demonstrates ambitious strategies to increase student achievement, decrease achievement gaps, and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

The State's history of innovation with respect to education is evident in the reform agenda put forward. The notion of "proof points" (i.e., the implementation, evaluation, and dissemination of innovative ideas) as suggested as a process for scale up of practices throughout the state, at the same time allows for continuation of the State's historic role in providing ideas for others throughout the nation to replicate.				
Total		0	0	

Grand Total	500	461	466	

Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 2

California Application #2200CA-6

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	**65**	**55**	**55**	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	35	35	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	15	15	

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

(A1i). The state's plan has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that is built on its strong history of educational reform. The state describes a development process that was stakeholder driven because the creation of the RTTT plan was designed by a cadre of seven Leadership LEAs, that according to the application, reflect the diversity of the state. In each of the reform areas, the plan describes the state's goals by first describing how the current foundation has been established, and these goals will be logical next steps on a strong existing foundation. For example, the adoption of common core standards will build on the state's work on standard development through the American Diploma Network to refine its existing state content standards. In addition, throughout the application, the state's plan emphasizes the development of performance metrics and data to inform policymakers and educators about student achievement and progress toward attaining reform goals; these data systems will emerge from an expansion of the state's current longitudinal data system for students data (CALPADS) and teacher data (CALTIDES). Similarly, according to the state's application, the plan is designed to address "key gaps in California's current system to support effective teachers and school leaders." Finally, the states proposes to build on the demonstrated success of several of its LEA partners when developing strategies for working with schools and /or LEAs identified as persistently lowest-achieving. The state's plan does an impressive job of linking previous reform efforts to the goals outlined in the application. Therefore, the plan appears to be consistent with the state's on-going reform efforts and is clearly articulated.

(A1ii). Because of the leadership role taken by seven Participating LEAs in the development of the plan, the MOU indicates strong support from these seven LEAs, but of California's 1, 729 LEAs only 302 (17.5%) are participating LEAs. Even more troubling than the small percentage of LEAs participating in the state's plan is the small percentage of local teachers' union leader signatures that have been obtained from the participating LEAs. Only 41 (33%) of the 302 Participating LEAs were able to obtain signatures from their union leaders. Because these LEAs serve 1,737,834 students, the state's plan proclaims that the participating LEAs "have the scale and influence necessary to generate broad statewide impact." The MOU also requires that each of the Participating LEAs sign on to implement the complete set of reforms that have been outlined by the leadership of 7 LEAs. According to the application, the state made a conscious decision to "not water down or diminish the transformational nature of the State's reform plan to win broader support." Granted, the number of students served by these participating LEAs is an impressive number of students; yet, it is problematical that such a low percentage of LEAs and a even lower percentage of union leaders have signed on in support of this effort. Therefore, this low level of union sign off, coupled with low percentage of participating LEAs, appears to be a impediment to the state's goal of generating statewide impact from the grant. This challenge is recognized in the state's application because

it notes that participating LEAs will be required to "build support of their union partners through ongoing dialogue."

(A1iii). The 302 LEAs that are participating in the state's plan represent 28% of all the state's children. Of equal importance, 68% of the students served by the participating LEAs live in poverty (36% of the state's total). The state outlines very reasonable steps for expanding the impact of the grant such as establishing "best practices that will be adopted by other LEAs in the state" based on the success of reforms within the participating LEAs. Specifically, within the area of increasing student NAEP achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, the application establishes some viable next steps that build on impressive gains already achieved. For example, according to a 2007 NCES study, "California's performance levels in reading and mathematics consistently placed them in the top 10 states for rigor when compared with NAEP achievement levels." Building on this foundation, the state's application proposes increases across the board. For example, 4th grade NAEP Reading would increase from today's rate of 54% at or above basic to 62% by 2015. Similar increases are proposed at other NAEP administration levels. Building on the state's history with the Academic Performance Index,(API), a numeric index to calculate student performance, the state's plan includes very specific targets for decreasing achievement gaps for a variety of subgroups. All of the subgroups have API targets of 800. In addition, the state's plan also establishes very clear goals for increasing the graduation rate to 90% of California students graduating from high school by 2020. In addition, other measures of post secondary success were also outlined, including a 2020 goal of 80% of California Community College completing one year of college credit within two years of enrollment. The state's proposals are very concrete and take into considerations various measures of student achievement including increased AP examination participation.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	**30**	**23**	**23**	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	16	16	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	7	7	

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

(A2i). The state's plan describes a strong leadership component that will be used to build statewide capacity. As with other components of the state's application, the leadership capacity builds on existing vehicles within the state. Central to this leadership is the guidance provided by the seven Leadership LEAs. In addition, the application discusses the importance of building on the existing high-quality infrastructure within the California Department of Education (CDE), the Office of the Secretary of Education, the State Board of Education and other education entities stateside. The state's plan also calls for the creation of a new non-profit organization, the "Race to the Top Implementation Team" that will focus exclusively on the grant's implementation, evaluation, and dissemination. Several new positions are described in this section of the application that define the work of the Implementation team such as an Executive Director and a Board of Directors. Although the state's narrative includes broad descriptions of the responsibilities of these new positions and an organizational chart that outlines the RTTT Implementation Team and Oversight Structure, the state's plan is vague about how this new organizational unit's work will be absorbed and carried on by existing structures at the conclusion of grant funding. It would have been helpful for the applicant to describe, for example, how existing agencies will redirect their efforts to absorb these responsibilities at the conclusion of grant funding, if additional funding is not obtained. According to the budget narrative, in addition to leveraging other ongoing state and federal ESEA funds to bolster the grant's efforts, more than 80% of the grant's funding is allocated directly to participating LEAs, 50% through the LEA subgrant, and an additional 30% through supplemental funding. The overall objective was to fund each LEA as close as possible to estimated costs of participating in the grant. Each LEA will receive 99% of the funds needed to execute the grant's activities. Finally, the state's plan includes a strong component regarding the independent evaluation of the grant's implementation. Recently enacted legislation requires an independent evaluation to begin in January, 2011 and conclude by June 2014. The independent evaluation appears to be designed to provide ongoing information about grant implementation and examine early indicators of the grant's impact. The RTTT Implementation Team's non-

profit status that will allow for the acceptance of donations, grants, and other funding could have a significant impact on the grant sustainability beyond the grant period.

(A2ii). The state's plan does have support from a broad group of stakeholders as evidenced by the letters of support that are included in the appendix. Letters are included from the state's local, state and federal political representatives, civil rights, student and parent advocates, STEM business partners, as well as strong support from the K-20 education arena. Problematic among the state's support is the endorsement and support of teacher and educator unions. With only 33% of the participating LEAs having signatures from their union leadership, the wording of union support letters underscored their lack of full endorsement of the grant's efforts. For example, the United Teachers of Los Angeles (UTLA) has indicated "their support for continuing discussion." Other unions, including the United Educators of San Francisco, have provided letters "indicating their willingness to be at the table". But, this tepid support is countered by recent legislative action to remove barriers to critical components of the RTTT plan including the proposed teacher evaluation system. The state's application reports both graduation rates and dropout rates, which are two helpful statistics to compare when discussing trends in secondary performance.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	**30**	**24**	**24**	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4	4	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	20	20	

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

(A3i). The state's application provides clear, sequential evidence of the progress the state has made over the years in each of the four education reforms. For example, in the area of academic standards and assessments, the application includes a chronology of California adoption of state standards in English language arts and mathematics that begins in 1997, with other content area standards following. In addition, the state has also developed a state assessment system whose central piece is Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program created in 1997 to provide annual assessments of academic achievement in core content areas in grades 2-11. Highlighted in this section of the grant is California's work in developing and using assessments as an early indicator for college readiness, the Early Assessment Program (EAP). In the area of data systems to inform improvement efforts, the application chronicles the state's investment in longitudinal data systems such as The California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) which will have complete student data at the end of 2011-12 and the companion system integrating teacher data--the California Longitudinal Teacher Integrated Data Education System (CALTIDES) which is scheduled to be operational in 2012. In the area of strong systems of support for teachers and leaders the application stresses California's groundbreaking work in the creation of the first comprehensive set of professional standards for teachers in 1997, the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). The application provides a clear chronological map of the additions to the initial standards that have been made over the years, including the 2001 adoption of standards for teacher education programs, as well as the 2001 development of California Professional Standards for Education Leaders. Finally, the state's plan also provides clear, well articulated evidence of the state's previous involvement in providing support in turning around its lowest-performing schools. Various efforts are described in this section of the application including the passage of the Public Schools Accountability Act in 1999 and the High Priority Schools Grants Program that was created in 2001. The application acknowledges that the state's varied approaches to providing assistance to these schools has had "mixed success." This mixed success rate cannot be defined as demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps; therefore, full points are not awarded.

(A3ii). While the state's application provides evidence that California's students have made consistent gains on state English language arts tests since 2003, the overall proficient students rate has risen by 15 percentage points, there still remains a significant gap between whites and other subgroups including Black, Hispanic/Latino, as well as students with disabilities. The state's application attempts to place the significant gap in prospective by quoting from the Education Trust West, "more [California] students are demonstrating mastery of state standards than at any point since standards and assessments became fully

aligned in 2003." The same type of trajectory can be observed when viewing the NAEP achievement data in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics for grades 4 and 8 since 2003. For example, while white students have improved from 69% at or above Basic Achievement Level for Reading in 2003 to 74% in 2009, Black students are at 42% in 2009; and Hispanic students are at 38%. These subgroups have made strides, but significant gaps exist among the three groups. The state's application shows that California's statewide graduation rate has increased by 4.5% since 1994-95. Like other state data, there are gaps among the graduation rate of various subgroups. The state's narrative provides some clarifying reasons for the graduation rate drop experienced by all groups between 2004-05 and 2005-06: The California High School Exit Exam became a requirement for graduation. Legislative changes such as AB 347 passed in 2007 require intensive instruction/services for students who do pass the exit exam. Also of interest is the data on the decrease in high school drop out rates for all subgroups using 2007-08 data. Although the changes in dropout rates for all groups are encouraging, it is alarming that subgroups such as blacks have a drop out rate approaching 40% and Hispanic/Latinos have a drop out rate approaching 30%.

Total	125	102	102	

B. Standards and Assessments

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

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

(B1i). The state's application describes California's participation in a number of multi-state efforts to develop common core standards such as the Council of Chief State School Officers' State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS) and the American Diploma Project (ADP). 48 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and U.S. Virgin Islands have committed to participate in the CCSSO's effort to develop college and career readiness standards and aligned core standards in English language arts and mathematics.

(B1ii). According to the state's application, California enacted legislation on January 7, 2010 authorizing the adoption process of common core standards, with the goal of adoption by August 2, 2010. The state's plan references the legislation which established a new Academic Content Standards Commission that includes 21 members appointed by the Governor and legislature that is charged ensuring that the state standards are internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness and that at least 85% of the state's standards must be composed of the common core standards. This Commission must bring recommendations to the SBE for action by July 15, 2010.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	**10**	**10**	**10**	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5	5	
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5	5	

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

(B2i and ii). The state's application builds on the previous strong work that California has done with developing and implementing high quality assessments. Central to the state's assessment system is the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program. In order to develop and align common assessments of the common standards, the state's plan details steps that the state has taken including signing a non-binding MOU for membership in the Race to the Top assessment consortium. In addition, the state is also a member of the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career Consortium whose goal is to create precise measures of student growth that would also be appropriate to evaluate teacher and principal effectiveness. The Partnership's membership is currently 26 states.

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	**20**	**19**	**19**	

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

(B3). This section of the state's application, similar to several previous sections, draws heavily on California's strong history of standards implementation. The plan outlines concrete, specific steps that the state will take to transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments. Central to the efficient transition are several non-negotiables that have been embedded in the MOU signed by participating LEAs. For example, schools must have common planning time, use interim and summative assessments in the core subjects, as well as formative assessments to inform instruction and provide rigorous course offerings including dual enrollment, AP/IB and STEM related courses. Because of the state's previous involvement in state level standards roll out with instructional materials and professional development, the aggressive timeline included in this section of the grant is based on prior experience and appears to be realistic and achievable. Included within the timeline is the drafting of curriculum frameworks aligned with common standards, adopting instructional materials aligned to standards, designing and developing of statewide online formative assessment item banks, and developing training modules on the new standards, curriculum frameworks and assessments. An especially relevant aspect of the the state's transition plan is a strategy to improve the timeliness of summative assessment information provided by the state. The state's strategy for increasing the timeliness of data is twofold: contract with a vendor to develop new ways of delivering assessment results to local LEAs and to work closely with LEAs to identify and implement new approaches for reporting assessment results that will be most helpful in informing LEA improvement methods. Although the state provides very clear and concise methods for transitioning to the enhanced standards and high quality assessments, providing information and soliciting feedback from parents were missing from this segment of the application. Indeed, a communication campaign for parents and non-educator stakeholders was very unclear.

Total	70	69	69	

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	**24**	**10**	**10**	

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

(C1). According to the state's application, California will meet eleven of the twelve American COMPETES Act elements by complementing its two longitudinal data systems, the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) and the teacher authorization and teacher preparation data system California Longitudinal Teacher Integrated Data Education System (CALTIDES). Verification of only five of the eleven elements was available by reviewing the "Status of America COMPETES Elements in the Appendix.

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	**5**	**4**	**4**	

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

(C2). According to the state's application, California's plan for accessing and using data rests on the foundation of the state's investment in a state of the art, high speed large bandwidth telecommunications network that connects roughly 82% of the state's schools, district offices, IHEs to each other and others. Central to the state's plan for providing access to and use of the state's data system is the involvement of end users such as parents, teachers, students and administrators in its development. The plan projects that a preK-20 data system will be fully developed by 2013. To further illustrate the importance of accessibility of data, the application points to the recent adoption of legislation that establishes a State-level institutional review board (IRB) which will work with a central data steering committee to consider requests for student level data for research purposes. This level of consideration of data requests may place excessive barriers on the access of data for research by introducing more layers into the approval process. More information is needed to clarify the role of this type of review board. The state's plan also describes a user friendly data dashboard with multiple stakeholder users that will provide information about student achievement that can be used to make decisions about status and progress and evaluate the effectiveness of instructional efforts. According to the application, protocols for district and school level continuous improvement processes which will use the data dashboards to monitor student outcomes, etc. will be established by the LEAs. The target of a prek-20 data system that is fully developed by 2013 is ambitious but may not be achievable given the large components of the project that will be decided by the end users. For example, while there are common elements to the data dashboards that are described in Appendix C2.11, there are significant portions that each LEA will develop in order to customize the content and format to serve the needs of the participating LEAs.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	**18**	**14**	**14**	
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	4	4	
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	4	4	
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	6	6	

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

(C3i). The state's plan proposes several strategies to use data to improve instruction. These strategies include the use of data coaches at the LEA and school levels who will be the front line for professional development and provide ongoing technical support on data use for teachers. A statewide Data Coach Training Center is proposed to open in 2010-11 and will use the train the trainer model to provide training and certify data coaches. In addition to data coaches at the state and district level, the state's plan also emphasizes the use of professional learning communities (PLCs) at the state and district level that will be the central mechanism for using data for decision making. This component of the state's plan is not specific enough as to how PLCs will help teachers to use the immense amount of data provided from interim and formative assessments to drive decisions in the classroom. The state's plan describes a massive amount of data that will be available for decision making, but the description of how the data coaches and PLCs will help teachers and administrators to use this data for decision making was unclear and vague. Moreover, the skill set for the data coaches appear too broad, ranging from inputting data correctly to interpreting data to drive instructional decisions.

(C3ii). The state's plan for providing effective professional development to teachers, principals, and administrators on how to use data systems makes use of technology such as online interactive training, steaming audio-video and telepresence participation in "live" professional learning. The plan describes professional learning modules and opportunities for best practices resources that will be accessed through the California Education Data Portal. The tracking of professional development will also be done digitally. Very little information is provided on the evaluation component for professional development. After

describing a very forward thinking model for data systems, the state's plan is very sketchy regarding how educators and others will receive professional development on the use of these systems that will result in continuous improvement.

(C3iii). According to the state's plan RTTT funds will be used by the Data Systems Steering Committee to provide sub-grants to K-12, independent, and IHE research practitioners to conduct research on State and LEA identified areas of critical interest and need. An example of this type of targeted research is provided in the application with the reference to the work done by the CSU Center to Close the Achievement Gap. The Center links public CDE data with best practices of instructional improvement programs in an attempt to correlate outcomes with new program pilot and practices which is one of the most difficult types of educational research to conduct.

Total	47	28	28	

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	**21**	**14**	**14**	
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	7	7	
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	3	3	
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	4	4	

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

(D1i). The state's application cites legislation that provides multiple routes to certification--both traditional and alternative for teachers and administrators. For example, the Teacher Education and Internship Act allowed "any school district. . . in cooperation with an approved college and university, to establish a teacher education internship program." Also cited is California's recently enacted RTTT legislation that authorized providers for a new STEM and CTE Educator Credentialing Program which includes community-based organizations and nongovernmental organizations, as well as the public education entities currently authorized as providers. Prospective administrators may complete an internship program or pass a California Commission on Teacher Credentialing-approved examination.

(D1ii). Although the state's plan cites a designation by the National Center for Alternative Certification of California having "the most prolific alternate routes," the summary data provided in the application denote 4% of administrators and 2% of teachers actually use internships/alternatives for certification. A review of the evidence provided in the appendix indicates that for 2007-08 all level II administrative credentials were issued using traditional IHE affiliated programs. There was a total of 610 level II credentials awarded.

(D1iii). The state provides clear evidence of benefits that it has received from a partnership with the Center for Future of Teaching and Learning. For example, the application references the Center's 1999 report that described the concentration of under prepared teachers working in the lowest performing schools. Changes instituted after this study decreased the number of under prepared teachers from 20% of the workforce to approximately 3%. The state also makes use of tracking specifically in teacher shortage fields and speciality areas by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). The state provides impressive data in the Appendix to demonstrate efforts made by such programs as CSU's Mathematics and Science Teaching Initiative that has inceased the production of math and science teachers 76.6% from 2003 to 2007. Of equal importance are data that demonstrate that more than 70% taught in schools where 25% or

more of students were from families in poverty. Although the state's effort to identify and target teacher shortage areas is impressive, the state's application also acknowledges a less than impressive history in tracking and monitoring principal shortages. According to the application this lack of tracking school leaders at the state level to monitor, evaluate, and identify areas of principal shortages has been caused by historical data limitations. Improvements in processes for longitudinal collection, such as CALTIDES are designed to alleviate this lack of data.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**40**	**43**	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4	4	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	12	15	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	5	5	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	19	19	

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

(D2i). The state's plan establishes a clear approach to measuring student growth and measuring it for each individual student. The application clearly describes how the state's current assessment system is designed to measure school and district academic performance and calculates whether schools have met growth targets. Legislation passed by the state in 2009 requires the development of group and individual academic performance growth models for tested grades and core subjects. The timeline for development of this student growth model is August 2011 delivery. Because the state can build on existing state standards assessments the time line appears to be achievable. For non core subjects and non-tested grades the state proposes an August 2011 timeline for the identification and recommendation of alternative strategies for measuring student growth. Significantly, the proposal for each participating LEA to select the final strategy appears to open the doorway to uneven administration of student growth models for non core and non tested grades. The role of the state in the administration of these models is not explained.

(D2ii). The state's plan provides for the RTTT Implementation Team to work with participating LEAs in the development of a multiple measures evaluation (MME) system that will begin implementation in 2011-12, with 30% of teacher and principal's summative evaluation being based on student growth in school year 2013-14. The state has proposed a staggered implementation timeline for the MME system that allows for feedback from early adopters to be used to adjust the system before the next round of implementation. It is also helpful that early adopters will not be required to use all evaluation measures for personnel decisions. This is a smart decision by the state and should help to decrease the amount of pushback given the low percentage of union leaders who have endorsed the state's plan. What remains problematical about the state's proposal is the flexibility given to LEAs in the development of the protocols. Each LEA will develop a working group of teachers and principals that will guide the local development of the evaluation system. This appears to lead to a duplication of efforts among the participating LEAs. Central development of these types of protocols would decrease individual effort among the LEAs and would help promote consistency in implementation. As with criterion D2i, the state's role is unclear other than providing technical assistance and offering information to LEAs who request it.

(D2iii). The state's plan for participating LEAs to conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback is vague and lacks specificity. The centerpiece of the state's efforts in this area appears to be the goal that by school year 2011-12, 100% of school leaders and 100% of teachers will receive training on the evaluation process. According to the state's plan, Leadership LEAs will share examples of evaluation structures from which other districts can learn. Since all LEAs will be new to the incorporation of student growth being at least 30% of teacher and principal evaluation it would appear that the Leadership LEAs would have a learning curve as well. More specific guidance from the state would help promote a more efficient implementation of this component of the state's plan. Given that the state's application discusses a lack of solid principal evaluation practices upon which to draw, the lack of state's direction appears to hamper rather than promote LEA participation.

(D2iv). The state's plan for using evaluation to inform decisions includes provisions that allow LEAs to establish a system of graduated interventions and supports as soon as a teacher or principal is identified as ineffective. In addition LEAs will work to implement Site-Based Alternative Compensation models based on school effectiveness data. When removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals, the participating LEAs will address this issue by setting board policy and working with collective bargaining units to make changes to agreements. As with previous components of the MME plan, the amount of flexibility provided to LEAs and the diverse amount of implementation strategies that will be generated does help the state garner LEA buy in, but this type of strategy also yields very inconsistent implementation. For example, there are no safe guards provided in this section of the grant against politics or favoritism being used to unfairly compensate or promote individuals. The state's plan notes the the Site-Based Alternative Compensation model is designed "to generate learnings that include innovative practices which can be shared and scaled up." How these diverse plans will be evaluated is unclear. Given the low level of initial teacher union buy in (33% of participating LEAS had signatures from their union leadership) a concrete, well developed plan for using evaluations to inform critical decision is vital, and the amount of flexibility given to LEAs and the lack of direction provided by the state both argue against the timely development of such a plan.

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

D2ii. During the state's presentation and follow-up question and answer period, the state clarified that each LEA will develop their evaluation system using specific guidelines that will provide structure for the development process.

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

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

(D3i). The state's plan acknowledges that previous data used to track the distribution of teachers and principals have been inadequate because of the reliance on such data as credentials rather than such measures as effectiveness. Central to the state's plan is the goal that by school year 2013-14 high poverty, under performing schools will have teacher retention rates equal to or greater than the other schools within their districts. To help accomplish this goal, the state's plan includes multiple efforts such as development of a better tracking system that uses teacher effectiveness rather than credentials as a measure and the introduction of incentives to attract teachers to low performing schools. The state's plan proposes to learn from participating LEAs that are using promising approaches to ensure equitable distribution of teachers, and the plan includes reference to several of these promising LEAs such as Fresno Unified. The state's plan for placing effective leaders includes a variety of strategies that are patterned after the ones introduced for teachers. The strategies proposed for teacher and principal distribution are feasible and well articulated, and the timelines proposed are achievable based on the state's existing and planned data infrastructure.

(D3ii). The state's plan for increasing the number and percentage of effective teachers and principals in hard to staff subjects builds on a number of programs that the state already has in place in this area. For example, RTTT funds will be used to support California State University's (CSU) Mathematics and Science Teacher Initiative that has been discussed in an earlier section of the review, and has a proven track record of increasing the numbers of science and mathematics teachers that serve targeted areas. The appendix includes concrete evidence of the work done by CSU and others universities in increasing the numbers of teachers especially in mathematics and science. Especially interesting is CSU's Foundational Level General Science (FLGS) teacher credential program that includes course taking patterns that allow

community college students to transfer to four year institutions. The state's plan also provides participating LEAs the flexibility to work with IHEs to design innovative programs to increase the number of teachers in the pipeline. This is an area where individual LEA initiatives can serve as an incubator for promising ideas. Included in the appendix is robust evidence of the innovative approaches taken by such districts as Los Angeles Leader Pipeline Development Program and San Francisco Model Staffing Initiative. Although the state's plan does not provide baseline data for this criterion, the plan does include reasonable targets that are achievable given the timeline and specifics outlined in the state's application.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	**14**	**14**	**14**	
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	7	7	
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	7	7	

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

(D4i). The state's plan builds on existing partnerships and progress made in the area of linking student achievement and student growth data to a variety of sources including teachers and principals, as well as in state preparation programs. According the state's plan, a CSU Center of Teacher Quality's pilot is conducting a study that tracks student achievement and growth data to several thousand first and second year teachers graduates of CSU. RTTT funds will be used to expand this pilot study. Using signed MOUs from all four of the state's teacher preparation programs as foundation, the application highlights the development of the California Excellence Corps, a collaboration between the IHEs and participating IHEs that requires individual teacher and principal data to be linked to each teacher's or principal's primary school of preparation with a fall 2011 completion time. Of great importance, is the agreement of IHEs to work with Leadership LEAs to make these baseline data available to the public by spring, 2013. This is an ambitious timeline, but it appears reasonable and achievable given the strides already made in this area and the firm commitment of the state's teacher preparation programs as evidenced by the signed MOUs.

(D4ii). Fundamental to the state's plan to expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals is the collaboration and strong buy-in shown by the state's IHEs. According to the application, the IHEs have agreed to work with the State to expand capacity in those preparation/credentialing options and programs that data show are successful at producing effective teachers and principals; they have also agreed to revise options and programs that data show to be ineffective. IHEs have agreed to a 2013-2014 timeline. This timeline is challenging, but based on the preliminary work done by the CSU system the timeline and goal appear reasonable and achievable.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	**20**	**10**	**14**	
(i) Providing effective support	10	6	10	[redacted]
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	4	4	

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

(D5i). Central to the state's plan for providing effective, data-informed professional development, coaching, and other support for teachers and principals is the development of Multiple Measures Evaluation System (MME) by each of the participating LEAs. According to the MOU, a minimum of 30% of the MME must be derived from the measures of student academic growth. The other 70% of the MME will be decided locally. Again, this is a massive amount of flexibility with the state's role limited to regionalized assistance. As LEAs are individually developing their MMEs, they should also be developing a data-driven coherent plan for professional development for teachers and leaders that will launched in 2013-14. LEAs are advised that Leadership LEAs have already implemented these data driven professional development. But,

none of the LEAs have developed professional development that includes the use of the data dashboard or have the capacity for a digital professional development component. The state's plan misses the opportunity to draw together all the elements of professional development that have been introduced throughout the plan into a coherent whole. Too much is left unclear or vague based on a concept of LEA flexibility. Effective components of the state's plan require professional development to be differentiated by both teachers and principals working with supervisors to create a personal development plan. To help institutionalize and spread effective practices, teachers will have an opportunity to earn additional pay by serving as mentor teachers and will be paired with teachers who are in need of improvement. The state's plan includes very detailed explanation of the additional support that will be provided to struggling teachers and developing or ineffective principals. Special attention has also been given to administrators who are in need of assistance such as UCLA's School Management Programs. The state's plan for professional development is concrete and very detailed including components for both the veteran, novice, struggling and high performing teacher and principal. The state's plan also references the Leadership LEAs developing and training "turnaround teachers", promising teachers and leaders who will have expanded roles. But, additional details are not provided again because of the LEAs flexibility in designing the programs. Having goals outlined for the program or broad objectives provided at the state level will help to provide definition for this innovative program and focus the work of the Leadership LEAs.

(D5ii). The state's plan to measure, evaluate and continuously improve effectiveness of specific teacher and leader support is unclear and needs additional details. Central to the state's plan for this criterion is the Professional Development evaluation framework and the talent management system. Both of these concepts are introduced with figures embedded in the state's application. The description of these systems and how they will be used by LEAs as a part of a continuous improvement cycle was not fully developed.

(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

D5i. During the state's presentation and question and answer period, clarifying information was provided regarded the "turnaround teachers" program and how guidance will be provided for LEAs. Additional points are awarded based on this clarification that LEAs will have flexibility, but within guidelines.

Total	138	103	110	

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

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

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

(E1). According to the state's application, the role of the state in supporting and intervening in struggling schools and LEAs is clearly established. Copies of SBX4 and E.C. 52059 are included in the appendix.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	**40**	**35**	**35**	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	30	30	

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

(E2i). The state's plan includes the process as outlined in federal guidelines and pursuant to recent legislation for identifying persistently lowest achieving schools. This method yielded 188 persistently lowest achieving schools (85 elementary, 45 middle and 58 high schools).

(E2ii). The state's plan for providing support for its LEAs in turning around the lowest performing schools builds on the state's history of working with low performing schools and incorporates the participating LEAs transitioning to using one of the four intervention models in their persistently lowest achieving schools. The state's plan is very detail oriented and builds on lessons learned from prior experience with assisting lowest performing schools. For example, the plan includes a step by step process that begins with identifying research-based conditions that are critical for successful school turnaround; support LEAs in addressing gaps identified in a collaborative diagnostic process; review and approve plans showing how participating LEAs will transition to using one of the four intervention models in their persistently lowest achieving schools; provide a clearinghouse of tools/data/insight to support execution of school turnaround; engage parents/community members; developing turnaround teachers and leaders; ensuring accountability; and investing in LEAs support while learning as a state from successes and failures. The plan is robust and does an excellent job of bringing all aspects of the state's plan together. Unfortunately, the state's plan does not address the requirement that an LEA with more than nine persistently lowest achieving schools not use the transformation model for more than 50% of its schools.

Total	50	45	45	

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	**10**	**10**	**10**	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5	5	

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

(F1i). The state's application includes a table which shows that there has been an increase in the percentage of state revenues allocated for education funding from FY 2008 to FY 2009. These revenues increased from 46% to 47.4%.

(F1ii). The state's application cites an analysis done by the Education Trust for SY 2005-06 that shows that the state provided $599 more per pupil fuding for high poverty LEAs. The section of the application provides detailed evidence to support the contention that the state's education funding policies are structured to guarantee equity between high need LEAs and other LEAs.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	**40**	**33**	**40**	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8	8	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8	8	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8	8	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	8	8	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	1	8	

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

(F2i). The state's application provides evidence that the state has repealed its original statute that set a total cap of 100 charters and enacted a law that allows for continued growth in the number of charter schools. There is a limit of the number of charters, but according to the application the limit has not been reached because the authority to expand has far outpaced the actual growth of charter schools. For example, in 2009-10, a total of 1, 350 charter schools were authorized to operate, in contrast with the 810 actually in operation. Therefore, the state's description appears to qualify as a "high cap."

(F2ii). The State of California's Charter School Law provides strong guidance for the approval, oversight, reauthorization, and revocation of charter schools and charter LEAs. There appear to be clear processes for denials at each level. Data provided in the state's application indicates the number of charters that have been closed each year. The application also references an analysis of closings done by the Rand report that found "that the most frequent reason for revocation of a school's charter was for unsound academic program." This is further supported by the California Charter Schools' assertion that "30 of 32 state charter schools closures last year were for quality reasons related to academic quality and/or fiscal stability." Embedded within the state's charter school statutes is specific guidance that charter school authorizers "shall give preference to petitions that demonstrate the capability to provide comprehensive learning experiences to pupils identified by the petitioners as academically low achieving."

(F2iii). The state's education code is quite specific that each charter school "be provided with operational funding that is equal to the total funding that would be available to a similar school"

(F2iv). The state's application provides evidence that the state provides charter schools with funding for facilities. Evidence provided in the appendix indicate that Proposition 39 passed in 2000 requires that public school facilities should be fairly shared among all public school students, including those in charter schools. In addition, a Charter School Facility Grant Program, passed in 2001, offers direct cash assistance for facilities rental/leasing costs.

(F2v). The state's application provides several examples of innovative, autonomous schools such as the Early College High Schools that blend high school and college into a coherent education program. Not enough information is provided within the application to determine if these schools meet all criteria established in the grant for these schools such as open enrollment and ability to select and replace staff.

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

F2v. During the state's presentation and follow-up question and answer period, the state provided clarification regarding the alignment of selected schools to the US Department of Education's definition of autonomous, innovative schools including per pupil funding, shared decision making, and control of budgets.

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

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

(F3). The state's application cited a number of other significant reform conditions such as implementation of AVID which focuses on closing achievement gap by strengthening college readiness for all students. Data were provided that indicated that the percent of AVID students graduating varied only slightly from a low of 97.6% in 2002-03 school year to a high of 99.7% in the 1997-99 school years. Additional programs highlighted at the other end of the educational spectrum focused on expanding opportunities for early learning programs. One of these program is the Power of Preschool (PoP) which offers disadvantaged children free voluntary, high-quality part day preschool to assist them in becoming effective learners. The state's application includes impressive pre and post data that indicate significant gains made by children completing the PoP program in personally and social competency; physical and motor skills and safe and healthy living competencies.

Total	55	48	55	

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

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

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state's plan promotes the core academic standards in mathematics and science as the cornerstone of a rigorous course of study. It would have been helpful to have more information to describe how the standards of mathematics and science will intersect with the traditional Career Technical Education fields of Engineering and Technology to develop a robust program of study for the four course elements of STEM. This is not a major concern and does not detract from the overall effectiveness of the state's plan. The plan does a good job of establishing a context of collaboration among a variety of stakeholders as evidenced by the number of letters of support garnered to endorse the state's application. Threaded throughout the state's plan are six ambitious initiatives that encompass all of the four areas of the RTTT. The plan emphasizes, for example, that the STEM curriculum and instruction must engage students--especially women and minority and economically disadvantaged students. Finally, the state's plan does a good job of building on an already impressive array of activities and initiatives in order to support a strong agenda for advancing STEM education in the state.

Total	15	15	15	

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

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

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state's plan represents a comprehensive and well articulated plan. A central focus of the application is the long history that the state has already amassed in the four areas of reform. The plan builds nicely on this history and reflects the lessons the state has already learned. The state's history provides a rich back drop for concrete next steps to fulfill the educational agenda. The budget is supported by sufficient detail and is aligned to the major initiatives of the plan.

Total		0	0	

Grand Total	500	410	424	

Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 2

California Application #2200CA-4

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	**65**	**44**	**49**	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	4	4	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	30	35	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	10	10	

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

(i)

The CA application provides a reform agenda that includes goals for implementing reforms in the four education areas described in the ARRA and improving student outcome. The reform agenda establishes a path to achieving these goals, and is consistent with the specific reform plans that the State has proposed in the application.

The CA reform agenda was developed by seven Leadership LEAs who have successfully implemented reforms and the agenda is grounded in a theory of change that focuses on great teachers and leaders along with a supportive and aligned system, accountability, and performance evaluation to attain high levels of student achievement. The proposed plan is comprehensive and includes six goals of improving and linking educator accountability to world class standards, using data systems to support instruction, creating and expanding effective systems to support and retain great teachers and leaders, turning around low achieving schools, supporting and expanding STEM initiatives, and developing innovative early learning programs. The state plan includes specific steps for each of the six goals and identifies current programs that undergird the proposed work.

The state's proposed reform agenda addresses each of the assurances and key ARRA components. To that end, the state's application is sufficiently comprehensive and the proposed steps are logically connected to the goals established in the reform agenda. The fact that the reform agenda is based on successful reforms accomplished by seven in-state LEAs makes the plan credible; however, a question arises as to whether the seven districts adequately represent the transformational turning point for the state. Additionally, a question arises as to whether the state has a critical mass of LEAs to make the plan achievable, especially since only 302 of the state's 1,729 LEAs committed to the reform agenda. The number of points awarded to this section is due to the absence of information regarding how the state will be able to take the proposed reforms to scale and realize sufficient statewide impact to move student achievement forward.

(ii)

In this section of the application, the state verified that it developed a MOU between the state and its participating LEAs that includes terms and conditions that reflect strong commitment by the participating LEAs to the state's plan, that the scope-of-work requires participating LEAs to implement the state's Race to the Top plan, that the state attempted to obtain the required signatures from the designated representatives.

The California RttT MOU, along with the state's reform agenda, was prepared by a Leadership LEA group in collaboration with the Secretary of Education, the California Department of Education, and the State Board of Education. The state indicated that LEAs were not given an option to participate in a reduced number of the reform initiatives and as a result, the 302 LEAs that signed the MOU and Scope of Work are committed to the entire reform agenda. In the participating LEAs, the MOU was signed by the district superintendent, and 91% of the MOUs were signed by the president of the local school board. However, only 33% of the MOUs were signed by union leaders. While the state's mandate to require full participation in the reform agenda, coupled with the fact that participating LEAs represent districts with high population density, are laudable conditions, the state's inability to garner support for the reform agenda from less than 20% of the LEAs and only union support in 33% of the participating districts may signal programmatic or collaboration obstacles that may prevent the state from achieving its proposed reforms. The number of points awarded to this section is due to the concern that the number of participating LEAs and the limited number of union leaders that signed the MOU may indicate insufficient constituent commitment to attain the designated reforms.

(iii)

In this section of the application, the state proposed to use reform initiatives that were successfully implemented in the districts that formed the LEA Leadership Team. The state describes the initiatives as bold and stated that the initiatives require scaling up in order to be adopted statewide and will to use administrators in these LEAs to serve as mentors for other LEAs. Additionally, the state indicated that the participating LEAs serve 1,737,834 students and have 35% of the state's Program Improvement (PI) schools.

In the proposed reform agenda, the state plans to increase student achievement in fourth grade reading from 54 to 62% by 2015 and from 72 to 82% in mathematics, and in 8thgrade reading from 64 to 70% and mathematics from 59 to 65% . The projected achievement gains range from 6 to 10% over the next five years. On the California Standards Test, the state plans to let LEAs set their own achievement goals beyond a base growth goal of 5% in English Language Arts and mathematics. Additionally, the state plans to reduce the achievement gaps and has established a targeted Academic Performance Index for each subgroup.

The state plans to increase the high school graduation rate to 80% by 2014 and to 90% by 2020, to increase college enrollment to 63% by 2014, and increase the number of students who complete at least a year's worth of college credit to 90% by 2014 for the University of CA, to 85% for CA State and to 80% for CA Community College. Additionally, the state plans to increase the number of students who receive college credit through AP exams to 25% by 2014.

The LEAs that participate in the CA RttT plan will be expected to attain the established achievement and subgroup goals. While the state indicates that the number of students in the participating LEAs is large, it also acknowledges that the reforms will need to be scaled up to have broad statewide impact. However, this section of the application does not explain how the state can compensate or overcome the current lack of scale or how it plans to garner sufficient commitment from non-participating LEAs to implement the reforms and meet the achievement targets. This question, coupled with the state's plan to permit LEAs to set their own achievement goals beyond a state benchmark, creates uncertainty as to whether CA will be able to reach the established achievement targets. The number of points awarded for this section is due to the need for additional information on how the state plans to manage the reform agenda so that the achievement goals can be realistically attained.

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

During the Tier 2 presentation and response to questions, members of the state team indicated that the LEAs represented at the Tier 2 session continue to work with union leaders to secure commitment to the reform agenda. In particular, the superintendents on the state team explained that they addressed union concerns such as leadership and multiple evaluation measures in the proposed plan, that the working relationship and communication between the districts and unions has improved, and that the work with unions is an on-going priority. While the concern remains that the state may not have sufficient constituent commitment to attain the desired reforms, the state panel did verify that the participating superintendents

continue to work on securing union support for the proposed reforms. As a result, the number of points awarded in this section was increased.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	**30**	**22**	**22**	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	14	14	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	8	8	

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

(i)

In this section of the application, the state indicates that it has the capacity required to implement and scale up the proposed reform agenda plans by using the reach and influence of the seven Leadership LEAs, adding 295 additional LEA participants, using support from education innovators and IHE partners, involving the STEM community, creating an entrepreneurial entity to guide the reforms, and establishing fiscal accountability. In addition, the state plans to provide leadership through a RttT Implementation Team and Oversight Structure along with an Outreach Director and Coordinator that will implement the statewide education reform plan. The designated members of the Implementation Team will perform specific duties such as identifying promising practices, replicating the effective practices, holding participating LEAs accountable for progress and performance, administering and overseeing the grant, and monitoring the budget. It is unclear, however, if the state plans to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed reform practices and to cease ineffective practices.

Additionally, the state plans to coordinate other budget funds to accomplish the reform agenda and meet its targets, and plans to use the non-profit status of the Implementation Team to access other funding opportunities such as grants and donations to sustain the reform agenda after the period of funding has ended. The Implementation Team and Oversight Structure should provide the framework needed to manage the reform plan and budget allocations; however, the state's reliance on the reach and influence of seven superintendents to effectively maintain and extend commitment to 295 additional LEAs does not seem realistic, especially since a large number of the districts face the additional challenge of gaining union commitment to the reform agenda.

(ii)

In this section of the application, the state indicates that it plans to involve stakeholders at both the state and LEA levels to support the reform agenda. The state provided examples of LEA task force groups that functioned during the application development phase and expects these groups to continue to meet during the implementation phase to discuss various portions of the reform agenda. While teacher unions were included in the task force discussion, the state indicated that the unions have withheld support for the new teacher evaluation system, preferring to work with the LEAs and wait until the evaluation system is developed before "giving it their stamp of approval." In addition to the involvement of local stakeholders, the application identified several state level professional organizations that supported the application and indicated that over 200 letters of support were given by non-LEA groups, state officials, IHEs, businesses, and private foundations. The number of points awarded in this section is due to the concern that unions have withhold support for the teacher evaluation system may diminish the stakeholder support that the state needs to implement and sustain its proposed plan.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	**30**	**25**	**28**	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5	5	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	20	23	

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

(i)

In this portion of the application, the state demonstrated that is has made progress over the past several years in each of the four education reform areas. In previous portions of the application, the state indicated that in many cases, the reform agenda represents a new departure for the state in the way it is approaching the reform agenda; but in this section of the application, the state indicated that the reform areas are not new to California, that the state has engaged in this work for almost two decades. The state described itself as a pioneer in setting high standards and discussed its effort to align programs for schools in program improvement under ESEA/NCLB to the "Nine Essential Program Components" that were adopted by the SBE. In the application, the state described progress in each RttT reform area.

The state reported that from 1997 to 2008,itadopted standards in English-Language Arts, mathematics, history–social science, science, English language development , visual and performing arts, physical education, career technical education, and health education, and recently developed foundations for preschool programs. The state also adopted standards to guide the adoption of instructional materials and uses the standards to provide instructional expectations and guidance on a scope and sequence for the knowledge and skills all students need to master at each grade level.

The state also reported that it has implemented multiple assessment measures, including the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) annual achievement assessment of core content areas in grades 2-11. The STAR Program consists of four components: the California Standards Tests (CSTs); the California Modified Assessment for students in grades 3-8 whose Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) call for an alternate CST format; the California Alternate Performance Assessment, designed to measure the academic gains of students with severe cognitive disabilities; and the Standards-based Tests in Spanish, designed for students who receive instruction in Spanish or were enrolled in schools in the United States for less than 12 months. The State assessment system also includes the California English Language Development Test for English Language Learners, the California High School Exit Exam (CASHEE) tests in mathematics and English-Language Arts, and the Early Assessment Program (EAP) designed to assess students for college readiness in their junior year of high school. In addition to the multiple assessments, the state adopted the Public School Accountability Act in 1999 which created an index for measuring academic growth in schools, known as the Academic Performance Index (API). The API combines multiple achievement measures into an index measure that is used to rank schools and assign school-specific annual performance targets, at both the school and subgroup levels. In the current proposal, the state proposes to use the assessment to implement a Multiple Measures Evaluation (MME) system for both teachers and principals, determine a student growth evaluation.

In the area of data systems, the state reported that it has an extensive system for making data about students, schools, and achievement measures publicly available for researchers, practitioners, policymakers, parents/community members, and other interested stakeholders. The state makes datasets publicly available on the CDE's website, including information on student and staff demographics; revenue and expenditure information for all LEAs; annual student achievement testing data for each school and LEA; student pass rates; and school-level performance on English Language development. In addition, the state provides online detailed handbooks and customized public reports and uses its Ed-Data.org Website to provide the public with access to comprehensive data about K-12 data and school, district and county fiscal data reports. In recent years, CA also increased its capacity to collect, manage, and share longitudinal data through the California Longitudinal Pupil Achievement Data System (CALPADS) at the end of the 2011-12 school year, and a through the Longitudinal Teacher Integrated Data Education System (CALTIDES) by 2012.

In the area of strong systems of support for teachers and leaders, the state plans to link California's existing measurement systems for student performance with teacher and principal evaluations and to use the 1997 California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), along with its integrated set of guidelines for the teaching profession, the California adopted standards for teacher preparation programs, and standards for induction programs to accredit programs, guide the growth of new teachers and establish a framework for assessing teacher candidates on the performance expectations. In addition to the teacher standards, the state developed six California Professional Standards for Education Leaders (CPSEL) that serves as the

foundation for certification, credentialing, professional development, and evaluation of principals in the state. LEAs also use the CPSEL to develop performance goals and conduct yearly performance reviews of principals.

California reported that it has alternative routes for teacher and principal preparation and certification and adopted multiple state policies to support the alternative routes. Under the policies, all credentialing providers must meet the same program standards and the state reports that the National Center for Alternative Certification designated California as having the "most prolific alternate routes" to teaching. In addition to alternative preparation and credentialing routes, the state reported that it has extensive professional development and support for teachersthat includes a Beginning Teacher Support Assessment (BTSA) program, the largest induction program in the nation, and a state system for local peer evaluations that matches experienced mentors to participating teachers who need help developing subject matter knowledge or teaching strategies. As a result of these programs, the state reports that its proportion of under-prepared teachers has dropped from 20 to 3%.

The state also reported that it has taken an active role in turning around the lowest-performing schools and that it has realized significant improvement in student performance over the past decade. In this section of the application, the state emphasized the important role of the LEA in this work and described a large number of programs that have been implemented to support school turnaround efforts.

(ii)

In this section of the application, the state described student achievement gains and the connections between the data and the actions that have contributed to increasing student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and ESEA assessments, described decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and ESEA assessments, and increasing high school graduation rates.

The state reported that since 2003, California students have made consistent gains on state tests for English-Language Arts with the percentage of proficient students rising from 35 percent in 2003 to 50 percent in 2009. The state has realized a slight narrowing of achievement gaps with Black students gaining 15 percentage points, Hispanic/Latino students gaining 16 percentage points, while White students gained 14 percentage points. During the same timeframe, English Learners and students with disabilities gained 10 percentage points, and economically disadvantaged students gained 16 percentage points. Additionally, the state reported steady increases in student achievement on both the 4th and 8thgrade NAEP assessments since 2003. The 4th grade NAEP performance in reading and in mathematics improved across all students and all subgroups with the percentage of California students scoring at or above the Basic Achievement Level for Reading increasing from 50 percent in 2003 to 54 percent in 2009; White students improved from 69 percent in 2003 to 74 percent in 2009; Black students improved from 37 percent in 2003 to 42 percent in 2009; and Hispanic students improved from 33 percent in 2003 to 38 percent in 2009. In mathematics, the percentage of California students scoring at or above the Basic Achievement Level increased from 67 percent in 2003 to 72 percent in 2009; White students improved from 86 percent in 2003 to 89 percent in 2009; Black students improved from 51 percent in 2003 to 56 percent in 2009; and Hispanic students improved from 53 percent in 2003 to 59 percent in 2009. In 8thgrade reading, the percentage of California students scoring at or above the Basic Achievement Level for Reading increased from 61 percent in 2003 to 64 percent in 2009; White students improved from 76 percent in 2003 to 80 percent in 2009; Black students improved from 48 percent in 2003 to 53 percent in 2009; and Hispanic students improved from 46 percent in 2003 to 52 percent in 2009. In 8thgrade mathematics, the percentage of California students scoring at or above the Basic Achievement Level for mathematics increased from 56 percent in 2003 to 59 percent in 2009; White students improved from 74 percent in 2003 to 78 percent in 2009; Black students improved from 35 percent in 2003 to 40 percent in 2009; and Hispanic students improved from 37 percent in 2003 to 45 percent in 2009.

The state reported that student achievement, as measured by the California's Standards Test (CST), also improved significantly since 2003 and that in a NCES study entitled "Mapping 2005 State Proficiency

Standards onto the NAEP Scales," California's performance levels in reading and mathematics consistently placed them in the top ten states for rigor when compared with NAEP achievement levels. California's CST performance in English-Language Arts and in mathematics improved across all students and all subgroups. The percent of students scoring at or above basic increased from 69 percent in 2003 to 76 percent in 2009; White students improved from 78 percent in 2003 to 85 percent in 2009; Black students improved from 57 percent in 2003 to 67 percent in 2009; and Hispanic students improved from 60 percent in 2003 to 71 percent in 2009. In mathematics, students scoring at or above basic increased from 68 percent in 2003 to 80 percent in 2009; White students improved from 72 percent in 2003 to 86 percent in 2009; Black students improved from 49 percent in 2003 to 69 percent in 2009; and Hispanic students improved from 57 percent in 2003 to 75 percent in 2009.

Additionally, the state reported a decrease in achievement gaps between subgroups in English-Language Arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and ESEA assessments. On the 8th grade NAEP assessment, achievement gaps between Hispanic and White students decreased by four percentage points in math and two percentage points in reading from 2003-2009; the achievement gap for Black students decreased by one percentage point for both subjects and the NAEP performance gaps between White and Hispanic students, and White and Black students on the 4th grade mathematics assessment decreased by three percentage points and two percentage points; and the performance gap on the 4th grade reading NAEP assessment did not change between 2003 and 2009. On the CST, achievement gaps between Hispanic and White students decreased by four percentage points in both mathematics and English-Language Arts from 2003-2009 and the achievement gap for Black students decreased by five percentage points in mathematics and by three percentage points in English-Language Arts during the same timeframe.

California reported that statewide graduation rates increased by 4.5 percentage points since 1994-95 and that graduation rates have increased by 1.4 percentage points since 2006. In 2004-05, the state approved the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE) as a requirement for graduation, and as a result, graduation rates dropped between 2004-05 and 2005-06 and eligible students receive intensive instruction/services for two consecutive years, or until they pass the exam.

The number of points awarded in this section is due to the fact that while student achievement and performance gaps have improved, the state acknowledges that it has much work to do to meet the needs of its diverse students. In addition, the number of points awarded is due to the fact that it is unclear as to which actions contributed to increasing student achievement and whether the actions are slated to be replicated in the reform agenda.

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

During the Tier 2 presentation and response to questions, the state team clarified that the CORE will examine best practices and identify effective strategies that can be implemented at the LEA and school levels. The LEA superintendents that were present for Tier 2 indicated that they assume responsibility for identifying the factors and strategies that have contributed to increasing student achievement and cited examples of cross-district collaboration that have resulted in replication and expansion of effective teaching approaches. As a result of the Tier 2 explanation, the number of points awarded in this section was increased.

Total	125	91	99	

B. Standards and Assessments

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

(ii) Adopting standards	20	20	20	

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

(i)

California reports that it is working with a consortium of states to develop and adopt a set of internationally benchmarked common core standards in English-Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics. The State first developed English-Language Arts and mathematics standards in the late 1990s and convened an Academic Standards Commission that included a wide range of stakeholders and practitioners. The state reported that it in 2005, California was one of just three states that had aligned its high school standards in English and mathematics with postsecondary and workplace expectations, and was one of only three states that administered assessments to high school students and shared the assessment results with postsecondary institutions. Additionally, the state reported that it was the first state in the nation to adopt Career Technical Education (CTE) curriculum standards and curriculum frameworks. The state used its experience with standards in its participation in the development of common core standards, and shared its experience working in multi-state, collaborative efforts on standards and assessment issues, such as the Council of Chief State School Officers' State Collaborative on Assessment and Student Standards (SCASS) projects and the American Diploma Project (ADP).

The state indicated that it became committed to the development of common core standards in English-Language Arts and mathematics and submitted a MOA on May 28, 2009 with the National Governors Association (NGA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CSSO), joining 48 states in the Common Core Standards Initiative.

(ii)

In this section of the application, the state indicated that California enacted legislation on January 7, 2010, authorizing the adoption process of common core standards, with a goal of adoption by August 2, 2010, although the state intends to submit evidence of adoption on or before that date. The state passed legislation to establish an Academic Content Standards Commission that will revise content standards in English-Language Arts and mathematics and ensure that the standards are internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness. The legislation also specifies that at least 85 percent of the State's standards must be composed of the common core standards and that the Commission must present its recommendations for new standards to the SBE for its action by July 15, 2010. The SBE will either adopt or reject these standards by August 2, 2010, and the State Superintendent will present to the Governor and Legislature a schedule and plan for integrating the new standards into the State's education system.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	**10**	**10**	**10**	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5	5	
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5	5	

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

(i)

In this section of the application, the state verified that it is working toward jointly developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments that are aligned with the consortium's common set of K-12 standards and are sensitive to measuring annual achievement growth. The California Legislature enacted provisions directing the state to incorporate the new common core standards into state assessments and as a result, the state signed an MOU with the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career Consortium and is one of 26 states in this multi-state consortium to develop high-

quality summative assessments and measures of student growth that would also be appropriate to evaluate teacher and principal effectiveness. The consortium plans to develop model curriculum frameworks and course syllabi, as well as a bank of performance-tasks for classroom use.

(ii)

The number of points awarded to this section is due to the fact that the consortium includes over one half of the states in the country.

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

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

California developed a reform agenda that supports the transition to enhanced standards and high quality assessments. The elements of the proposed agenda included 5 strategies. The first strategy addressed the creating of a standards-aligned, data-driven educational approach founded upon internationally benchmarked standards, aligned curricula, and a high quality assessment system that includes multiple formative assessment options. To accomplish this strategy, the state plans to implement common planning time in all schools by grade level or subject area, thus enabling quality common assessment data analysis to inform instruction. The state also plans to use interim assessments in core subjects in conjunction with summative assessments, administer formative assessments to students and use the data to inform classroom instruction and academic interventions, provide professional development programs in all schools that focus on effective instruction, and will be linked to the use of formative assessment data linked to mastery of standards, and offer expanded options for rigorous STEM-related courses.

Strategy 2 addresses the development and implementation of summative, interim, and formative assessments. To accomplish this strategy, the state plans to revise the summative assessment system, build a statewide online assessment item bank that LEAs can draw from to build interim and formative assessments, create an Assessment Item Bank Advisory Board, leverage the existing formative and interim test item banks in use at LEAs to create the assessment bank of items, build LEA capacity to review assessment items, develop common assessment quality indicators, provide training on assessment development, work with Publishers to Develop a Reading Passage Bank and Interim Assessments, offer professional development on new standards, curriculum frameworks, and assessments, revise accountability system to reflect new standards and assessments, improve the timeliness, relevancy, and usefulness of the CST results provided to LEAs through a contract with a vendor established by the CDE. To monitor implementation of the plan, the state identified activities and milestones for each strategy included in the plan.

The state, in collaboration with the Leadership LEAs, developed a reform agenda that supports the 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 tied to these standards. The number of points awarded to this section is due to the fact that while the state plans to use the influence of the seven Leadership LEAs to bring more districts on board, under the current application, the number of LEAs do not represent statewide impact and it is difficult to predict if the proposed agenda, along with the influence of the seven LEAs, is sufficient to expand the number of participating LEAs to achieve the needed statewide impact.

Total	70	67	67	

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	**24**	**10**	**10**	

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

In this section of the application, the state verified that it has a statewide longitudinal data system that currently includes 5 of the America COMPETES Act elements. The state expects to meet all 12 elements of the America COMPETES Act by 2012; and while several elements are not currently in place, the state has a plan to implement the remaining elements such as the statewide longitudinal system that tracks individual K-12 students and eventually link students from PreK-20, the California Longitudinal Teacher Integrated Data Education System (CALTIDES) which will be launched in 2012-13, and CALPADS and CALTIDES which will be included with the California Partnership for Achieving Student Success program (Cal-PASS), a voluntary data sharing network for California's schools, colleges, and universities. All Leadership LEAs participating in the current application are members of the Cal-PASS system. The number of points awarded in this section is given by multiplying the 5 elements currently in place by 2 points.

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

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

In the current application, the state proposes the development of a data portal which will offer dashboards, reports, tables, graphs, and data sets that can be used by students, parents, teachers, school leaders, LEA leaders, governing agencies, community members, policy makers, and educational researchers. To accomplish this goal, the state plans to implement a number of strategies: develop a governance structure to monitor data quality, ownership, accountability, and data access; ensure that the data elements in the statewide longitudinal system reflect the needs of stakeholders; ensure that the State's data system is fully accessible to the community, researchers, and LEAs; and use accountability targets to develop a comprehensive data dashboard. In the first strategy, the state plans to establish a data governance structure by developing and maintaining common file formats, timelines and privacy requirements, provide guidelines to ensure data quality and to conduct data quality reviews. Secondly, the state plans to recommend expansion or modification of the state longitudinal data system as needed, require each participating LEA to designate an individual or team to participate in a data quality control certification program, and develop and monitor appropriate access levels for various users.

The state also plans to implement a strategy designed to ensure that the data elements in the statewide longitudinal system reflect the needs of stakeholders. To implement this strategy, the state proposes to expand the data elements to fill a number of Pre-K and postsecondary data gaps, supplement the longitudinal data system with elements from participating LEAs that are useful to practitioners and researchers and encourage LEAs to propose additional elements for inclusion in the longitudinal system. And under the final strategy, the state plans to ensure that the State's data system is fully accessible to the community, researchers, and LEAs by creating a single data portal that will display data dashboards, data reports, data tables/graphs, downloadable data sets, and best practice resource tools in one central location. In the final strategy, the state plans to use accountability targets to develop a comprehensive data dashboard with multiple stakeholder views and to use the work of specific Leadership LEAs as a model and then each participating LEA will replicate the dashboard infrastructure and feed data to the statewide system. While each LEA's dashboard will be customizable in content and format, the state plans to use a set of common dashboard elements as a foundational dashboard for each participating LEA.

The number of points awarded to this section is based on the fact that the state proposes 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 key stakeholders and that the state proposes to use the data to support decision-making and continuous improvement.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	**18**	**18**	**18**	
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	6	6	
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	6	6	

(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	6	6	

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

(i)

In the current application, California proposes a high-quality plan to increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems and to provide teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decision-making, and overall effectiveness. The state's plan includes strategies to ensure that data is fully utilized by providing professional learning through data coaches, developing a common system for interim assessments , integrating a best practices resource area into the data portal, incorporating school dashboards into the school's data analysis, and using data systems to coordinate and individualize instruction for each student through eportfolios.

In the proposed plan, the state will require all participating LEAs to place priority on making schools more conscious of collecting and analyzing data to improve student learning and will support this effort by providing data coaches at the LEA and school levels and conducting professional learning communities (PLCs). School data coaches will work with the PLCs for each grade level or subject area and will provide ongoing technical support on data use for teachers. The state also plans to establish a Statewide Data Coach Training Center which will provide training and certification to district designees who will act as data coach trainers (DCTs), training teachers and administrators to become school data coaches, promote best practices, and champion the use of data to accelerate student achievement. Both the state and participating LEAs will monitor the effectiveness of both district- and school-level coaches to ensure that they foster improved instructional practices and share best practices involving the use of data in instruction. Additionally, school PLCs, with support from trained data coaches, will use state and district assessment data to determine which standards need additional time for review, based on student achievement, and then teachers will assess progress and use the information gathered to make instructional decisions.

(ii)

In the proposed plan, the state plans to support participating LEAs and schools that are using instructional improvement systems and to support the LEAs in providing effective professional development on how to use these systems and data to support continuous instructional improvement. The state's proposed plan will be implemented through various strategies that include building a statewide online assessment item bank that LEAs can draw from to build interim and formative assessments and integrating a best practices resource area into the portal that connects outcome findings to instructional resources, materials, and best practice strategies. The best practices resource in the data portal will include established curriculum frameworks, professional learning modules, examples of best practices certified with evidence of linked student achievement, interim and formative assessment resources, and turnaround school best practices. The state also plans to incorporate curriculum frameworks, guides, and professional learning modules, including online interactive training, streaming audiovideo, and telepresence opportunities, into the best practices resource area of the data portal and to incorporate best practice curricular resources and instructional strategies that are certified with evidence of linked student achievement. Additionally, the state plans to provide interim and formative assessment resources, including guidelines for the development of assessments, and indicators to ensure the validity and reliability of growth measures and value-added calculations, to the best practices resource area in the data portal. The best practices resource area of the data portal will also include turnaround school case studies, web forums, and best practice blogs.

In the proposed plan, the state will incorporate school dashboards into the school's data analysis for the annual Single Plan for Student Achievement and participating LEAs will use the new data tools and systems to implement a periodic cycle of review sessions, utilizing professional learning days to review data, to review the implementation of programs and actions, and to use a reflection process to identify changes that need to occur during the next instructional period. The plan includes the development of a web-based tool for collection of SPSA data analysis using dashboard indicators and disaggregated data from schools, provision of an automated system to generate the data analysis, and the development of a

monitoring process for district leaders to review progress with school leaders, using the dashboard and the data analysis summaries to coordinate and individualize instruction by providing students with electronic portfolios to recognize work, support self-reflection, and enable alternative assessment.

(iii)

In the current plan, the state proposes to make the data from instructional improvement and longitudinal data systems 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.

In the plan, the state will make data available to researchers who will analyze CST data to identify standards missed by a majority of all students or a majority of subgroup students. The state plans to analyze the identified standards for trends and patterns and provide targeted professional development resources in the data portal. Additionally, the state plans to provide resources particular to specific subgroup needs based on the data disaggregated by content standards, racial/ethnic groups, socio-economic status, students with disabilities, and English Language Learners. The state also plans to use data in e-portfolios for education research and give researchers access to the stored information if they agree to share findings with all stakeholders. The state also plans to provide RttT funds to the Data Systems Steering Committee to provide sub-awards to K-12, independent, and IHE research practitioners to conduct research on State- and LEA identified areas of critical interest and need. These grants will be awarded based on the expertise of the research groups who will collect and analyze outcome measures and determine the value of specific programs, practices, and strategies in accelerating student achievement.

Total	47	33	33	

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	**21**	**12**	**12**	
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	4	4	
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	4	4	
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	4	4	

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

(i)

In 1967, California enacted the Teacher Education and Internship Act which established teacher internship programs. Since then, the state reports that it has enacted additional legislation that developed three alternative pathways: participant choice which provides multiple pathways for talented, dedicated individuals to demonstrate or receive rigorous preparation and earn certification; local control which gives counties, school districts, and private entities the ability to develop preparation/certification activities and programs to meet local needs; and high standards that require regulatory oversight to ensure that all programs are rigorous and every credentialed individual is prepared to become an effective educator. Additionally, the state reports that incentive funding for alternative certification programs began with the enactment of AB 1161 which addressed geographic and subject area shortages in the teaching workforce by encouraging districts and IHEs to design concentrated programs leading to a teaching credential. Education Code 44450 to 44468 allows people move into teaching after having careers in other professions and provides intern grant funds for University and District Intern Programs. Additionally, grant funding is

available for interns teaching in multiple subject, single subject, or education specialist credential areas. In the most recent RttT legislation enacted in January of 2010, the state has a new pathway—the STEM and CTE Educator Credentialing Program—to provide pre-service training to teachers and authorizes community-based organizations and nongovernmental organizations to be providers for other alternative routes.

The state offers a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential to administrators who attend a state-approved preparation program offered by a college or university, school district, county office of education, or other entity prior to beginning work as an administrator. Prospective administrators may also complete an internship program or pass a California Commission on Teacher Credentialing-approved examination. The state reports that the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing is currently establishing the Administrative Services Credentialing Advisory Panel to review and provide recommendations for identifying administrators.

The state verified that it has the legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions that allow alternative routes to certification for teachers, including routes that allow for providers in addition to institutions of higher education. The state offers internships to prospective administrators and the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing is currently establishing the Administrative Services Credentialing Advisory Panel to review and provide recommendations for identifying administrators. While the state has alternative pathways for certifying principals, the information in the narrative does not provide sufficient information to determine if the certification meets the criteria for an alternative pathway. The number of points awarded for this section of the application is due to the absence of clear verification that the programs listed meet the criteria for alternative certification. In particular, additional information is needed on a mentoring program for administrators, clarification as to whether the internship is a credentialing pathway or a capstone experience after the traditional coursework is completed, and the selection process for alternative certification.

(ii)

California reported that it has nearly 70 teacher and 40 administrator intern programs in operation and is one of only three states designated by the National Center for Alternative Certification as having "the most prolific alternate routes." While aspiring teachers do take advantage of alternate routes and the number of intern credentials issued by the state increased by more than 1,000, or 19% between 2005-06 and 2006-07, state data show that the vast majority of candidates still obtain their teaching credential through a traditional program.

The state verified that it has teachers who have two or more alternative pathways to credentialing and that it has a teacher and administrator intern program in operation; however, the application does not verify that the intern program leads directly to certification and acknowledges that the vast majority of candidates still obtain their teaching credential through a traditional program. The number of points awarded in this section of the application is due to the need for clarification on whether the teacher and administrator intern programs are separate routes that lead to certification.

(iii)

The state reports that it annually tracks and reports information on the state's teaching workforce, and since 1999, data has been reported on the number of under-prepared teachers that are working in the lowest-performing schools in the state and serving the highest numbers of poor, minority, and English Learner students. The state used this data to implement policies and programs that were designed to ensure the equitable distribution of resources and according to the data reported, the number of under-prepared teachers in California schools dropped from 20 percent of the workforce to just under three percent of the workforce in less than ten years.

The California Department of Education (CDE) and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) track information about the current and incoming supply of teachers and specifically monitor on shortage fields and specialty areas. To address shortages, the CTC developed a comprehensive set of teacher development programs designed to meet the demand in high-need fields and specialty areas, and the

University of California (UC) and California State University (CSU) developed programs designed to increase the number of teachers trained in mathematics and science in California.

The state reported that because of historical data limitations, tracking of school leaders and the effort to identify areas of principal shortage have not been as extensive as the state's efforts to track teacher shortages. In 2008, the Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning (CFTL), established the *Education Leadership and California's Future* initiative to encompass school leaders and the state established an Integrated Leadership Development Initiative (ILDI) designed to support leader development . Additionally, the state established two UC-based programs to prepare principals to serve in high-need schools. In the current proposal, California plans to continue supporting alternative routes to certification, while continuing to improve the traditional routes for teachers and leaders.

The state reported that it has a process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher shortage and for preparing teachers to fill these areas of shortage. The number of points awarded to this section is due to the fact that the state does not have a similar process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of principal shortage.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**42**	**42**	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	5	5	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	12	12	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	5	5	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	20	20	

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

(i)

The state plans to develop and implement teacher and principal evaluation based on multiple measures, including 30% on growth in student achievement, and plans to combine state standards for student achievement with innovative existing frameworks for teacher and principal excellence in the growth model. At the present time, the state calculates whether schools have met growth targets by comparing the difference in achievement from one year to the next among different groups of students, but in 2009, the state legislature passed legislation that requires development of a methodology for measuring group and individual academic performance growth that uses individual student results from a longitudinally valid achievement assessment system. As a result of this legislation, the state RttT Implementation Team will empanel a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) composed of researchers and experts on student outcome measurement who will provide advice and expertise in the development of student growth measures and recommend a student growth model by August 2011. Additionally, the TAC will identify and recommend alternative strategies for measuring student growth in non-core subject areas and non-tested grades by August 2011, with the final strategy selection to be determined by each participating LEA.

In this section of the application, the state verified that it plans to identify approaches to measuring student growth and measure it for each individual student.

(ii)

The state plans to work with participating LEAs to define a rigorous, transparent, and fair multiple measures evaluation (MME) system for both teachers and principals, with a minimum of 30% of the evaluation measured by student growth. The state plans to have the system in place by August 2011 and begin implementation in 2011-12, and expects 100% of the LEAs to fully implement them by 2013-14. The state expects to base the system on the six key areas of strength needed for excellent teaching in the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and on Professional Standards for Education leaders. In the California plan, select LEAs will begin using the MME in the fall of 2010 and the Los Angeles Unified School will pilot new, research-validated approaches to measuring effectiveness including Administrator

Observations, Peer Observations, Student Outcome Data, Parent/Guardian & Student Feedback/Survey, Assessment of commitment to and collaboration, and Self-evaluation. The state reports that state law already requires the use of student achievement data in evaluation and recent state legislation clarified that student data can be used in teacher and principal evaluation. After the initial pilot, the state plans, to have participating LEAs pilot other quantitative and qualitative non-student growth measures such as student engagement, student achievement, and/or parent/guardian satisfaction. The state is also considering other additional quantitative and qualitative measures such as teacher attendance, student attendance, graduation rates,teacher and principal self-evaluation, measures of commitment to collaboration, and other classroom observation measures.

Under the current plan, the state will have each LEA form a working group of teachers and principals who will develop the local evaluation system. The working group will ensure that the system differentiates effectiveness using multiple measures, including using data on student growth and includes success in closing achievement gaps as a priority area. Additionally the LEAs will develop observational rubrics and protocols and be responsible for ensuring that the instruments have been validated by research, are well aligned with the CSTP, have been developed, adopted or adapted with input from teachers and leaders, and identify and articulate at least four levels of effectiveness (Highly Effective, Effective, Needs Improvement/Developing, and Unsatisfactory/Ineffective). The state TAC will offer information and technical assistance to those LEAs who request it. By school year 2011-12, the state expects districts to have the MME System developed and piloted at select school sites representing at least 20% of the schools in the district. During the first year of implementation, the state will use the outcomes from the evaluations to form a baseline, incorporate learnings from the initial year, and expect LEAs to have a minimum of 60% of schools implementing the MME during school year 2012-13 and by 2013-14, it is expected that 100% of schools in participating LEAs will be implementing the MME.

In this section of the application, the state plans to implement evaluation systems for teachers and principals. Rather than develop a statewide system, the state plans to let each LEA develop a local evaluation that differentiates effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth. The LEA must also ensure that the evaluation system is designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement. While the proposed system meets the threshold criteria for this section of the application, it is not clear how the state plans to monitor for compliance regarding the required evaluation system components or how it plans to overcome the failure to develop a system if the local union does not approved the proposed system.

(iii)

Starting in school year 2013-14, the state plans to have all principals and teachers in participating LEAs evaluated annually using the Multiple Measures Evaluation (MME).The state plans to use the new MME to increase the performance of teachers who receive an unsatisfactory performance review and to leverage the new evaluation system to ensure that districts take a more focused and systematic approach to regular evaluation. The state acknowledges that principal evaluation practices have not been systematically documented and as a result, there is an absence of statewide data on the methods used to evaluate principals and the extent to which principals are evaluated. Leadership LEAs will provide examples of evaluation structures that other districts can use and will serve as models for providing timely feedback through ongoing supervision and evaluation, and to ensure that administrators and principals conduct high quality evaluations, the state plans for all school leaders to receive annual training on how to conduct high-quality evaluations, and all teachers will receive training on what to expect through the evaluation process.

While the state plan includes the implementation of an evaluation system that includes feedback, the plan does not describe how supervision and evaluation processes will be used to provide feedback, the guidelines for the frequency of feedback, or the type of feedback to be given. Additionally, this section of the application does not discuss how the state plans to provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools. The state also acknowledges that principal evaluation processes have not been systematically documented yet the plan does not describe how the state

proposes to implement a high quality principal evaluation system. The number of points awarded in this section is due to the need for additional information on the criteria established for this section.

(iv)

(a) California offers the State's Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program to support new teachers during their first year of work and during the induction process and data from the BTSA programs show satisfaction with the elements of the program, including the teacher mentor matches. The state plans to incorporate the MME system into the BTSA to provide feedback to new teachers and to identify those teachers and leaders in need of additional professional development and those highly effective teachers and leaders who may be eligible for additional compensation or a promotion.

(b) By 2013-14, all promotions to instructional leadership positions in the participating LEAs will require a track record of effectiveness as determined in evaluation ratings as "effective" or "highly effective." A Teacher Leader Pathway will be available to effective and highly effective teachers, giving them advancement opportunities to step into a Teacher Leader role in a specific focus area, such as data coaching or professional development. Additionally, principals will only be approved for transfer to high-need schools if they receive an effective or highly effective rating. Additionally, compensation decisions will also be informed by the MME and the state plans to award five competitive grants to LEAs to fund school sites plans that pilot alternative compensation approaches for teachers/leaders and LEAs will work to implement Site-Based Alternative Compensation models based on school effectiveness data.

(c) By 2013-14, the state expects all tenure decisions to be based on evaluations of performance and effectiveness. Principals will be required to make data-informed decisions andgrant tenure only when teachers have been rated as effective or highly effective and LEA leaders will make decisions on whether or not to maintain principals in their positions based on evaluation data.

(d) Participating LEAs will set board policy and will work with collective bargaining units to make changes to agreements, ensuring that the described approaches to evaluation, promotion, and dismissal are implemented. Participating LEAs will removeuntenured teachers who have not demonstrated effectiveness as measured by the MME by the end of their second year, and tenured teachers who receive a rating of ineffective twice in a two-year period while serving in a participating LEA will be removed from the position, subject to due process rights. Principals who receive a rating of ineffective twice while in the district will be removed from their position.

While the state addresses each of the criteria listed, the number of points awarded to this section is due to the need for additional information on how the state will be able to implement this portion of the reform agenda if the LEA is unable to establish board policy or develop an agreement with the union regarding the evaluation, promotion, and dismissal requirements.

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

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

(i)

The state reports that it has been tracking the equitable distribution of teachers for over a decade using the only available indicators which, to date, have been based on "inputs," such as credentials, rather than "outputs," such as effectiveness and the most recent study completed by the Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning shows that students in California's lowest-achieving schools are five times as likely to have a teacher without a full credential as students in the highest achieving schools. As a result, the state plans that by 2013-14, high-poverty, underperforming schools will have teacher retention rates equal

to or greater than the other schools within their district and the state plans to develop systems for tracking teacher retention by school site, with baseline data available by the end of school year 2010-11. This data will be published in the LEA's data dashboard and will include the number of years teachers have been at a site and the percent of teachers with less than three years of overall experience. Additionally, the state proposes to implement an Initiative to Recruit/Retain Teachers and Leaders in High-poverty, High-minority Schools and provide monetary incentives as well as monitor and improve working conditions in order to retain staff. The state also expects participating LEAs to identify effective and highly effective teachers and leaders and work with bargaining units to devise a compensation system that provides annual incentives for highly effective teachers and leaders who serve in high-need schools. In addition to supporting the placement of effective teachers in high-need schools, the state expects LEAs to ensure that these schools do not suffer from chronic exposure to entrenched, ineffective teachers, and LEAs containing schools identified as the lowest performing 5% in the state will ensure that open positions in these schools are filled with teachers who have demonstrated effectiveness in the classroom. Additionally, the LEAs will work with IHEs to build a pool of effective principals who have the skills to work in underperforming schools, project leadership needs and identify promising candidates to move into these positions, have a standards/competency-centered, integrated talent management system in place by 2013-14. and place and retain effective principals in all high-poverty and underperforming schools.

While the state has a plan to ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals, the number of points awarded to this section is due to the state's reliance on local efforts to implement the goals and the absence of information on how the state plans to monitor or intervene to if high-poverty and/or high-minority schools are served by ineffective teachers and principals at higher rates than other students.

(ii)

In the current proposal, the state plans to have participating LEAs develop a set of strategies to ensure that all hard-to-fill subject positions are filled, especially those in high-poverty schools and work with bargaining units to provide incentives, such as tuition assistance, for recruiting and retaining effective teachers in hard-to-staff subjects. Additionally, LEAs are encouraged to offer additional support to teachers in hard-to-staff subject areas in the form of professional development, common planning time, or access to a cadre of same-subject area peers and mentors. Participating LEAs will also establish programs designed to build a pool of teachers prepared to teach hard-to-staff subject areas and will work toward a common goal of retaining effective teachers in hard-to-staff subject areas at the same rate as other teachers in their district.

While the state has goals, activities and exemplary practices integrated into the plan, the number of points awarded in this section is due to the fact that each of the elements of the plan are implemented at the LEA level and are dependent upon successful negotiations with the union.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	**14**	**13**	**13**	
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	7	7	
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	6	6	

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

(i)

The state plans to use the CSU data system to collect, maintain, and use data on each teacher's or principal's primary school of preparation and year of completion, and proposes to have the system in place by the fall of 2011. California Education Code currently requires the capture of information that links the credentialing entity with the credentialed teacher, although the state indicated that this data is not currently publicly available. In the current proposal, IHEs have agreed to work with the Leadership LEAs to make baseline data publicly accessible by spring 2013 and then in subsequent years, new data from participating districts will enable participating universities to reveal the qualities and features of teacher programs that

yield the strongest learning gains by students of first- and second-year teachers and IHEs have agreed to use teacher effectiveness data to examine their current program practices and make changes as appropriate.

(ii)

Once the new evaluation plan is in place, the state proposes to use teacher and leader assessment results to inform decisions about preparation and credentialing options and programs. Then using the data, highly effective preparation programs will be expected to expand, and less effective ones will be required to improve. IHEs have agreed to work with the State to expand capacity in the preparation/credentialing options and programs that data show are successful at producing effective teachers and principals and will revise those options and programs that data show to be ineffective. IHEs will also work with LEAs, serving as technical advisors for professional development and will collaborate with LEAs to develop subject matter institutes for long-term, ongoing professional development.

While the state indicates that it expects effective preparatory programs to expand and less effective ones to improve, the plan does not describe how the state plans to use the data to define and identify the effective programs. As a result, the number of points awarded in this section is due to the need for additional information regarding the state's approach to identifying effective preparatory programs.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	**20**	**13**	**13**	
(i) Providing effective support	10	8	8	
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	5	5	

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

(i)

In the current proposal, participating LEAs will develop a system of support and professional development (PD) based on performance evaluation results and by 2013-14, the state expects participating LEAs to implement a data-driven, coherent plan for professional development for teachers and leaders in all schools. The state, as well as the Leadership LEAs will provide regionalized assistance for participating LEAs that need support developing PD systems. In participating LEAs, principals will provide teachers with all data relevant to their evaluation, and they will work individually with teachers to create a personal development plan. District administrators will provide principals with their evaluation results, and they will work with the principals individually to develop a PD plan, and LEAs will be responsible for communicating the range of PD offerings to both principals and teachers. Additionally, the state has identified programs that can be available to support LEAs in providing training and implementation.

While the state plans to provide support to teachers and principals, the plan calls for the support to be delivered through traditional supervisory personnel. The number of points awarded in this section is due to the concern that in order to realize its reform goals, the state may need to provide an expanded system of support that includes horizontal as well as hierarchical administrative support.

(ii)

The state's RttT Implementation Team, Leadership LEAs, and participating districts, will have access to continuous data on teacher and leader effectiveness and PD participation. LEAs can also use the talent management system to examine the effectiveness of the PD and use feedback to refine the supports.

While the state plans to use the proposed data system to share information on an on-going basis, the application does not describe how the state will measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of the supports. The number of points awarded in this section is due to the need for information on the processes to measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of supports.

Total	138	97	97	

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

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

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

The State established legal authority through the State Board of Education (SBE) to work with districts in corrective action to improve their schools. In addition to the State's authority under *No Child Left Behind* (NCLB), the State gained additional legal authority to intervene in the persistently lowest achieving schools through the RttT legislation enacted in January 2010.

The state plans to work with the participating LEAs to implement a turnaround plan that includes seven components including expert independent review and approval of LEA Turnaround School Plans, conduct evaluations of Turnaround models, develop a collection of successful parent engagement resources, fund activities that enable Turnaround Schools to engage parents, provide demonstration grants for showcasing successful Turnaround Schools, support accountability walkthroughs, establish Turnaround Partnerships and Learning Communities, and provide program funding for turnaround schools. In addition, the state plans to implement activities utilizing data systems to inform instruction, ensure that LEAs utilize new rigorous standards and assessments, and develop, equitably place, and evaluate teachers and leaders.

For persistently low performing schools, that require more intensive interventions and supports, the state plans to require the schools to implement one of the four intervention models required under RttT, and in the federal School Improvement Grant. Additionally the state will require schools, not in the lowest 5%, but faced with continued corrective action, to implement one of the four intervention models required under RttT if 50 percent of the parents in a school sign a petition requesting such a change.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	**40**	**34**	**34**	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	4	4	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	30	30	

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

In this section of the application, the state demonstrated that it has a plan to identify and intervene in the persistently lowest-achieving schools.

The state reports that it began intervening in low-performing schools in the 1999-2000 school year through its Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP). The program involved a needs analysis conducted by an external consultant and the development of action plans for schools in the bottom 50 percent of the state in order to improve performance in two to three years. The state introduced a second program in 2001, the High Priority Schools Grant Program (HPSGP), that focused funding priorities on the bottom 20 percent of the state's schools. Schools that failed to improve under II/USP or HPSGP were required to contract with an external, state-approved team, the School Assistance and Intervention Team (SAIT) to identify critical areas for improvement and to implement corrective actions. SAITs were required to use the state's nine Essential Program Components (EPCs) as the foundation for all improvement efforts.

California has a comprehensive intervention system in place for Title I schools that fail to make adequate yearly progress under NCLB. These schools must enter Program Improvement (PI) status and face corrective action sanctions after three years in PI. Schools whose LEAs assign an external partner to assist with their corrective action plan can tap into the approved pool of intervention teams who utilize the nine

EPCs to assess the school's areas for improvement. In the second year of corrective action, schools prepare a plan with their LEA for alternative governance of the school and are required to select one of the federal restructuring options: reopening the school as a charter; replacing all or most staff including the principal; contracting with an outside entity to manage the school; or other major restructuring. In Year 5 of PI, the school implements this alternative governance plan. In addition to the supports and sanctions for schools in PI, California also created tools and processes to support and intervene in districts in PI status through the District Assistance and Intervention (DAIT) process that assists districts in revising and implementing LEA plans and DAIT recommendations for improvements.

The state reports that it currently has 78 turnaround schools identified in the participating LEAs, and in the current proposal, the state developed nine specific strategies and an accompanying set of detailed activities for turning around the state's lowest achieving schools. The nine strategies include: Identify the State's Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools; Ensure Conditions for Success at the LEA Level; Provide a clearinghouse of tools/data/insight to support execution of school turnaround; Support Turnaround Partnerships and Learning Communities; Engage parents/community members; Ensure Accountability; Developing Turnaround Teachers and Leaders; Provide additional resources and supports to LEAs that will allow for lasting change after the schools implement the turnaround models; and Learn from successes and failures.

The proposed strategies provide a sequenced set of steps that districts can follow in intervening in low performing schools. Additionally, the state proposes to collect information from LEAs engaged in other innovative strategies for school turnaround, conduct evaluations of the four intervention models in the lowest-achieving schools to examine implementation and determine effects of the models, and coordinate and participate in intra-state and cross-state learning initiatives. While the state indicated that it intended to implement the required restructuring options, the number of points awarded in this section is due to the need for additional information that the state intends to apply the restructuring models according to the required parameters regarding EMOs and the number of schools permitted to use the turnaround model.

Total	50	44	44	

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	**10**	**9**	**9**	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	4	4	

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

In this section of the application, the state verified that the percentage of the total revenues available to the state 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 that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2008. In the application, the state reported that even with a deep fiscal crisis and a decline in revenue from FY 2008 to FY 2009, education funding as a percentage of state revenues increased from 46% to 47%. The Governor indicated his intent to protect education from further cuts, and to support K–16 education at the same General Fund level as in the prior fiscal year, despite an anticipated budget deficit of $20 billion.

The state reported that its funding policies are structured to guarantee equity between high need LEAs and other LEAs and referenced an analysis of state data completed by The Education Trust, that showed for the last year for which the analysis was completed, the State provided $599 more per pupil in funding for high-poverty LEAs than it provided for students in low poverty LEAs. In addition to funding policies, the state discussed a number of state laws that ensure equitable funding across LEAs. For example, the Serrano

Ruling and Proposition 13 dealt with the issue of wealth-related disparities in per-pupil expenditures that denied students in less wealthy LEAs a constitutional right to an equal education. As a result of the Serrano Ruling, the state passed legislation that established district-wide, per-pupil "revenue limits" for each LEA that would be equalized among all LEAs over time. And in a second example provided in the narrative, the state discussed the passage of Proposition 98 which guaranteed K–12 education and California Community Colleges a minimum level of funding.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	**40**	**34**	**35**	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	6	6	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8	8	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	7	7	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	7	7	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	6	7	[redacted]

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

(i)

California reported that it has operated charter schools since 1992, and since that time, the total number of charter schools has grown to 810, representing nearly 8 percent of the schools in the State. In absolute numbers, The state reported that it has the most charter schools and the largest number of charter students among all of the states with over 250,000 K–12 students attending one of the state's 323 elementary, 89 middle, 249 high school, and 149 K–12 charter schools. Additionally, the state reported that California was one of only three states to receive an "A" from the Center for Education Reform for the strength of its charter school laws, noting that the State has been able to establish the largest number of charter schools in the country. In this section of the application, the state provided data on the type and number of charter schools currently in operation: Conversion 122; Start-up 688; Traditional 226; Performing/Fine Arts 96; Technology 65; Science/Mathematics 35; Vocational 26; Montessori 21; Other Specialty 486; Site-based instruction 626; Independent study 152; Combination of site-based instruction and independent study 32. The state indicated that the diversity of charter school types in California stems directly from state law that supports charter schools. Additionally, the state discussed the fact that in 1998, California repealed its original statute that set a total cap of 100 charter schools in the state, and enacted a law that allows for continued growth in the number of charter schools. In the reenactment, the state authorized an increase in the total number of charter schools by an additional 100 charter schools (or approximately one percent of all schools in California) in each successive school year.

(ii)

California Education Code outlines the mechanisms for the approval, oversight, reauthorization, and revocation of charter schools and charter LEAs, and allows multiple methods to be used to request authority for a charter at the LEA and state levels. The Code provides appeal processes for denials at each level and permits charters to be granted for individual schools, for an entire LEA, an entire county, or for a "statewide benefit" charter school. Additionally, the state reported that California statutes provide explicit guidance to encourage the establishment of charter schools in areas that serve high-need students.

When a charter is granted, it is approved for an initial period of up to five years. Renewals are approved for a period of five years and are based on student achievement and academic quality criteria. Charter authorizers are required to provide ongoing oversight of the charter and conduct site visits and monitoring of the school's fiscal condition. Under California law, charter schools must meet all statewide academic standards and conduct all state mandated student assessments, in addition to the criteria identified in the individual charter.

In cases in which schools do not meet the statutory requirements, the charter is revoked. Reasons for revocation include failure to meet or pursue any of the student outcomes identified in the charter; violation of the charter's conditions, standards, or procedures; fiscal mismanagement; or violation of any provision of law, and a school's charter may be revoked by the SBE, whether or not the SBE is the chartering authority.

Charter schools applying for renewal must meet academic criteria that includes attaining an Academic Performance Index (API) growth target; attaining a state rank in deciles 4 to 10 on the API for a demographically comparable school in the prior year, or in two of the last three years; and ensuring that the performance of the charter school is at least equal to the academic performance of the public schools that the charter school students would otherwise attended. In addition, the school's performance must be at least equal to the academic performance of the schools in the LEA in which the charter school is located.

The state provided information on the numbers of charter schools started, renewed, and closed for each of the past five year, and indicated that while it does not currently maintain information on the total number of applications made for charter schools or the total number of new charter applications denied, the CDE has committed to tracking this information in the future.

(iii)

The state reports that general and categorical funding for public schools apply equally to the charter schools in California and a revenue analysis for LEAs for 2007–08 school found that the distribution of general and categorical fund is being implemented effectively to create equity in funding between public and charter schools.

(iv)

The current application states that California charter schools are eligible for assistance with facility rental and lease costs if they are located within the attendance area of a public elementary school in which at least 70 percent of the pupil enrollment is eligible for free or reduced price meals, **or** the charter school is serving a pupil population that meets or exceeds 70 percent eligibility for free and reduced price meals. In 2000, the state enacted Proposition 39, requiring public school facilities to be shared fairly among all public school students, including those in charter schools. The state reports that in 2009-2010, 120 charter schools were beneficiaries of Proposition 39, and an additional 116 charter schools were housed in district facilities not supported by Proposition 39. Charters also participate in state and federal programs covering facilities costs, and receive facility funding through the Charter School Facility Grant Program (SB 740) which provided a total of $23.6 million to 195 charter schools to support facility rental costs; Qualified School Construction Bonds (QSCB) which awarded $29.2 million to six charter schools, with a total of $73 million set-aside, in 2008-2009;State Charter School Facilities Program awarded $836 million to 58 charter schools serving 27,500 students; State Charter School Facility Incentive Grants Program which awarded $48 million to 128 charter schools serving 42,900 students; and the California Charter Building Fund which provided over $100 million to 13 charter schools between 2007 and 2009.

(v)

In the current application, the state acknowledges that its education rules and regulations stifle creativity, but indicates that steps have been taken to create a more flexible system. The State intends to expand current initiatives and provide greater innovation and flexibility in education code, categorical programs, and local budgeting. Examples of increased flexibility cited by the state allow LEAs to request a waiver of almost any section of the Education Code, allow locally elected school boards and superintendents greater flexibility to decide how to best use their funds to maximize student achievement, allow LEAs to conduct a local public hearing and use categorical program funds for any educational purpose, and allow the majority of resource decisions to take place at the school level.

The state reports that California law provides school districts with the ability to establish and maintain alternative schools and programs of choice and allow the schools and programs of choice to be operated in a manner to maximize the opportunity for improvement of the general school curriculum by innovative methods and ideas. Examples of alternative schools of choice provided by the state include Early College High Schools, Magnet Schools, Schools Without Walls, and Thematic Schools, Additionally, the state also

permits the operation of schools that offer a different educational philosophy or approach to learning, such as Montessori, Waldorf, or International Baccalaureate, a different instructional strategy, such as independent study, dual language immersion, or online learning, or specialized programs for targeted student populations, such as street academies and newcomer centers.

In this section of the application, the state verified that it has statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools, described the student achievement criteria that the school must meet, verified that charter schools serve student populations that are similar to local district student populations, especially relative to high-need students, and discussed the procedure and criteria for closing or not renewing ineffective charter schools. The number of points awarded in this section is due to the fact that the alternative programs and thematic schools, while many appear to be innovative, the narrative does not verify that they are permitted to operate autonomously.

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

During the Tier 2 presentation and responses to questions, members of the California team explained that in one district, innovative schools are given flexibility to design curriculum and operational elements. While the examples provided evidence of autonomous functioning, the team did not verify that the examples were common throughout the state or that state statute or policy provided a legal foundation for autonomy. Since the team provided evidence of existing autonomous schools, the number of points awarded to this section were increased.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	**5**	**4**	**4**	

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

In addition to the reforms discussed in the previous sections of this proposal, California reported that it has taken additional measures to build a foundation of reform. Examples of numerous reform efforts cited by the state include the Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) program, which focuses on closing the achievement gap by strengthening college readiness for all students, the California Partnership Academy (CPA) program which was designed to integrate a rigorous academic program with career technical education and provide students with the choice of multiple career paths upon graduation from school, and the state's initiative to Improve and Expand Early Childhood Education and Expanded Learning Opportunities by supporting a seamless transition from preschool to kindergarten.

Total	55	47	48	

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

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

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Throughout the application, the state described its plan to offer a rigorous course of study in mathematics, science, technology, and engineering and to cooperate with industry experts and community partners to prepare and assist teachers in integrating STEM content across grades and disciplines. Additionally the state plans to address the needs of underrepresented groups and of women and girls in the areas of science, technology, engineering,and mathematics.

California proposes to use rigorous science and math standards to ensure that all California students will experience classroom STEM learning that is integrated, interdisciplinary, and college and career relevant. The state proposes to use four principles to guide the work and connect advancements in STEM to broad-based school improvement. In the first principle, the state believes that STEM curriculum and instruction

must be aligned with the state's core academic standards and promote the mastery of challenging, relevant math and science content. The state's second principle states that STEM curriculum and instruction must engage students who are underrepresented in STEM careers by providing them with opportunities to experience, understand, and address real-world problems. The third principle states that STEM learning experiences should contribute systematically and cumulatively to providing students with a range of pathways to college or career success. The fourth and final principle states that STEM should serve to build strong, lasting partnerships between schools and community based organizations that can expand student access. The state plans to use these principles to guide the implementation of a three-part plan to advance STEM in California: 1) Strengthen the design and delivery of STEM in California's high schools; 2) Map backward into K-8 and build a strong STEM foundation emphasizing authentic application and career exploration; and 3) Build support systems and infrastructure by supporting STEM-related investments that will help expand high-quality STEM teaching and learning.

Total	15	15	15	

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

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

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state's application addresses all of the four education reform areas specified in ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria. The state and its participating LEAs propose a systemic approach to education reform and while the number of participating LEAs is less than 20% of the LEAs in the state, the state indicates that the LEAs represent a large number of students. Participating LEAs are required to implement the entire reform agenda and the state identified seven Leadership LEAs to guide the implementation of the proposed reforms. In the plan, the state described goals, strategies and activities to implement and achieve the reform initiatives and describes how the state, in collaboration with its participating LEAs, will use RttT 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.

Total		0	0	

Grand Total	500	394	403	

Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 2

California Application #2200CA-5

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	**65**	**36**	**36**	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	23	23	
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	8	8	

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

California has a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that reflects well the four education areas specified in ARRA. The budget is aligned with application goals and over 80% of it is dedicated to participating LEAs. The school reform plan is specific and detailed, goal driven, and full of innovative and interesting ideas. It is largely the work of seven leading superintendents. The state has decided to take a unique approach in building LEA commitment by enlisting the expertise and commitment of these leaders to essentially plan and implement its RTTT application. This innovative approach taps into practitioner wisdom and knowledge and creates buy-in by making those involved ultimately responsible for what happens.

302 out of 1729 LEAS representing 1,733,458 out of 6,252,031 students have signed MOUs. The MOU is exemplary in that it is very detailed and clearly articulates the scope of work involved with accepting RTTT funds. One clause, however is problematic:

Nothing in this MOU shall be construed to alter or otherwise affect the rights, remedies, and procedures afforded school or school district employees under Federal, State, or local laws (including applicable regulations or courts orders) or under terms of collective bargaining agreements, MOU, or other agreements between such employees and their employers.

This appears to mean is that in most cases MOUs are still subject to collective bargaining. An apparent commitment may in reality not be a binding commitment. Furthermore, only 41 out of 302 or 33% of teacher union leaders signed MOUs. A deeper reading of the application also indicates that only two of the seven leading superintendents were able to attain union signatures in their own districts (Fresno & Sanger). The superintendents, however, describe the positive working relationships with their teacher associations and feel confident that through dialogue and negotiation, agreements will be reached to fully implement RTTT as specified in what the MOU refers to as the preliminary scope of work.

These districts represent large numbers of students of color and poverty and a critical mass of California's Big City School Districts with San Francisco, Los Angeles, Fresno, and Long beach represented. The application also has broad based political, community, business and higher education support.

The state leadership team has chosen to work with its most reform minded districts and create a template for subsequent state-wide adoption. Breadth was sacrificed for depth and commitment. The state will translate LEA participation into statewide impact by: translating school success into "proof points" for best practices to be adopted by other LEAs; use research and collaboration to disseminate information regarding the success of reform efforts; and use the results of RTTT reforms to drive legislative changes which will change laws and regulations impacting all students statewide. Yet, only a third of the participating LEAs MOUs have clear teacher union support and signatures, making statewide impact in the future uncertain.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	**30**	**27**	**27**	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	20	20	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	7	7	

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

The state has clearly developed a very comprehensive and thoughtful organizational structure to ensure its capacity to implement its RTTT application. The RTTT Implementation Team and Oversight Structure is an independent organization solely responsible for implementing RTTT. It will be able to focus exclusively on RTTT implementation, evaluation, and dissemination free from competing interests or distractions found in typical educational organizations. The implementation team is led by leading superintendents who have the capacity and knowledge to manage the change process.

The state will use a combination of federal, state, and LEA funds, along with strategic investments from private foundations to support implementation. To the extent possible RTTT funds will be used to support one time infrastructure costs, such as adopting new standards, assessments, and instructional materials, and the development of new models for teacher and principal evaluation. Because the implementation team will be a 501(c)(3) non profit organization, it will be capable of accepting donations, grants, and other funding to ensure sustainability beyond the grant period. Significant philanthropic support by private foundations has been secured.

Stakeholder support within the political, business, educational administration, and higher education communities appears to be very strong. Within participating LEAs, school board and superintendent support appears to be strong. Union support is another matter. Rather than try and enlist the support all LEAs and watering down the MOU, the leadership team chose to work with reform minded districts. Within these districts, though, new agreements will need to be made especially around teacher and principal evaluation. California, however, has recently passed legislation (SBX5 1) to remove barriers to critical components of the RTTT plan, including its proposed teacher evaluation system.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	**30**	**17**	**17**	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4	4	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	13	13	

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

The state has clearly made progress in each of the four education reform areas as defined by ARRA. California is a pioneer in adopting quality content standards, curriculum frameworks, and instructional materials. Its primary assessment tool is the Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program. Both its current standards and assessment systems date back to 1997. The state is also a leader in developing a college readiness assessment given to juniors in participating school districts. Its investment in a longitudinal data system appears to be less robust. It appears that at the time of this application, the state had only implemented 5 of the 12 America COMPETES Act's elements. The state has earned a reputation for high quality professional standards and programs for teachers and principals. Preparation programs are standards based and there appears to be a number alternative routes for practitioner preparation. The state has invested in several school improvement programs to turn around its lowest achieving schools. Of note is the creation of school assistance and intervention teams whose results to this point have been limited.

According to the California Standards Test (CST) student achievement has steadily improved with high numbers of students in all sub groups except ELL scoring at the basic (state defined) or above level. There also appears to be a significant closing of the achievement gap across sub groups of students. NAEP data on the other hand is difficult to interpret because of a state created index. The state does not make it clear how its NAEP scores actually compare to national averages. NAEP scores clearly indicate only slight improvement in the closing of Achievement gaps. High school graduation rates declined between 2004 and 2005 when a state mandated exit exam was introduced. Since 2006 graduation rates have risen only 1.4%. The application does not offer comprehensive data on yearly graduation rates.

Total	125	80	80	

B. Standards and Assessments

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

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

California is clearly a national leader in the area of standards. The state is a member of the Common Core Standards consortium comprised of 48 states, DC, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. It plans to adopt the standards by August 2, 2010.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	**10**	**10**	**10**	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5	5	
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5	5	

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

California has committed to participate In an assessment consortium, the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career Consortium. 26 states are involved.

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

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

The state has a very clear and tightly linked six year transition plan to move toward enhanced standards and a assessments. Participating LEAs have agreed in their MOUs to allot common planning time in all schools by grade level or subject area, enabling quality common assessment data analysis to inform instruction.

After the standards are adopted (2010), aligned curriculum frameworks and instructional materials be will begin an adoption and developed process (2012). Professional development on the new standards and frameworks will begin in 2012. Finally the state Board of Education will begin the formal adoption process of instructional materials between 2012-2014. The California Department of Education will draw on the expertise of the Curriculum Development and Supplemental Materials Commission composed of teachers educators, and content experts. The Curriculum Framework and Evaluation Criteria Committees for math and reading will also meet to help with the revision of curriculum frameworks.

Assessment plans include developing and implementing summative, interim, and formative assessments while working with other state partners. Specific plans include building an online data bank that LEAs can draw from to build interim and formative assessments. The state also plans to build the local capacity of LEAs through professional development. Training modules will be hosted on the California Education Data Portal so that materials are accessible to all California LEAs. Working with publishers the state plans to develop a reading passage bank and interim assessments. Finally the state will revise its overall accountability system to reflect the new standards and assessments. The state's plan for supporting its transition to enhanced standards and high quality assessments is very comprehensive, reflects clear targets, and appears to be achievable.

Total	70	70	70	

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	**24**	**10**	**10**	

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

It appears that 5 of the 12 America COMPETES Act elements are currently in place. The state plans full implementation of the elements by 2012. Implementation status is not clear from the application narrative, however appendix C1.II provides a clearer picture.

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	**5**	**4**	**4**	

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

California appears to have a clear plan to ensure that data from its Statewide Longitudinal Data System is accessible and useful to practitioners. Goals are clear and make sense.

What's missing is an assessment of the here and now. The gap between current practice and and were the state would like to be ideally is not described.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	**18**	**16**	**16**	
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	5	5	
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	5	5	
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	6	6	

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

California will primarily focus on the development of its statewide data portal and on the professional development activities needed for practitioners to access and use it. The portal has five elements: data dashboards; data reports; data tables and graphics; datasets; and best practice resources. The portal appears to be nicely organized and practitioner friendly. It will be fully developed by 2013. It is intended to be used by students, parents, teachers school leaders, LEA leaders, governing agencies, community members, policy makers and education researchers. Clear goals and targets have been established with a strong concern about learning from stakeholder feedback to ensure that the portal meets the actual needs of its stakeholders in real time. The state has several interesting means to ensure that the portal is used well. Such ideas include: the development of a statewide data coach trainer program; the creation of a governance structure to monitor data quality and use; and the utilization of professional learning communities to make work with data come alive at the local level. Much of the discussion is focused at the state rather than the local level. The application, however, does mention that each participating LEA will replicate the dashboard infrastructure and feed data to the statewide system. Baseline information on the current status and use of local LEA data systems is missing.

Total	47	30	30	

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	**21**	**9**	**9**	
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	5	5	
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	1	1	
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	3	3	

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

California has the legal, statutory, and regulatory provisions to allow for alternative routes to certification beyond higher education for both teachers and principals. A variety of providers including school districts, county offices of education and programs such as Teach for America and the New Teacher Project are possible. Selection criteria for school district or county offices of education are not rigorous. Also there are a number of LEA and IHE partnerships or "hybrid programs" that look promising. Completion data for

teachers is quite good, but administrative data is not provided. Interestingly, administrative certification candidates may in fact test out of specific credential requirements and it appears that a significant number of candidates take advantage of this opportunity. Yet, as the application itself points out, the "vast majority of candidates still receive their credentials through traditional programs." Alternative pathways, especially those independent of higher education, are possible, but appear to be insignificant in numbers or emerging at best.

The state uses data in partnership with the Center for Future Teaching and Learning and EdSource to assess demographic information about teaching and principal shortages. Such data has led to a significant decrease in the number of under prepared teachers working in the lowest performing schools. The California Department of Education and the Commission of Teacher Credentialing track complimentary information about the current and incoming supply of teachers, focusing specifically on shortage fields and specialty areas. IEHs have joined to develop programs to meet these needs. One concern is that there is no discussion about the equitable staffing in urban and rural schools. Additionally, there is virtually no discussion or data shedding light on the areas of principal shortages, distributions, and needs.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**47**	**47**	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	3	3	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	15	15	
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	8	8	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	21	21	

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

The RTTT implementation team will identify a student growth model by August 2011. Final strategy selection will be determined by each participating LEA. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) composed of researchers and experts on student outcome measurements will provide advice and expertise. TAC will define strategies for linking student growth data to individual teacher data. The goal is to develop and implement teacher and principal evaluation based on multiple measures evaluation (MME), including a significant part - no less than 30% - on growth in student achievement and success in closing achievement gaps. The state has clear plans but a long way to go. Furthermore, with each district selecting its own strategy for measuring student growth the probability of consistent implementation is questionable.

The evaluation system will be based on professional standards, involve multiple measures or data sources (e.g. principal observation, peer observation, student outcome data, parent and student surveys, self evaluation, etc.) and will be developed in collaboration with LEAs. Rubrics and protocols will also be developed with at least four levels of effectiveness to be assessed. Implementation will be rolled out over a three year period with a goal of 100% implementation by the 2013-14 school year. The evaluation system design is very clear and compelling. Furthermore, the MOU offers a detailed and sequenced plan of action for participating LEAs.

With the development of the LEA MME framework 100% of principals and teachers in participating LEAs will be evaluated annually beginning in the 2013-14 school year. The discussion in this section is rich and offers informative research based information about how traditional teacher evaluation systems are ritualistic and meaningless for most teachers. One flaw, however is that there is very little if any discussion about how principals will be evaluated. For the most part, the discussion is focused on teachers.

The application clearly describes how use of new evaluations will influence future decision making. For example, the state will build on the success of its Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment program by incorporating the MME System to provide additional feedback to new teachers. Support and assistance will be given to ineffective teachers and principals over a two year period. Peer assistance and coaching models will be used. Teachers identified as effective will be considered for promotion to leadership positions such as data coach and staff developer. Principals will only be considered for transfer to high needs schools if they receive an effective evaluation. Site based alternative compensation will be considered so that teachers may receive stipends for materials and supplies and professional development opportunities. Tenure will also be influenced by negative and positive evaluations. Principals who do not improve over a two year period will be removed from their positions. The application, however, appears to force fit ideas and recommendations regarding principals into the discussion. The focus is clearly on teacher evaluation, not principal evaluation.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	**25**	**13**	**13**	
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	8	8	
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	5	5	

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

The state plans to move from tracking the equitable distribution of teachers based on inputs such as credentials to a system that focuses on outputs linked to teacher effectiveness. Recent changes in state law allow districts to consider performance ratings when making reduction in force decisions. However, the application mentions that considerable work needs to done to enure the equitable distribution of leaders and that this is particularly true in succession in leadership in low performing schools. The state has set a goal that high poverty and low performing schools will have teacher retention rates greater than other schools with their district.

The state also proposes an Initiative to Recruit/Retain Teachers and Leaders in High poverty, High-minority Schools. Incentives will include monetary stipends, improved working conditions, and an extended work day for greater teacher and leader support. Annual working conditions and exit surveys will be also be implemented. Plans are in place to remove entrenched ineffective teachers after a two year improvement intervention. Schools performing in the lowest 5% will ensure that open positions are filled with teachers that have demonstrated effectiveness in the classroom. The application goes on to offer positive examples of such programs and interventions within its seven leading school districts. The state also commits to placing only effective principals in its lowest achieving schools by offering a variety of incentives that may include local control of hiring and budgets.

These plans are encouraging but developed at a very general level. Will they be achievable with each LEA negotiating its own plans for the equitable distribution of teachers and principals? The equitable distribution of teachers and principals is dependent on the establishment of the MME evaluation system and that won't be fully implemented until 2015. Furthermore, each participating LEA's evaluation system may be considerably different, which makes consistent definitions of teacher and principal effectiveness challenging to define.

Plans regarding the equitable distribution of effective teachers teaching hard to staff subjects and speciality areas are very general. LEAs are responsible for developing such

plans. Incentives may include tuition assistance, professional development, common planning time, and PLCs. Working with IHEs, LEAs will create programs to build a pool of STEM teachers. Currently the California State University system is the largest developer of math and science teachers and has dramatically improved the numbers of math and science teachers it licenses each year. Elementary students in the state receive little if any science instruction and the state university system has initiated a Foundational Level General Science credential. Special education is another area of concern and the state will explore options to reduce barriers into special by integrating special education into general education training programs. The application seems to spin out ideas and examples of what could be done rather than offer concrete action plans to be implemented.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	**14**	**14**	**14**	
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	7	7	
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	7	7	

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

The state has a very clear and tightly linked 3 year plan to link student data to credentialing organizations and publicly report its findings. California has several pilot studies in process that focus on the linkages between preparation programs and effectiveness in the workplace. With RTTT funds it will expand these pilot studies into all preparation programs. Furthermore, an MOU signed by the universities clearly calls for the state and IHEs to partner with all participating LEAs to link individual teacher and principal data to each teacher's or principal's primary school of preparation by the fall of 2011. This data will be publicly accessible by spring 2013.

The state will use teacher and leader assessment results to inform decisions about preparation and credentialing options and programs. IHEs have agreed to work with the state to expand capacity in those preparation programs that the data demonstrates are successful at producing effective teachers and principals.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	**20**	**10**	**10**	
(i) Providing effective support	10	7	7	
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	3	3	

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

Support will be derived from the MME evaluation system. With accurate and rich data focused on student growth, clearer professional development plans will emerge in each participating LEA. The professional development system will also be informed by professional standards for both teachers and principals. PLCs will be at the heart of teacher professional development. California also provide an induction program for new teachers.

Administrator training and professional development has not matched teacher professional development. The state does provide up to $3,000 at the second level of administrator licensure for principals to cover training from State Board of Education approved providers. There are a variety of other interesting opportunities for administrators at various programs and locations throughout the state, but little in terms of systematic and comprehensive development and support.

The RTTT implementation team, the Leadership LEAs, and other participating LEAs will continuously share data on the effectiveness of professional development. Also the state has created a simple yet useful professional development evaluation framework to track and examine the effectiveness of professional development. This section (ii) of the application is on the thin side and needs further elaboration and development. The professional development plan is neither comprehensive nor well developed.

Total	138	93	93	

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

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

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

The state has the legal authority to intervene in its lowest achieving schools and LEAs that are in improvement or corrective status. The state has a 10 year history of such interventions and has come to the conclusion, especially in a state as large as California, that LEAs must take the lead in turning around these schools. The states approach is in to work in more of of a partnership or coaching mode with its struggling schools and LEAs. By setting clear targets, providing a rich variety of resources, and holding identified schools and systems accountable, the state is ready to take its intervention initiatives to new levels.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	**40**	**35**	**35**	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	30	30	

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

The state clearly has the ability to identify its lowest performing schools. First, it identifies Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring (n=2735) as well as secondary schools that are eligible but do not receive Title I funds (n=1022). Then it identifies the lowest 5% of these schools (n=187) by calculating average three year performance rates for English-Language Arts and Mathematics (2006-09). 78 low performing schools have been identified in the participating LEAs featured in this application.

The state has experimented with at least six different approaches in turning around its lowest performing schools with mixed results ranging from negligible to average improvement. The 78 lowest performing schools identified in this application will be required to adopt one of the four intervention models specified in this application. The application does not elaborate on or describe which of the four intervention models should be used. Rather it leaves it up to its LEAs to make these decisions on a school by school basis.

California has significant expertise, experience, and creative ideas about turning around its lowest performing schools. Its plans make great sense, but achieving them and bringing them to scale will be the real test.

Total	50	45	45	

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	**10**	**8**	**8**	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	3	3	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	5	5	

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

The percentage of total revenues available to support education remained substantially unchanged. The actual percentage of revenues increased from 46% - 47%, but total education funding took close a 20% cut.

California policies clearly lead to equitable funding of its public schools. As mentioned in the application, the well known Serano Priest decision of 1971 led to the establishment of per pupil revenue limits for each LEA in the state. Over the years this in effect has led to the states equalization of funding. California also provide numerous categorical programs to meet the needs of its neediest students.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	**40**	**39**	**39**	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8	8	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8	8	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8	8	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	8	8	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	7	7	

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

California has an extremely supportive and accountably driven environment for charter schools. In 2009-10, a total of 1350 charter schools were authorized to operate. There are 10,225 school in California and the number of authorized charters exceeds 10% of the total number of schools. This represents a high cap state.

Charter schools must meet all statewide academic standards and conduct all state mandated assessments, in addition to the criteria specified in their charter. Furthermore, a charter may be revoked by the SBE, whether or not the SBE is the chartering agency. Each year approximately 90 new charter are approved and 30 charter schools are closed or not unauthorized to operate. State guidelines allow for the creation of 100 new charter schools each year and if that figure is not reached, unused slots may be carried over to the following year.

Charter schools appear to be funded at levels comparable to general education schools. The state is also very generous and creative in helping charter schools fund and find appropriate facilities. For example, California's Charter School Grant Program requires funding at the highest level to charter schools opening up in the attendance area of low performing schools. Furthermore, if a charter school opens up within the attendance area

of a school in which 70% of its students qualify for free or reduced lunch, the funding for facilities would be equal to the total funding available to traditional schools within the attendance area. In addition to charter schools the state appears to be very supportive of innovative, autonomous schools such as Early College High Schools, Magnate Schools, Schools without Walls, Curriculum based Thematic Schools, Philosophically Distinctive Schools, etc. Clearly there is a great deal of innovation and experimentation happening in California. The application, however, does not indicate how autonomous these schools are.

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

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

California has a number of other significant reform conditions that have increased student achievement and raised high school graduation rates. Notably the Advancement VIA Individual Determination (AVID) program has had a huge effect on the achievement of high school students of color and those living in poverty. Also of note are the 500 or so California Partnership Academies (CPA) that merge academic learning with career technical education and fieldwork opportunities in STEM related areas and career pathways. Another significant trend is the increased opportunity for parents and community people to be involved in the improvement of their schools.

Total	55	52	52	

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

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

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

STEM discussion is integrated into the entire application. STEM discussion is nicely summarized in the application's conclusion. The summary is also clearly linked back to the exact areas in which it first appeared in the application. All STEM criteria are covered in the application.

Total	15	15	15	

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

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

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

California's application comprehensively and coherently addresses all of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA. Its approach is unique in that seven leading and practicing superintendents and 302 reform minded LEAs will build on their strengths and commitment to make school reform happen. Representing about a third of California's LEAs and schools with a critical mass of big city school districts, they believe that they can lead the way in their own systems and influence the state as a whole. Given California's huge size this approach makes sense. Rather than building

commitment by watering down expectations they have chosen to band together and fully implement the ideas embedded in RTTT.

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

The California team presentation validated and confirmed the initial assessment of this application. While its reform plan is innovative, the requisite level of commitment and voice from teacher groups has yet to emerge. The presentation was clear and informative, but during the Q & A period, the team appeared to speak and offer individual examples from their particular school districts rather than speak as a statewide group with a clear unity of purpose. The state plan has promise and is emerging, but is not quite there.

Total		0	0	

Grand Total	500	385	385	

Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 2

California Application #2200CA-7

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	**65**	**49**	**55**	
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5	5	
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	34	40	[redacted]
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	10	10	

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

(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda

California's application is both comprehensive and coherent. It starts with their Theory of Change:

"Great teachers and leaders with supportive and aligned systems and targeted and focused accountability systems will lead to students achieving at high levels and prepared for college or careers."

Tackling each of these emphases, the state outlines a clear set of objectives, with details describing the work behind the headings.

The application was built by turning to a group of 7 strong Leadership LEAs (urban and rural) to develop a reform plan that would be credible to other LEAs. However, rather than trying to create a plan that would appeal to the lowest common denominator, the Leadership LEAs, each of whom have records of strength in a variety of reform efforts, have developed a plan that challenges other LEAs to step up.

The MOU and attached Scope of Work were created with the Participating LEAs, Leadership LEAs and the Governor's Office of the Secretary of Education, California Department of Education, and the State Board of Education. The Scope of Work is incredibly explicit, and since it was developed and agreed to by superintendents who will be responsible for its execution, its implementation seems credible.

The expectations are clear in the scope of work, as are the parties responsible, and the timelines for implementation.

This plan is clear, well articulated, detailed and comprehensive, and therefore full points are awarded.

(ii) Securing LEA commitment

302 out of 1,729 possible LEAs have signed MOUs committing to action in all of the reform areas. Of participating LEAs, 91% have signatures of school board presidents and 31% have signatures from union leaders.

302 LEAs represents about 17% of LEAs, and about 36% of students living in poverty. It also includes Los Angeles, Sacramento City, Long Beach, Fresno—some of the state's largest or most challenging districts.

That said, the MOU/Scope of Work is very specific and demanding, and expectations are spelled out in stark detail. Any LEA signing on to this all-or-nothing MOU (there was no leeway to opt out of individual strategies) knows precisely the kind of challenging work they are agreeing to. Signing up in spite of this (or perhaps because of it), 302 LEAS have shown their strong commitment to the plans and have entered into binding agreements.

These 302 LEAs represent 1.7 million students—1.1 million of whom live in poverty. These numbers are larger than the entire number of students in all but 6 states.

That said, with so little union support, even from the lead districts, suggest concerns about broad commitment.

For this reason, this section is awarded high points.

(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact

68% of the students served by the participating LEAs living in poverty (36% of the state total). Participating LEAs include over 167,000 African-American students (37% of the state total), and over 1,000,000 Hispanic students (34% of the state total). Additionally, the 302 LEAs account for 961 Program Improvement (PI) schools (35% of all PI schools in the state of California).

CA has baseline and target scores mapped out for student achievement in reading and math, for all subgroups, as well as increased graduation rates and college attendance rates.

Their plan to reach across the state is to encourage the success of the reforms in the LEAs as proof that these reforms work, use research and collaboration to disseminate information to non-participating LEAs; and use the results of the reforms, together with recommendations by a Blue Ribbon Panel to drive legislative changes.

California expects broad impact beyond the four years of the RTTT grant because they are focused on implementing reforms in LEAs that are 100% committed to change and to sharing and scaling their success. They plan to invest heavily in research to study what works and what doesn't.

Even though the percentage of participating LEAs is small, the numbers of students it represents is significant. The state acknowledges that they have work to do to reach non-participating districts and the plan seems plausible. For these reasons, this section is awarded medium points.

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

(ii) Reviewers asked questions about LEA commitment, in particular about union support, and the state answered with details about continuing efforts to involve unions, including weekly efforts in Los Angeles to meet with bargaining units, including the presidents and union staff in all reform plans, listening to teachers and unions and working to address their concerns about evaluation and differential pay and including teacher voice on turnarounds. The superintendents on the panel expressed enthusiasm and commitment to continue working with unions, and the satisfaction for both sides when breakthroughs are reached. The state said teachers are motivated to include multiple measures in evaluations because if not, it will boil down to being measured by one test, which is preferable to no one. LEAs where unions have not signed on are confident that given a year to work on these issues with their unions, they'll be able to get them there. The funds are a major motivating factor.

With this explanation, more points are awarded to reflect the efforts underway that will induce broad commitment.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	**30**	**25**	**25**	
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	20	20	
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	5	5	

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

(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement

To implement the reforms, CA has created a non profit 501(c)3, The RttT Implementation Team, reporting to the Department of Education, State Board of Education, and the State Secretary of Education for fiscal and programmatic results, but governed by an independent board of directors. They believe this set up will allow for focus since this organization will only be tasked with implementing RTTT. The Board will have 17 members, 7 of whom will be the superintendents from the Leadership LEAs. Others include chancellors and presidents of California colleges and community colleges, charter schools, state superintendent, president of the CA NAACP, foundations and Ed Trust West.

Structure of the Implementation Team is carefully laid out and includes a workplan and timeline of activities.

Their intention is to use RTTT funds to develop and test models across the four reform areas, and re-direct ongoing funding to support the implementation of effective strategies.

In addition, they approached and obtained the support of all gubernatorial candidates, ensuring support of the RTTT plans no matter who leads the state.

For this section, they are awarded high points.

(ii) Using broad stakeholder support

CA plans to engage stakeholders at both the State and LEA levels, which will involve teachers, school administrators, political leaders, institutions of higher education, private foundations, research organizations, and other assistance organizations.

Some Leadership LEA unions have already signed on (i.e. Fresno and Sanger School Districts). Los Angeles just concluded a six-month Task Force that focused on evaluation, tenure, differentiated compensation, support mechanisms, and legislative changes. This Task Force included labor partners, parent and community representatives, private sector leaders, and higher education partners, as well as LEA leaders, teachers, and administrators. The Task Force will continue to discuss many of the implementation items identified in this application. The United Teachers of Los Angeles (UTLA) has indicated in writing their support for continuing this discussion. Other unions, including the United Educators of San Francisco, have provided letters indicating their willingness to be at the table and seek high-quality implementation of the programs described by this proposal. In Clovis, a union does not represent teachers; however, their faculty senate has provided a letter of support.

Other LEAs express confidence that they will be able to develop evaluations with the cooperation of their local unions, due in part to recent legislative action (SBX5 1) to remove barriers to critical components of the RttT plan, including the proposed teacher evaluation system.

The application mentions support from over 200 groups, and includes a sample of letters from elected officials, business groups, charter school association, universities, researchers and minority groups. They don't, however, include any of the referenced union support/interest letters.

CA has done a lot to build formal structures of support to lead the application and implementation efforts, though union support is fairly weak at this stage. For this reason, this section is awarded medium points.

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

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	**30**	**23**	**23**	
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5	5	
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	18	18	

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

(i) Making progress in each reform area

For over a decade, CA has been working on issues that have made progress in each of the 4 reform areas.

High standards. Beginning in the late 1990s, California adopted standards in English-Language Arts, mathematics, history–social science, science, English language development, visual and performing arts, physical education and career technical education, and health education.

State standards are enacted in classrooms through curriculum frameworks that guide the adoption of instructional materials. CA uses multiple assessment measures in their Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) program, also created in the late 1990s to provide annual assessments of academic achievement in core content areas in grades 2-11.

Data systems to inform improvement efforts Public access to multiple data reports. California has a system for making data about students, schools, and achievement measures publicly available. It includes information on student and staff demographics; revenue and expenditure information for all LEAs; annual student achievement testing data for each school and LEA; the California High School Exit Exam and the California English Language Development Test.

Strong systems of support for teachers and leaders

CA has a comprehensive set of professional standards for teachers and leaders as well as preparation programs, has alternative routes to certification, and a large induction program.

Supports to turn around struggling schools

The State has invested in several different programs to support school turnaround efforts since the passage of the Public Schools Accountability Act in 1999 with mixed success.

The state has a long history of work and making progress in the 4 reform areas.

(ii) Improving student outcomes

California students have made consistent gains on state tests for English- Language Arts with slight narrowing of achievement gaps.

California's student achievement has improved steadily on both the 4th and 8th grade NAEP assessments since 2003.

California's 4th grade NAEP performance in reading and in mathematics has improved across all students and all subgroups.

- *Grade 4 NAEP Reading*: The percentage scoring at or above the Basic Achievement Level for Reading has increased from 50 percent in 2003 to 54 percent in 2009.
- *Grade 4 NAEP Mathematics*: The percentage scoring at or above the Basic Achievement Level for mathematics has increased from 67 percent in 2003 to 72 percent in 2009.
- *Grade 8 NAEP Reading*: The percentage scoring at or above the Basic Achievement Level for Reading has increased from 61 percent in 2003 to 64 percent in 2009.
- *Grade 8 NAEP Mathematics*: The percentage scoring at or above the Basic Achievement Level for mathematics has increased from 56 percent in 2003 to 59 percent in 2009.

In all grades, the gaps between White and Black and Hispanic students narrowed by 1-4 percentage points, however the gaps remain significant. For example, on the 2009 Grade 8 Math NAEP, White students scored 78%, Black students 40%, and Hispanic students 45%.

Similar, though more aggressive, progress was made on the CST as well.

Graduation rates have increased by 1.4 percentage points since 2006, when the California Department of Education's methodology changed to using student- level enrollment and exit data to calculate graduation rates. Drop-out rates in California have been decreasing, and African American, American Indian, Hispanic/Latino, and Pacific Islander drop-out rates have all decreased at a greater rate than the overall decrease in drop-outs.

Test scores still have room for improvement, and the achievement gaps are still significant, but because the state is increasing performance of all groups and narrowing gaps in all grades and subjects tested, has increased graduation and decreased dropouts, they are awarded high points for this section.

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

Total	125	97	103	

B. Standards and Assessments

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

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

(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards

In May 2009, CA joined 48 other states and territories to join the Common Core Standards Initiative. They include a copy of the standards in their application. For this section, they are awarded full points, 20.

(ii) Adopting standards

California enacted legislation in January 2010 authorizing the adoption process of common core standards, with a goal of adoption by August 2, 2010. The State intends to submit evidence of adoption on or before that date.

The Academic Standards Commission is charged with presenting its recommendations for new standards to the SBE for its action by July 15, 2010. The SBE will either adopt or reject these standards by August 2, 2010, and the State Superintendent will present to the Governor and Legislature a schedule and plan for integrating the new standards into the State's education system. Full points are awarded.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	**10**	**10**	**10**	
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5	5	
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5	5	

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

(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments, (ii) Including a significant number of States

California has committed to participation in a consortium through a non-binding MOU, with the expectation that details will be further defined as assessment proposals are crafted. The consortia is called the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Career Consortium. To date, 26 states have committed to participate in this multi-state consortium to develop high-quality summative assessments. For working toward high quality assessments with a majority of other states, this section warrants full points.

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

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

The state has a history of having developed high quality standards in the late 1990s, earning high marks when compared to other states. They also were leaders in linking school standards to postsecondary education and employment. They have experience in implementing standards statewide using high quality curriculum frameworks, instructional materials, and State statutes and regulations to ensure a transparent process and public participation.

They will use their past transition methods to roll out the new standards. They have also written important elements into the LEA MOUs: common planning time to consider data and instructional practices, interim and summative assessments, targeted professional development, and expanded STEM options in all schools.

They plan a realistic 6-year phase in. The state will:

- Use focus groups and other LEA input to develop new curriculum frameworks tied to new standards,
- Adopt instructional materials based on successful processes already in use,
- Revise the summative assessment system while waiting for the new system from the consortia,
- Build a statewide online assessment item bank that LEAs can draw from to build interim and formative assessments,
- Revise the accountability system to reflect new standards and assessments
- Improve the timeliness, relevancy, and usefulness of the current test results provided to LEAs through a contract with a vendor established by the CDE

This is a very thorough, well-planned proposal to thoughtfully roll out standards across the state. Having implemented standards before, CA is well situated to do it again. For this section, high points are awarded.

Total	70	70	70	

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	**24**	**10**	**10**	

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

1.Unique student ID number – yes

2. Student demographic, enrollment and program participation information – yes
3. Student transition information P-16 – yes
4. Capacity to communication to higher ed data systems --no
5. Audit system to ensure data quality – no
6. Yearly test records for assessment required under the ESEA – yes
7. Information on students not tested by grade and subject – yes
8. Teacher identifier to match teachers to students –no
9. Student level transcripts containing courses and grades – no
10. Student scores on college readiness tests – no
11. Transition data from secondary to higher ed – no
12. Data on the alignment and adequacy of student preparation for post secondary education – no

Total= 5 yes, 7 no

The application reports 11 of 12 elements, however some are not fully in place, so 10 points are awarded.

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

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

California plans to develop a data portal to offer dashboards and reports that would be accessible for use by all, including students, parents, teachers, school leaders, LEA leaders, policy makers, and educational researchers.

To get there, they plan to:

- Develop a data governance structure to monitor data quality, ownership, business processes, accountability for quality, and processes for data access;
- Ensure that the data elements in the statewide longitudinal system reflect the needs of stakeholders;
- Ensure that the State's data system is fully accessible, and
- Use accountability targets in a comprehensive data dashboard with multiple stakeholder views to provide angles on student achievement and to identify areas for stakeholder engagement.

The RttT Implementation Team will establish a data governance team, the Data Systems Steering Committee (DSSC). The nine members of the DSSC will include experts on data systems, instruction, assessment, and e- learning representing Leadership LEAs, CDE, and practitioners.

To collect high quality data, CA will provide professional development for system users to make sure data is input correctly and used effectively. The Committee will oversee the development of the statewide data coach trainer program and the best practices resource tool.

The proposed data portal will be a rich, real time, tool for anyone seeking data on CA schools. Beyond the America COMPETES elements, CA will add data that is valuable to LEAs, including student and teacher absences, career technical education (CTE) and multiple pathways information, University of California

college preparatory requirements ("A to G requirements"), "on track" status for graduation for 9th-12th graders, students with at least 1 grade of D or F in a reporting period, and/or student ACT/SAT scores. Many of these elements are a step beyond what is currently reported and what RTTT is asking for and would be valuable to other states to model. The accountability target dashboards will provide important formative assessments on how the reforms are doing from LEA to LEA and from classroom to classroom.

California has proposed a sophisticated but user-friendly system of providing data to anyone who is interested. Being able to track students, teachers, schools and outcomes on so many fronts will give policy makers a detailed picture of what is working and what isn't, which is critical for decision making. For this section, CA gets full marks.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	**18**	**15**	**15**	
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	6	6	
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	6	6	
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	3	3	

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

(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems

To ensure that data is fully utilized to improve instruction, CA proposes 5 strategies that will increase use of data. They will:

1. Provide professional learning through data coaches, a centralized training and support system, and professional learning communities to enhance the use of data to drive instructional improvement;

2. Develop a common system for interim assessments linked to the content standards, and reported in State and LEA dashboards and information systems;

3. Integrate a best practices resource area into the portal that connects outcome findings to instructional resources, materials, and best practice strategies;

4. Incorporate school dashboards into the school's data analysis efforts for CA's Single Plan for Student Achievement requirement; and

5. Use data systems to coordinate and individualize instruction for each student through e-portfolios that demonstrate student achievement and academic interventions that target individual needs.

The application provides an incredible amount of detail explaining how they have thought this through and how they plan to proceed. The plans seem reasonable, and full points are awarded.

(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems

Their first strategy, as mentioned in C(3)(i) focuses on providing professional learning through data coaches, a centralized training and support system, and professional learning communities.

They plan to have each LEA designate a district-level trainer who will participate in a one-year train-the-trainers process. The district-level trainer will then train a school data coach for each of the district's designated schools – starting with turnaround schools and then rolling out district-wide. School data

coaches will work with the Professional Learning Communities for each grade level or subject area, and will provide ongoing technical support on data use for teachers addressing how to accurately enter data as well as more advanced uses of data. Teachers will get support from coaches and facilitated PLCs, to develop analysis skills and to share what they are learning about student achievement.

The process seems like a straightforward method for reaching across the state. Full points are awarded.

(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers

There is no outright mention of directing this data toward researchers; however, in section C2 this is covered in detail, assuring that data will be collected and made accessible, in real time, to any seeker. Whether a researcher can get data with student or teacher identifiers however is not addressed. Since that is where fine grain research lies, this is important to spell out. For this reason, this section gets medium points.

Total	47	30	30	

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	**21**	**14**	**14**	
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	7	7	
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	2	2	
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	5	5	

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

(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification

The state has laws that support counties, school districts, and private entities to offer teacher preparation/certification activities and programs to meet local needs; and requires regulatory oversight to ensure rigor.

For principals, a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (the first tier of certification) can be obtained by attending a state-approved preparation program offered by a college or university, school district, county office of education, or other entity prior to beginning work as an administrator. Prospective administrators may also complete an internship program or pass a California Commission on Teacher Credentialing-approved examination. All programs must meet all of the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Preliminary Administrative Services Credentials. The application details the necessary 5 elements, as required in the sub-criterion, for alternative certification programs.

For having the legal alternative available and meeting the elements of the sub-criterion, high points are awarded.

(ii) Using alternative routes to certification

CA has nearly 70 teacher intern programs and 40 administrator intern programs and is ranked as one of three states designated by the National Center for Alternative Certification as having "the most prolific alternate routes." That said, only 400 (2%) of the 21,000 CA teachers who received credentials in 2008-09 were alternatively prepared. Of the 3,700 principals certified that year, only 140 (4%) were alternatively prepared.

The alternatives may be in use, but the numbers are so small as to be insignificant. For this reason, this section gets low points.

(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage

The state has several methods for determining shortage and preparing to fill that shortage:

The State has a partnership with the Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning to annually track and report on the state's teaching workforce. In the past, their reports have highlighted the concentration of under-prepared teachers working in the lowest-performing schools in the state, and serving the highest numbers of poor, minority, and English Learner students. This data focused attention on the issue, and led to policies and programs aimed at ensuring the equitable distribution of teaching resources. In 10 years, the state has reduced under-prepared teachers from over 40,000 to just under 11,000.

The California Department of Education and the Commission on Teacher Credentialing track complementary information about the current and incoming supply of teachers, focusing specifically on shortage fields and specialty areas. To address these shortages, the CTC has developed a comprehensive set of teacher development programs designed to meet the demand in high-need fields and specialty areas.

Because of historical data limitations, tracking of school leaders at the state level efforts to monitor, evaluate, and identify areas of principal shortage have not been as extensive as efforts made to track teacher shortages, though their planned data improvements will address this.

However, public- private partnerships provide current information about the labor market for school leaders, and these efforts are being expanded. EdSource has studied administrator data, reported on potential principal shortages, and highlighted obstacles to principal recruitment and retention.

The state has a history of monitoring teacher shortages and using the data to drive policy decisions with some success. They have some data on principals, with more planned. For this reason, this section is awarded high points.

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

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	**58**	**51**	**54**	
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4	5	
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	15	15	

(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	9	9	
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	23	25	[redacted]

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

(i) Measuring student growth

The Legislature passed legislation in October 2009 to require "a methodology for generating a measurement of group and individual academic performance growth by individual pupil results from a longitudinally valid achievement assessment system." The RttT Implementation Team will appoint a Technical Advisory Committee composed of researchers and experts on student outcome measurement to identify and recommend alternative strategies for measuring student growth in non-core subject areas and non-tested grades by August 2011. The final strategy selection will to be determined by each participating LEA.

This seems like a plausible plan for developing a growth measure. Allowing LEAs to choose from several strategies for non-tested subjects also seems like a good idea for the LEAs though what this means for future dashboarding on growth remains a question. If everyone isn't using the same measures, it could lead to problems comparing LEAs. For this reason, this section is awarded high (but not full) points.

(ii) Developing evaluation systems

CA plans an evaluation system that will include multiple measures of evaluation including data on student growth, and includes teachers and principals in this development process.

The RttT Implementation Team will work with participating LEAs to define a multiple measures evaluation (MME) systems for teachers and principals, with a minimum of 30% of the evaluation attributed to student growth by August 2011. Following the development of these systems, LEAs will begin implementation in 2011-12, with 100% of LEAs fully implementing them by 2013-14.

Beginning in Fall 2010, select LEAs will begin piloting components of the new multiple measures evaluation system, starting with LAUSD. LAUSD measures were developed by a Task Force that included involvement from their labor partners.

In addition, in August 2011, participating LEAs will pilot other quantitative and qualitative non-student growth measures that will be included in measures of teacher and leader effectiveness (such as student engagement, student achievement, and/or parent/guardian satisfaction, teacher attendance, student attendance, graduation rates, teacher and principal self-evaluation, measures of commitment to collaboration, and other classroom observation measures.)

Each LEA will develop a working group that includes teachers and principals who will guide the local development of the evaluation system.

The plan to pilot these new evaluations is solid. It will give the state a chance to study and fine tune the system in preparation for statewide LEA implementation in 3 years. For this section, high points are awarded.

(iii) Conducting annual evaluations

CA admits that up till now, teacher evaluations have been inconsistent, lacking feedback, rarely linked to student outcome data, and rarely result in an unsatisfactory performance review. Principal evaluations have also been inconsistent.

Leadership LEAs are already implementing some high quality annual evaluations that will be used as examples.

CA has set a target that by school year 2011-12, 100% of school leaders (principals and administrators) will receive annual training on how to conduct high-quality evaluations, and 100% of teachers will receive training on what to expect through the evaluation process. Little is said about improving principal evaluations; however, annual evaluations will be fully implemented during 2013-14 school year.

CA's plan makes use of the example of Leadership LEAs, involves preparing teachers and leaders and sets a target date for implementation, though it is a few years out. It's comprehensive, and realistic, and this section is awarded high points.

(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions

(a) *Developing teachers and principals*

Most of the participating LEAs and all of the Leadership LEAs already participate in the State's Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program designed to support new teachers during their first year of work and during induction.

LEAs will establish a system of graduated interventions and supports as soon as a teacher or principal is identified as ineffective, up to the conclusion of a two-year period. Peer Assistance and Review and other approaches that leverage the expertise and coaching of experienced mentor teachers are planned for teachers receiving ineffective reviews.

(b) *Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals*

LEAs will also use the MME system ratings to identify highly effective teachers and leaders. LEAs have set the following goal: By school year 2013-14, all promotions to instructional leadership positions will require a track record of effectiveness as determined in evaluation ratings. In addition, five competitive grants will be awarded to LEAs to fund school sites plans that pilot alternative compensation approaches for teachers/leaders in their schools.

(c) *Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification to teachers and principals*

Using MME and the training that will lead into it, principals will need to evaluate teacher effectiveness in order to make decisions on tenure. LEAs will grant tenure only when teachers have been rated as effective or highly effective, as measured by the LEA's MME System. Superintendents will need to use similar measures to decide whether or not to maintain principals in their positions. Participating LEAs agree that no teacher will be granted tenure if found to be ineffective for two consecutive years.

LEAs have agreed to the target of 100% of tenure decisions being based on evaluations of performance and effectiveness by 2013.

(d) *Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals*

LEAs will set board policy as allowed in EC 44660, and will work with collective bargaining units to make changes to agreements to ensure that proposed actions in the Scope of Work related to evaluation, promotion, and dismissal will be implemented.

New policies that relate to removing ineffective teachers and principals in the Scope of Work include:

- LEAs will remove untenured teachers who have not demonstrated effectiveness as measured by the MME by the end of their second year. Tenured teachers who receive a rating of ineffective twice in a two-year period while serving in a participating LEA will be removed from the position, subject to due process rights.

- Also in the MOU Scope of Work, principals who receive a rating of ineffective twice while in the district will be removed from their position.

The state has a comprehensive plan, including ambitious targets for implementation, to address improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance. Using their multiple measures of evaluation (MME) they will induct and support educators, promote highly effective educators and experiment with pay-for-performance pilots, tie tenure to performance and prohibit tenure being granted to educators with 2 ineffective ratings, and, after receiving support and assistance, remove ineffective educators with 2 ineffective ratings. There are clear targets set for implementation by 2013. These assurances are detailed in the signed MOUs, however most districts have yet to bring their unions into discussions, which may pose a threat to implementation. This ideas and plans are bold, but feasible. For this section, high points are awarded.

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

(i) Reviewer concern in Tier 1 was that allowing LEAs to use a variety of methods to measure student growth might make data sharing and evaluation more difficult. Reviewers questioned the state in Tier 2 about the balance between innovation and local flexibilty and overall management and measure of the reforms. The state provided more detailed information to explain the caveats to local flexibility--that statewide commissions on data, for example, would scan for best practices and then allow LEAs to choose from these vetted models. Their explanation sufficiently addresses the concern about too much variation across LEAs. Full points are awarded.

(iv) Reviewer concern in Tier 1 that low union participation might pose a threat to implementation was more thoroughly addressed in the Tier 2 answer session when superintendents further detailed that unions have expressed a great deal of interest in the the multiple measures of evaluation, fairness and having evaluations lead to support, among other things. This explanation better addressed earlier concerns about union participation.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	**25**	**22**	**22**	
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	15	15	
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	7	7	

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

(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools

CA has attempted to track teachers at schools and LEAs for the past decade though they admit the measures have been based on "inputs," such as credentials, rather than "outputs," such as effectiveness. Through this reporting, however, they have found that California's lowest-achieving schools (bottom quartile) are five times as likely to have a teacher without a full credential as students in the highest-achieving schools (top quartile).

CA has a number of solid efforts already underway to attract and retain educators in high poverty schools, and they have plans in place for better monitoring school climate and teacher retention, increased pay for teachers in more challenging schools, and increased supports for educators in these schools. They include details, targets and partners.

In addition, the state (Governor and State Board of Education) are supporting a lawsuit brought by the ACLU on behalf of the forced layoffs of new hires that would disproportionately affect low-income students in LAUSD. Legislation is also pending to allow LEAs to use performance ratings as a way to handle layoffs, rather than simply going off of seniority status.

The state has some effective efforts underway, promising plans to approach from other angles using better data, and reasonable targets to meet. For this section, they are awarded full points.

(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas

Data on short-term staff permits issued by subject area shows that science, mathematics, and special education teachers are in short supply in California and that there is a high need for ELL and special education teachers. The application explains that LEAs will need to work with bargaining units to provide incentives for recruiting and retaining effective teachers in hard-to-staff subjects, and suggests that increased pay, additional support such as professional development, common planning time, or access to a cadre of same-subject area peers and mentors might be strategies they could introduce. It is left up to the LEA and their union to work out.

On the supply side, the LEAs and IHEs will establish programs designed to build a pool of teachers prepared to teach hard-to-staff subject areas including STEM subjects. CSU and UC both have programs already in place to attract students, support and deploy significant numbers of math and science teachers. CA plans to expand and build off of these programs. CA will also explore ways to include special education courses to be taught in the general education program to reduce barriers to entry for teaching candidates.

The plans for preparing the teachers seem strong, but the plans for assigning them are vague, leaving it up to the LEA and local union. While this may yield the best results in the end, there's not a lot to go on right now. For this reason, this section is awarded medium points.

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

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	**14**	**14**	**14**	
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	7	7	
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	7	7	

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

(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly

CSU prepares over fifty percent of the state's teachers, and it has annually evaluated the outcomes of all CSU teacher education programs for nine years, reported program results for seven years, and held campuses accountable for demonstrated program improvements for five years. The ongoing results of this initiative show gains in program effectiveness in reading, writing, math and science instruction at all levels, as a result of strengthening university coursework and school-based fieldwork.

The CSU Center for Teacher Quality (CTQ), is conducting a study that tracks student achievement and growth data linked to several thousand first- and second-year teachers who have graduated from CSU programs who are currently working in five of California's largest urban school districts. Early results are showing a direct connection between teacher preparedness and students' academic growth in reading, language and math.

CA has obtained signed MOUs from all four of its college and university systems, public and private. Contained in the MOU is an agreement between the State and the IHEs to partner with all participating LEAs to link individual teacher and principal data to each teacher's or principal's primary school of preparation by the fall of 2011. IHEs have agreed to work with the Leadership LEAs to make these baseline datapublicly accessible by spring 2013.

With a history of already linking teacher's effectiveness back to their preparation programs and making adjustments that have improved student performance, CA understands the importance behind this and has plans to expand this to all preparation programs. For this section, full points are awarded.

(ii) Expanding effective programs

IHEs have agreed to work with the State to expand capacity in preparation and credentialing programs that data show are successful at producing effective teachers and principals; they will also revise the programs that data show to be ineffective by school year 2013-14.

IHEs will also work with LEAs, serving as technical advisors for high-quality, focused professional development. They will collaborate with LEAs to develop content-driven PD and subject matter institutes for long-term, ongoing PD.

CA's plans for expanding the programs that produce the most effective teachers and principals are reasonable and will be based on data about program graduates. Expanding the reach of these programs to continue to serve educators once they are in schools is also creative and a good use of IHE expertise. For this section, high points are awarded.

(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	**20**	**20**	**20**	
(i) Providing effective support	10	10	10	
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	10	10	

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

(i) Providing effective support

While LEAs develop their multiple measures for evaluation, they will also develop support and PD that will relate to evaluation results. According to the MOU, in 2013-14, LEAs will implement a data-driven, coherent plan for professional development for teachers and leaders in 100% of schools. LEAs that need help doing this will be able to get assistance from the State and Leadership LEAs. The plan is that LEAs will connect professional development to the results of the teacher and leader evaluation systems.

PD will therefore be differentiated, with activities targeted toward teachers and principals based on years of experience and ratings of effectiveness. Principals will work individually with teachers to create a personal development plan. Administrators will work with the principals individually to develop a PD plan.

Effective teachers will have an opportunity to earn additional pay by serving as mentor teachers, data coaches, or leaders of professional learning communities.

While LEAs may use a variety of methods to deliver PD, they will also provide teachers with common planning time and access to professional learning communities, also stipulated in the MOU.

LEAs are responsible for supporting principals as they learn to translate evaluation findings into PD plans. Participating LEAs will provide training on using evaluation to inform PD and will share specific strategies unique to their LEA evaluation system. LEAs will also develop surveys to assess whether these trainings are meeting the needs of staff.

LEAs will also implement the Pipeline Development for Leaders Initiative, which will provide new, aspiring, and veteran leaders with support such as leadership academies, coaching, training and additional curriculum.

This is a thorough, well-articulated plan for providing support through a variety of methods that is connected to what is learned through evaluations. This section is awarded full points.

(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support

CA provides an evaluation framework to determine how well the PD is meeting the needs of the staff. Its talent management strategy offers a continuous feedback loop to learn how well things are working or not, and to make adjustments to improve the plan.

CA's plans to measure, evaluate and improve PD efforts are straightforward, promising and involve a host of measures that will result in data they can use to make changes. For this section, full points are awarded.

(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

Total	138	121	124	

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

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

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

CA has established legal authority through the State Board of Education to work with districts in corrective action to improve their schools. (SBX5 1; EC 53202)

Specific language requires "*the governing board of a school district, county office of education, or the governing board of a charter school or its equivalent to implement, for any school identified by the Superintendent [of Public Instruction] as persistently lowest-achieving, one of four interventions for turning around lowest-achieving schools described in federal regulations and guidelines for the Race to the Top program.*"

The application meets the criteria, and full points are awarded.

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	**40**	**35**	**35**	
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5	5	
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	30	30	

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

(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools

The CDE and the SBE identified the persistently lowest-achieving schools using the following process (as outlined in the federal guidelines and recent state legislation):

The State first identified Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring (2,735), as well as secondary schools that are eligible but do not receive Title I funds (1,022). In order to identify the lowest 5 percent of these schools (or 188 schools), the State then calculated the average three-year proficiency rate for English-Language Arts and mathematics using the three previous school years (2006-07, 2007-08, 2008 -09). Schools that had shown at least 50 points of growth in the Academic Performance Index (API) over the previous five years were excluded from the list, as were community day schools, juvenile court schools and very small schools.

This methodology yielded 188 persistently lowest-achieving schools (85 elementary, 45 middle, and 58 high schools) of which 78 reside in participating LEAs (24 elementary, 23 middle, and 32 high schools).

While the RTTT application targets only the bottom 5%, Participating LEAs are also engaging in turnaround efforts for low-performing schools that don't fall into the turnaround category under RTTT grant criteria.

The state has a specific methodology for determining schools for turnaround, and is awarded full points.

(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools

For over 10 years, the state has focused attention on turning around its lowest achieving schools (numbering over 1,000), layering programs and funds (5 in all) on top of more programs and funds to try to eak out some improvements. They admit these programs have had, for the most part, negligible effect, and have investigated these failures, highlighting several main lessons:

- They believe that a turnaround program that relies solely on State intervention in schools is neither effective nor efficient because of California's size and educational structure. To ensure sustained success, the school cannot be the unit of change; LEAs, which can create systemic changes in key fiscal and employment decisions, must be the nexus of change for this difficult work.

- They have found that asking schools or districts to change without providing clear guidance on effective change is often not enough to achieve success.

- They have realized that previous programs stopped providing support to schools once they showed enough success to exit a program, leaving many schools without enough sustained support to continue their improvement.

With these lessons, the state has proposed a plan where:

- The focus is on the LEA as the point of change; and will let the LEA decide which of the 4 turnaround models to choose from,
- LEA partnership and collaboration are critical, with the State acting primarily as broker; and
- The State should establish clear outcomes and clear accountability, while allowing flexibility in implementation.

CA has outlined a very explicit set of steps to identify, support, connect, measure, refine and learn about turnarounds in their LEAs. They acknowledge the lack of movement in the past, even with significant attention and resources, highlight what they've learned and built their new approach out of these findings. It is, of course, unknown whether they will have greater effect with this model, but on paper, it is well constructed with foundations in lessons learned. This section warrants high marks.

Total	50	45	45	

F. General

	Available	Tier 1	Tier 2	Init
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	**10**	**8**	**8**	
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5	5	
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	3	3	

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

(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education

Even as state revenues deeply declined from FY 2008 to FY 2009, education funding as a percentage of state revenues increased from 46 percent to 47 percent. In his budget proposal in January of 2010, the Governor indicated his intent to protect education –including higher education– from further cuts, and to support K–16 education at the same General Fund level as in the prior fiscal year, despite an anticipated budget deficit of $20 billion.

The percent available to support education increased, for which the state is awarded full points.

(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools

California Supreme Court's ruling in *Serrano v. Priest* in 1971 and the enactment of Proposition 13 in 1978 had significant effects on CA's education funding. In the Serrano case, the California Supreme Court ruled that significant wealth-related disparities in per-pupil expenditures denied pupils in less wealthy LEAs a constitutional right to an equal education. Proposition 13 dramatically cut property taxes, and subsequent education budgets.

Equalization efforts have produced a substantial increase in equality between districts in the area of revenue limits; in fact, the Court discontinued monitoring compliance with the *Serrano* decision because it concluded that equalization was essentially complete.

Economic Impact Aid funding ($946 million), is specifically provided to high-need LEAs to address the needs of low-income students.

In a variety of other areas, the state channels several hundred million dollars to high needs education populations: students with disabilities, English language acquisition program, foster youth, students who fail the high school exit exam, pregnant and parenting teens, expelled and at-risk students.

California's education funding policies are structured to guarantee equity between high- need LEAs and other LEAs. State data, analyzed by the Education Trust, shows that for the 2005-06 school year (the last year for which this analysis was completed), the State provided $599 more per pupil in funding for high-poverty LEAs than it provided for students in low- poverty LEAs.

While individual LEAs can and do equalize funding between high poverty schools and others, there are no state policies that drive how LEAs distribute funds.

Because the CA has worked at the state level to ensure equitable funding policies for high needs districts, but has not influenced how districts allocate funds, this section is awarded medium points.

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

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	**40**	**38**	**40**	
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	8	8	
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8	8	
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8	8	
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	8	8	
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	6	8	[redacted]

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

(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"

California first allowed a total of 250 charter schools to be authorized in 1998, with a provision to increase that total by an additional 100 charter schools (or approximately one percent of all schools in California) *in each successive school year.* Any unused authorizations roll over to the following year. This limit has never restricted the number of charters authorized because the authority to expand has far outpaced the actual growth in charter schools. In 2009–10, a total of 1,350 charter schools were authorized to operate, in contrast with the 810 actually in operation (which represent nearly 8 percent of the schools in the state.)

For having a law that does not prohibit or cap the number of charter schools at less than 10% of schools in the state, this section is awarded high points.

(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes

Both the Center for Education Reform and the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools rank the state very high on the strength of its law, quality and accountability, funding equity, facilities support, autonomy, and growth and choice.

Multiple methods can be used to request authority for a charter, whether at the LEA level, the county level, or the state level. There are clear appeal processes for denials at each level. Charters can be granted for individual schools, for an entire LEA, an entire county, or for a "statewide benefit" charter school, which provides instructional services that cannot be provided by a charter school operating in only one LEA or county. This system of multiple authorizers and types of charters ensures sufficient opportunity for innovative ideas to develop in charter schools across the state. All charter school petitioners must agree to meet all statewide academic standards and conduct all state pupil assessments.

When a charter is granted, it is approved for an initial period of up to five years. Renewals are approved for a period of five years and are based on student achievement and academic quality criteria. Charter authorizers must also provide ongoing oversight of the charter, including site visits and monitoring of the school's fiscal condition. In California, charter school oversight and monitoring are primarily implemented by the LEA authorizer. The law also provides county and State education agencies with charter oversight and monitoring responsibilities, including the right to investigate and to revoke a school's charter.

California has supported its charter schools by providing state-led technical assistance through a CDE Charter Support Team and the State Advisory Commission on Charter Schools, which reviews charter school funding and programmatic issues and provides advice to the State Board of Education. In addition, the California Charter School Association and the Charter Schools Development Center provide resources and training for charter school leaders and staff.

The Education Code, requirements for charter applications and funding incentives encourage the priority of schools that serve students who are most in need. Education Code also dictates academic achievement levels that must be met in order to be granted renewal.

CA doesn't mention the number of applications each year or how many were not approved or why. They do provide a table that shows the number approved, the number opened, and the number closed or not reauthorized. These numbers range from 10-39 a year. A Rand report on the operation of charter schools in California found that the most frequent reason for revocation of a school's charter was "an unsound academic program. "According to the California Charter Schools Association, 30 of 32 state charter school closures last year were for quality reasons related to academic quality and/or fiscal stability.

The state has guidelines for authorizing and monitoring, for encouraging schools that serve high needs students, and for closing schools, in particular, for not meeting student achievement targets. The state receives high marks from charter policy centers who rate them high compared to other states on having a quality law and for expecting authorized charters to be high quality schools. For this section, the application receives full points.

(iii) Equitably funding charter schools

California has established funding mechanisms for the state's charter schools to help ensure that they will receive funding at a level that is equitable to traditional public schools.The State's Education Code indicates, "*It is the intent of the Legislature that each charter school be provided with operational funding that is equal to the total funding that would be available to a similar school district serving a similar pupil population.*" The mechanisms for general and categorical funding for public schools apply equally to California's charter schools. A revenue analysis for LEAs in the State of California for the 2007– 08 school-

year reflects that this strategy is being implemented effectively to create equity in funding between public and charter schools.

Charter schools in CA receive equitable funding and this section is awarded full points.

(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities

In 2000, voters in California enacted Proposition 39, which required that public school facilities be shared fairly among all public school students, including those in charter schools. In the 2009-2010 school year, 120 charter schools were beneficiaries of Proposition 39, and an additional 116 charter schools were housed in district facilities not supported by Proposition 39.

The State has also made investments in charter school facilities through the following programs:

- Charter School Facility Grant Program (SB 740): Provided a total of $23.6 million to 195 charter schools in the 2008-2009 school year to support facility rental costs;
- Qualified School Construction Bonds (QSCB): Awarded $29.2 million to six charter schools, with a total of $73 million set-aside, in 2008-2009;
- State Charter School Facilities Program (Prop. 47, 55, 1D): Awarded $836 million to 58 charter schools serving 27,500 students;
- State Charter School Facility Incentive Grants Program: Awarded $48 million to 128 charter schools serving 42,900 students; and
- California Charter Building Fund: Provided over $100 million to 13 charter schools between 2007 and 2009.

The state has worked from a variety of angles to ensure funding and access to facilities and is awarded full points for this section.

(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools

Though the applicant lists a host of innovative schools, there is not enough information provided to know if the applicant fully meets this sub-criterion.

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

(v) In answer to a reviewer question about clarifying the autonomy of innovative schools, the state provided examples of per pupil budgeting, shared decision making, open enrollment, autonomy, traditional public schools that have written plans for flexibility and have individual contracts in Los Angeles, and parent and teacher involvement in choosing school models. With this information, the applicant fully meets this sub-criterion.

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

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

Beyond the work around the four key assurance areas, California has implemented AVID to address the achievement gap, created the California Partnership Academies (CPA) to offer students multiple pathways to graduation and technical careers, brought forth legislation to support parents of children in low performing schools, empowered LEAs by making the education code more flexible and offered more budget flexibility; and expanded early childhood learning.

Long before RTTT, CA has been working through laws, innovations and programs to change conditions that would increase student achievement and narrow achievement gaps. For this section, full points are awarded.

(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

Total	55	51	53	

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

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

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The application builds around a three part plan for advancing STEM in CA:

1) Strengthen the design and delivery of STEM in California's high schools through the following:

- Teacher Preparation Programs with the California State University System *(Section D: Great Teachers and Leaders)* (See Appendix S.XIII);; and
- Use STEM-focused Pathways in California Partnership Academies To Turn Around Low-Performing High Schools (*Section E: Turning Around Lowest Achieving Schools)*.

2) Map backward into K-8: Build a strong STEM foundation emphasizing authentic application and career exploration

- After-School STEM Learning Programs *(Section D: Great Teachers & Leaders)*; (See Appendix S.III); and
- Summer Learning Opportunity: Stepping into STEM *(Section B: Standards and Assessments;* (See Appendix S.IX for description).

3) Build support systems and infrastructure: Support STEM-related investments that will help sharpen and expand high-quality STEM teaching and learning statewide:

- Online STEM Programs (*Section C: Data Systems; Section B: Standards & Assessments*);
- STEM E-Portfolio (*Section C: Data Systems*) (See Appendix S.VI); and
- TechNet and Industry Partners STEM Programs (Spans all Assurance Areas, See

Appendix S.IV).

The partners include the Office of the Governor, the California Department of Education, selected two- and four-year post-secondary institutions, TechNet and its industry partners, ConnectEd: the California Center for College and Career, California Virtual Campus, the Silicon Valley Education Foundation, and representatives of California's premier philanthropies. All of these organizations have signed a formal letter of support for this application, pledging their commitment to implement the plan over the next four years and beyond.

STEM initiatives are embedded throughout the application, emphasizing rigorous classes, targeted toward under-represented groups, connected to industry, and encouraging advanced study of STEM subjects. The application meets the competitive preference priority.

Total	15	15	15	

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

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

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

This application is refreshingly clear and comprehensive. It starts early with a high bar set for what all participating districts would need to do, spelled out the details in black and white, and got significant numbers of districts to join in, even if they represent only 1/3 of this large state.

CA answered every part of every question, even if it meant revealing failures, weaknesses or past omissions. They reflected on these experiences to discern why they didn't work and how their new initiatives could build off of lessons learned. The MOU for participating LEAs went well beyond the strong sample provided by USDOE and was developed by 7 vanguard districts which are already implementing many of the reforms within. It contains a very explicit scope of work yet has managed to energize 302 districts to the challenge. In addition, they created an MOU for partner IHEs, set targets, and assigned responsibilities across the reform areas. To implement the plan, CA has created a novel structure to run the program as an independent non profit, has the support of all gubernatorial candidates, and is built off the expertise and credibility of 7 districts that are already deep in this work.

This application embodies the spirit of Race to the Top, using this opportunity as a chance to challenge a variety of sectors, leaders and educators across the state to aim high, use ambitious goals set by superintendents to galvanize all levels into new ways of doing business and take risks that could lead to significant gains for CA students.

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 2)

The state did a great job of conveying the enthusiasm and grassroots, LEA-driven effort to bring ambitious reform to the State of California. The panelists were knowledgeable, experienced, passionate and committed.

Total		0	0	

Grand Total	500	429	440	