



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1



Missouri Application #3300MO-4

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	46
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	33
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	8
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>Missouri clarifies that its unique state segments are distinct entities that require thoughtful and different approaches and strategies. Its concise summary of the chronology of state reform in the state and survey data clarified the extent to which reform approaches have been implemented and provides suggestions for strengthening reform. The state articulated its three overarching goals for educational reform and for improving student outcomes statewide. It tied the goals to the four areas described in ARRA and described how STEM will be emphasized. Finally, it clearly articulated a set of academic goals that are ambitious and on point and promised to track them publicly through a dashboard that promotes transparency and identifies areas in need of intervention. Full points were awarded <i>articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda</i>. Missouri's Memorandum of Understanding for LEA participation was modeled after the U.S. Education Department's model, thus promoting alignment with ARRA reform elements. Missouri presented a summary table designed to show commitment, but provided no narrative to explain the data presented. Sixty-two percent (347) of Missouri's LEAs agreed to participate in the reform effort. This represents 67 per cent of all state students and 71 per cent of the students in poverty, a moderate level. This level of participation provides a reasonable opportunity for statewide impact but necessitates highly effective strategies and activities to reach all the state's LEA's, schools, and students. Each of the 347 participating LEAs signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) committing to each element of the state reform plans. MOUs were signed by all participating superintendents and board presidents. More than seventy percent (72) of the 136 union leaders signed the MOU. It is noteworthy that there only 136 union leaders in the 347 LEAs because Missouri is a right to work state and many districts do not have unions. Medium points were awarded <i>securing LEA commitment</i>. The proportional representation of LEAs has promise for achieving statewide impact but further clarification is needed as to how it will be achieved. For example, St. Louis and Kansas City agreed to participate in the reform effort but the Kansas City MOU, in the appendix, revealed that all changes had to be bargained before they can be implemented. It was not clear how many of the 72 LEAs where union leaders signed the MOU also require bargaining agreements prior to implementation and what the effect would be. Medium points were awarded <i>translating LEA participation into statewide impact</i>.</p>		
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	17
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	13
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	4
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>Missouri is planning and has taken steps to promote the capacity to implement, scale up and sustain reform. The Missouri Department of Education is currently planning a reorganization to better support newly defined state goals</p>		

outlined in the application. This entails a shift in their divisions to include data management and other appropriate areas, the grouping of job a-likes, and appointment of their Deputy Superintendent as Race to the Top Manager. Organizational charts clarified proposed changes. Other activities will promote the effort. The department recently completed an independent audit to determine implementation levels of programs and to identify areas for improvement. The electronic grant tracking system can be used to track budget, disbursement, and performance. District and regional teams with specialists will act as a conduit to local and state collaboration and effectiveness. They assert that a level of trust has been developed but provide nothing to support or substantiate that. Finally, Missouri proposes continued deployment of regional service centers through contracts and FTE, with the goal of completing the transformation by July 2014. It further asserts that this will sustain the reform long beyond 2014. It is not clear what that transformation is or how it will enhance the reform effort. Steps taken by the state show promise but further explanation about aspects such as the regional centers and how various aspects tie together is needed. Medium points were awarded *capacity to implement*. The department's outreach in the recently completed independent audit to determine implementation levels of programs and to identify areas for improvement and the stakeholder forum, webinars, and web-based survey promote broad-based support and enhance commitment. The subcommittees formed for each of the four assurance areas seem positive but no information about sub-committee make-up was provided. The on-line state wide survey about RTTT work that garnered 5000 responses helps. But letters of support were sparse, less than a dozen such letters were provided. Of these five were from higher education institutions, one from the state Board of Education and others from two chambers of commerce and others. None were provided from the state teachers' or principals' associations or business entities such as corporations or business roundtables. There were no support letters from the PTA or other parent or stakeholder groups that play a critical role in supporting education reform. Medium points were awarded *using broad stakeholder support*.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	15
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	3
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	12
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>Missouri provides evidence it has undertaken reform initiatives in the four areas that Race to the Top identified as crucial for improving student achievement. They funded development of rigorous standards and assessments resulting in a comprehensive system of assessments in core content areas to measure student progress statewide. They implemented a statewide longitudinal data set with unique student identifiers and initiated the Missouri Student Information System to allow school districts to analyze student performance over time at a variety of levels using a web-based reporting system. It established a Leadership Academy aligned to National Staff Development Council standards for the professional development of teachers and school leaders. They also instituted accountability plans for districts not meeting academic standards. As a result 74 districts were required to develop accountability plans. Six of the 74 made sufficient progress to be released from the plans. No information was provided to clarify impact. Impact on standards and assessments is not addressed nor were there data clarifying the number of people served by the Learning Center or the number of low performing schools where progress has been made. Medium points were awarded <i>making progress in each reform area</i>. Missouri's NAEP scores have risen slightly but steadily over the past six years. The point scale rise in mathematics and reading is not dramatic but progress has been made. The scaled score gains in mathematics were substantial, advances in reading were slight. There is a persistent significant achievement gap in the achievement of white students compared to that of black and Hispanic students on NAEP reading and mathematics scores at both grade levels. Hispanic student achievement falls short of white students but generally outperforms black students in reading and mathematics by ten or more NAEP scaled points. An even more pronounced gap exists for students with disabilities. These gaps also surface when the ESEA component is examined. Graduation rates in Missouri have changed minimally since 2003. Medium points were awarded for <i>improving student outcomes</i>.</p>		
Total	125	78

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	25
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	5
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>Missouri is working with 48 states and 3 territories as part of the National Governor’s Association/Council of Chief State School Officers consortium to develop common core K-12 standards and college and career readiness. The benchmarking process and the most current versions of the common core standards and college and career readiness standards provided evidence of their good work to date. Full points were awarded <i>participating in consortium developing high- quality standards</i>. Missouri has the authority to adopt standards and a detailed plan to ensure implementation. Current law guiding standards adoption is specific and detailed. The state’s plan to adopt standards is equally specific and provides a timeline, activities and responsible parties that are sound. The plan provides for stakeholder involvement and culminates in implementation by August 20, 2010. Because the notice stipulated that adoption must be completed by August 2, 2010 low points were awarded <i>adopting standards</i>.</p>		
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>Missouri participates in a multiple state consortium for developing both formative and summative assessments. They are a member of SMARTER Balance Assessment Consortium (26 states). The consortium will launch a system of formative assessments aligned to National Governor’s Association/Council of Chief State School Officers Common Core Standards. They also plan to create partnerships with their LEAs and work with regional centers to continue developing assessments, materials, and benchmarks. A copy of the MOU was included in the appendix. The summative assessment system also will be developed in conjunction with the aforementioned consortium. The list of principles provided by the state to guide their work is sound and well grounded. Full points were awarded <i>participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments and including a significant number of States</i>.</p>		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	20
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>Missouri’s plan for supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high quality assessments is exemplary. It is anchored by legislation specifically authorizing standards use and a governance/oversight structure (P-20 Council) that includes higher education institutions. The key activities identified are sound and spelled out in detail. Each activity is sequentially correct, provides sufficient background to understand how it fits, and describes what will be needed to ensure success. Timelines, activities and responsible parties are real world, appropriately involve the appropriate stakeholders, and have realistic timelines. They include sound processes for developing and disseminating materials and for supporting implementation. The anticipated impact is well articulated and accompanied by ambitious but doable performance measures. These include closing the achievement gap between whites and African American and Hispanics. Full points were awarded <i>supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments</i>.</p>		
Total	70	55

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	24
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) Missouri asserted that it developed and implemented data collection activities that address all twelve of the America Competes Act. A table was provided and the status of each element, with the exception of element 12, explicitly described. Full points were awarded <i>fully implementing a longitudinal statewide data system</i>.</p>		
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	5
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) Missouri has a high quality plan to access and use state data. The plan includes use of The Show-Me-Portal, an on-line integrated portal. It will be used by members of a consortium of researchers, teachers, administrators, and policy makers. The applicant makes clear its intent to use the data system to provide information that will be helpful to teachers in the classroom as well as researchers and the public. Activities, timelines and responsibilities are clear. Full points were awarded <i>accessing and using state data</i>.</p>		
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	16
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	6
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	6
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	4
<p>(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) Missouri's plan to increase the use of instructional improvement systems was developed through a collaborative planning process and is guided by the assumption that it can most positively impact educational practices at local districts by identifying local successes and providing opportunities for districts to learn and grow collaboratively. These are sound assumptions and provide a solid foundation to build on. "Incubator projects," in which at least one district in each region will transition the current management and instructional improvement system to The Missouri Comprehensive Data System, seem sound. Full points were awarded <i>increasing instructional improvement systems</i>. The plan to increase adoption and use of local improvement systems for supporting participating LEAs, schools, and teachers using instructional improvement systems in providing professional development to teachers and principals to support continuous instructional improvement is of high quality. Its two key activities are sound and the timelines, activities, and responsible parties are clear and well designed. The collaborative planning process was instrumental in helping them identify ways for teachers, principals, and administrators to use the improvement system and data collected from the system for instructional improvement. Full points were awarded <i>supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems</i>. Missouri asserts it will not only act as a national resource for long-term studies, it will also help policymakers address specific topics of immediate concern. It proposes some innovative approaches to achieve this. One is to provide mini-grants up to \$25,000 to encourage researchers to focus on critical overlooked questions, test explicit hypotheses, and deliver findings helpful to those in the field. Its plan to become a national resource center focused solely on innovative partnerships and mini-grants. While it was adequate for that purpose no activities or plan were offered to ensure greater use of data for researchers and policy makers. High points were awarded <i>making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers</i>.</p>		
Total	47	45

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	7
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	2
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	2
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	3
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>Missouri's State Board of Education has authority to issue teaching certificates and approve teacher preparation programs based on its adopted rules. The applicant asserts it retains flexibility to base awards of certification on several factors beyond training at teacher preparation institutions. But all candidates except those with doctoral degrees, must pass a content area assessment. No information about the Board's flexibility in meeting the criteria specified in the RTTP notice was provided. Thus, it was not clear that alternative education pathways are designed to provide certified teachers for English language learners and students with disabilities. Nor was it clear what processes are used to select teachers or to monitor and supervise the programs. Provisions for alternative certification pathways for principals are not provided. Low points were awarded <i>allowing alternative routes to certification</i>. Missouri identified six alternative routes to teacher certification. Of these only two appear to meet the RTTT criterion in the notice that specifies the some alternative pathway be independent of institutions of higher education: (1) American Board of Certification for Teacher Excellence (ABCTE), and (2) doctorate degrees. ABCTE, which certifies mathematics, science, communication, and social studies at the middle-and high school levels, has certified only 74 teachers since 2008. No principals were certified by alternative routes. Low points were awarded <i>using alternative routes to certification</i>. Missouri uses a centralized reporting system to track annual educator vacancies and trends. This appears to be an effective means to track and identify shortages although no teacher shortage data were provided. The state supports two programs to encourage teacher candidates to enter fields where there are teacher shortages. Transition to Teaching and Tuition Reimbursement provide scholarships for new special education teachers and prospective guidance counselors. While it intends to replicate other successful/model teacher/leader preparation programs in the state to meet regional needs, as well as the unique needs of non-traditional students who will commit to teaching in hard to staff subjects and locations, it does not have a system in place. Principal shortages were not addressed. Medium points were awarded <i>preparing teachers and principals in areas of shortage</i>.</p>		
(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	37
(i) Measuring student growth	5	5
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	12
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	7
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	13
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>Missouri's districts have been able to access and analyze student-level data for nearly a decade. That positions them to move forward in measuring student growth. A number of steps have been completed. They received permission to implement a growth model for determining NCLB accountability and are one of 15 states that the U.S. Department granted permission to use a Growth-to Standards model for NCLB. A work group has been established and will recommend one or more approaches for measuring student growth that will yield valid and reliable data. A workable process for completing that task was presented that completes the first phase of the work in summer 2010. Full points were awarded <i>measuring student growth</i>. Missouri statutes require performance-based evaluation for teachers and principals but offers few guidelines as to how this evaluation should be conducted. There are no obstacles in place that</p>		

prohibit linking student growth to teacher and principal evaluation. The plan identified three activities that have been carried out and had appropriate timelines and responsible parties. Its plan for developing evaluation systems is built around a revision of their Performance Based Teacher Evaluation (PBTE) and Performance Based Principal Evaluation (PBPE). These systems were initially implemented in 1996 and updated in 1999 and 2003. The state proposes evaluation aligned to the four levels of teaching standards currently in draft form (in appendix). These are sound strategies. The plan provides for teacher and principal involvement. The activities and plan provided offer a workable process for developing a teacher evaluation model to be implemented September 2012. A similar approach is identified to develop a three-tiered principal evaluation model to be piloted in 2011 with implementation targeted for September 2013. Points were withheld because more specificity is needed as is more explanation as to why it takes two years from pilot to implementation. High points were awarded *developing evaluation systems*. Missouri's plan to conduct teacher evaluations has provisions that provide teachers and principals student growth data and clearly specifies the frequency of evaluation while differentiating the approaches to be employed for various experience and effectiveness levels. More could be provided as to how they will ensure timely and constructive feedback. Medium points were awarded *conducting evaluation systems*. Missouri asserts that their work plan agreement will ensure that teacher evaluations are conducted frequently depending on teacher level of experience and demonstrated success with student achievement. They appropriately lay out an experience classification scheme that includes effective teachers and proficient/master teachers and beginning principals and principals. They propose completion of an audit of participating local districts with the analysis of results resulting in data clarifying the distribution of teachers and principals at four performance levels. It is not clear what these data will be used for or how the state will ensure the validity of findings. In many states such a report would yield data that indicates most educators perform at a high level of effectiveness. Little information was provided that addressed two elements of the RTTT notice: (1) How timely and effective feedback would be provided or (2) How teachers and principals would be provided data on student growth. Low points were awarded *conducting annual evaluations*. Missouri's plan to use evaluations to inform key decisions addresses some aspects of the RTTT sub components but does not effectively address others. To develop teachers and principals it proposes professional development based on need tied to four level standards. It targets enhancement of the statewide system of support to develop teachers and principals and targets a number of strategies to achieve that end. These include (1) infusing teacher/principal standards in preparation programs, (2) ensuring master teachers and master principals in each region, (3) a statewide mentoring program, and (4) support systems for new and experienced teachers and principals. These plans have much merit but more detail is needed. For example, the plan does not specify how master teachers will be freed up to help others and if they will be compensated. The plan addresses compensation, promotion, and retention of teachers and principals. It proposes developing and implementing model policies for compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers based on multiple measures of student performance. It plans to continue the collaborative effort with stakeholders that has yielded the two regression growth models. It also proposes "encouraging" participating districts, through incentives, to provide differentiated rewards that it will collect data on and analyze, then report district data related to each district's performance evaluation systems. The effort to provide incentives to districts to implement the evaluation systems has merit. But, an approach that relies on encouragement and a plan that has no activities to ensure that compensation and performance are linked and fails to address tenure and reduction decisions does not earn high points. It also addresses granting of tenure and removing ineffective teachers by adopting levels of performance and providing training and support to evaluators but more specific information about how this will occur statewide is needed. Medium points were awarded *using evaluations to inform key decisions*.

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

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

The state proposes to implement a plan to ensure an equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals in high need schools and eliminate percentages of ineffective teachers in high need schools. It proposes a Highly Effective Teacher Group whose task will be to identify procedures and processes for identifying highly effective teachers. The plan for that task culminates in 2013-2014 when the districts identify these teachers and submit their names to the department. While there may be merit in this it seems that the proposed evaluation system could accomplish that task. A second strategy is to prepare teachers and leaders to work in high need schools. The plan results in subgroup recommendations for identifying effective teacher preparation programs by June 2012. It is not clear how that

information will be used. The department also proposes the development of draft compensation and contract procedures to share with local districts for use to retain high-quality teachers. More information is needed to understand how this activity and the plans for ensuring equitable distribution will promote equity in high-need schools. Medium points were awarded *ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools*. The department's plan to ensure equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas includes expansion of existing scholarship funds to include Visual Impairment/Orientation and Mobility. It has joined the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment Consortium. Through that effort teachers of English Learners will have access to professional development opportunities. It also will establish a Highly Effective Teachers Work Group to develop, by June 2012, model recruitment and compensation policies for teachers of hard to staff subjects to be implemented by local school boards and charters. More specific targeted strategies are needed to bolster the plan. Medium points (5) were awarded for *ensure equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas*.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	10
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	6
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	4

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

Missouri currently employs Missouri Standards for Educator Preparation (MoSTEP) as a preparation program approval system and uses a seven-year review cycle to ensure that all educator preparation programs are compliant with certification requirements and meet other requirements, including 11 national standards. It compiled the first set of data linking beginning teachers and their preparation programs to student achievement. It asserts that it is now ready to rate teacher preparation programs and publicly report the results and to use effectiveness data to improve the quality of teacher and leader preparation programs. A blue ribbon task force will be formed and publicly report the effectiveness rating of teacher/leader programs by September 2012. These are good steps. High points were awarded *linking student data to credential programs and reporting publicly*. Missouri proposes enhancing its approval procedure for teacher and leader preparation programs to expand effective programs. In addition to assessments of competency in various areas, student achievement will become a criterion for measuring program effectiveness. Programs that fail to meet required targets will be obligated to seek assistance or close. The implementation plan included sound activities and identified responsible parties for developing the educator preparation system. Development of the rating system is planned for 2012 to be piloted in 2013-2014. This time line seems excessively extended. More importantly, no activities are provided to clarify how the plan will be implemented. Medium points were awarded *expanding effective programs*.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	12
(i) Providing effective support	10	4
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	8

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

Missouri legislation supports professional development support and fostered development of Regional Assistance Centers, proposed as a key vehicle for delivering RTTP support to teachers and principals. Development of a collaborative culture, induction protocols for new teachers and principals, and content-centered support that includes specific skills/pedagogy associated with improved student performance are sound approaches for enhancing professional development for Missouri public school educators. The plans for these activities, however, are vague and tend to focus on process. Specific steps to ensure the desired result are needed. Medium points were awarded *providing effective support*. Missouri proposes three appropriate activities to measure, evaluate, and continuously improve professional development: (1) Develop and pilot a System of Support rubric, (2) Conduct a biannual implementation audit, and (3) Develop the capacity to link student performance to professional development. Its plan demonstrated it understands the importance of deep implementation and the basic elements that lead to implementation effectiveness. The implementation plans for each of the three activities have sound activities, timelines,

and responsible parties. A summary that clarifies how these activities and plans come together would strengthen the overall plan. High points were awarded *continuously improving the effectiveness of the support*.

Total	138	76
-------	-----	----

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) The Missouri State Board of Education has authority and broad powers to intervene directly in both LEAs and the state's lowest-achieving schools. Accreditation is the tool used to exercise that power. While the language in the law does not use terminology that makes clear their specific authority over lowest-achieving schools, the law specifies that the State Board of Education has authority to accredit or withhold accreditation in districts and schools. Full points were awarded for <i>intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs</i> .		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	30
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	25
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) Missouri has clear rules and guidelines for identifying its lowest-achieving schools. Up to 4 percent of the state's schools may be designated as low performing and 10 percent of districts, 2.5 percent at a given time. It also has a well defined process and clear definitions and criteria to guide identification of low-achieving schools. These definitions and criteria were provided in the application and a list of identified schools were included in the appendix. Full points were awarded <i>identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools</i> . Missouri's plan include a number of excellent activities: develop a model for quality schools, build on its current turnaround model to develop a Missouri Turnaround Model, and develop a state model for a "braided" seamless community-based system of support aimed at improving learning conditions for children. It also has identified and already initiated sound strategies such as a specialized corps of turnaround teacher and leader teams and to support capacity building of interveners, and identification of lead partners. None of the four models to be employed in turning around low-achieving schools identified in the RTTT notice were explicitly discussed in the narrative. Because the applicant explicitly described turnaround strategies that parallel approaches in the four models it may have considered them addressed. But because the models are not explicitly addressed some points were not awarded. Medium points were awarded <i>turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools</i> .		
Total	50	40

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	3
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	0
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	3
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		

The data needed to rate this criterion were not provided; FY 2008 data were not provided. No points were awarded *allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education*. It uses an equalization aid program and adds additional aid to ensure equitable funding for high need LEAs and other LEAs, between LEAs, and between high-poverty schools but it was not clear how the formula specifically ensures equitable funding. Medium points were awarded *equitably funding high-poverty schools*.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	14
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	2
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	4
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	6
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	2
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	0
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>Missouri's charter school law provides for a low cap; limiting the establishment of charter schools geographically to Kansas City and St. Louis allows less than five percent of the schools to be charter schools. Low points were awarded for <i>enabling high performing charter schools (*caps)</i>. Missouri charter school law provides authority to hold charter schools accountable. It specifically calls for review of performance, management, and operations at least once every two years, or at any point where the operation or management is changed. It also calls for each charter school's achievement to be compared to an equivalent group of district students and reported to the charter's community. Points were withheld because only 2 of the 33 Missouri charters have been closed in the past three years. Medium points were awarded for <i>authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes</i>. Missouri law appears to ensure equal funding for charter schools. Several sections contain language that require equal funding. It is not clear if public schools receive funding from any other sources not stipulated in the law. Data are needed to clarify the extent to which charter school funding is equal to public school funding. High points were awarded <i>equitably funding charter schools</i>. Missouri does not provide direct facility assistance for any public schools, including charter schools. The applicant notes that charter schools must provide for facilities through their operating budget but did not provide information to further clarify to what extent they are funded. Low points were awarded for <i>providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities</i>. The applicant noted that the state will offer funding incentives to LEAs to develop innovative schools and proposes a plan to achieve this. But no credit can be given for a plan in this area. Low points were awarded for <i>enabling LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools</i>.</p>		
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	0
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The state identified a plan to create innovative school models to demonstrate other significant reform conditions. This does not meet the criteria set forth in the RTTT notice. No points were awarded for <i>demonstrating other significant reform conditions</i>.</p>		
Total	55	17

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	0
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		

Missouri ties its STEM activities and plans to its three goal overall plan in a manner that promotes coherence and comprehensiveness. They have included and woven in specific strategies and activities throughout the application in areas such as certification and preparation, professional development, standards and assessment, technical assistance (content specialists), and in working with the business community. They included key STEM stakeholders in key state activities and specifically targeted them to help in focusing on the integration and emphasis of STEM content and learning progressions across all content areas. They offer competitive grants to aid in teacher and leader preparation and intend to integrate STEM in its effort to turn around low-performing schools. But they did not specifically address underrepresented groups or women and girls in the proposal in the narrative related to STEM or in other areas of the application. No points were awarded.

Total	15	0
-------	----	---

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
Missouri has comprehensively and coherently addressed all of the four reform areas specified in in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria and demonstrated that Missouri and its participating LEAs are taking a systemic approach to education reform.		
Total		0

Grand Total	500	311
-------------	-----	-----



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

Missouri Application #3300MO-8



A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	45
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	4
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	32
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	9

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

(i) The state indicates it has learned from its history of school improvement efforts and is currently drafting the 5th cycle of Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP). The proposed strategies are strongly correlated to three of the four ARRA areas. There is a lack of clear articulation around the plan's strategies around turning around lowest achieving schools. The state's seven academic goals support the P-20 environment. The current status of student outcomes within academic goals 1, 2, 3, and 5 is not provided which limits a clear understanding of the rate of change in student outcomes at the end of the grant period as compared to the current incremental success in student achievement.

Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the high range. The lack of establishment of a clear path on turning around the lowest achieving schools and status on specific academic goals limits the extent of the plans proposed success.

(ii) The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is the same as the Model Participating LEA MOU. 62% (347/560) of Local Education Agencies (LEAs) have responded with a Y on the MOU Terms and Conditions (Appendix 5). This reflects a proposed impact on 67.4% of K-12 students and 71% of students in poverty. Each Participating LEAs agreed with a Y to each application Plan Criterion within the Preliminary Scope of work across each of the four areas of reform. 100% of participating LEA superintendents and presidents of local boards of education provided their signature demonstrating their extent of leadership support. 39% of participating LEAs (134 out of 347) were eligible to provide a letter of support from the President of the Local Union and of the 134 possibilities of a letter of support, 75% provided a letter of support. Many of the local teachers unions that did not provide a letter of support represent LEAs with large numbers of teachers and students.

Of the participating LEAs whose superintendents and president of local boards of education that provided signatures on the MOU, the lack of local teacher union support questions the extent of the commitment of teachers in some of the state's largest LEAs with the potential impact to a larger number of the students.

Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the medium range. The lack of identified support from the local teachers' unions, to include designated large LEAs, demonstrates a lack of leadership support that ultimately can impact student success and the state's overall education reform plan.

(iii) 62% LEAs, representing 69.6% of the state's schools, have agreed to participate in the plan that reflects a proposed impact on 67.4% of K-12 students and 71% of students in poverty. The response is evidenced by the following academic goals and related evidence provided:

- “65% proficient or advanced on NAEP 4th grade mathematics and 60% proficient or advanced on all other NAEP assessments by 2014-2015’ and ‘100% efficient or advanced on statewide mathematics and communication arts assessments by 2014’”. The response does not provide specifics as to the current status and the goals are not clear on the impact on assessments required under Elementary Secondary Education Act (ESEA).
- “Reduce racial, ethnic, and socio-economic achievement gaps on NAEP by half by 2014-2015.” The goal is unclear with reference to specific subgroups in reading /language arts and mathematics and assessments required under ESEA. The state does not provide current status of achievement gaps by subject matter upon which the proposed goal would half.
- “The percent of students graduating from high school will increase to 93% by 2014.” The state is unclear about whether it will use the four year or extended-year graduation rate.
- “80% of college retention by 2014, as measured by the percent of students enrolled in college who complete at least one year of collegiate-level credit within two academic years.” The state does not provide the current college retention status thus broad impact cannot be determined.

Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the medium range. The extent to which the proposed academic goals lacks specificity reflects a lack of ambitious goals that can have limited results for broad statewide impact.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	18
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	13
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	5

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

(i) Alignment of the new organizational structure with the state’s proposed work will provide a degree of insurability of meeting the proposed plan. The extent to which the plan will provide leadership amongst its P-20 stakeholders is unclear. The response indicates that current Regional School Improvement Teams will provide support to the LEA based on their existing relationships. The response for LEA support is lacking specificity in how the proposed reforms will be ensured by promising practices; how the practices will be widely disseminated specifically to the participating districts and high need students that includes plan for statewide implementation in the future; how the participating LEAs will know if progress is being made on student success; and how the LEAs will be held accountable if they are not.

The use of ePeGS supports the proposed Race to the Top (RTTT) operations and processes. The state lacks specificity in the extent to which the plan for operations and processes will be effective, efficient, and how it will be formatively and summatively assessed. Although the fourteen projects are referenced within the Budget Part I: Budget Summary Narrative, it is unclear of the location and/or correlation of the fourteen projects within (A)(2)(i)(a) of the application.

Budget Part I: Budget Summary Narrative indicates the Commissioner is starting steps to update state and federal funding resources around the proposed RTTT goals and projects as evidenced by the coordination of State Longitudinal Data System (SLDS) and School Improvement Grant (SIG) funds with the proposed grant and that all new grants awards will be focused towards goals and projects, e.g., Math and Science Partnership Grants for Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM).

Although the state indicates that the structure of the budget can be divided into the categories of human capacity and infrastructure, the Budget Summary Narrative is lacking in specificity in how funding within Budget Categories of the proposed fourteen projects and its targets are correlated by grant year.

The reorganization of the state department of education demonstrates alignment within the four ARRA areas of reform and that funds will be repurposed toward the states’ reform plan.

Therefore the evaluation of the criterion is in the middle range. The extent to which the plan will ensure the capacity to implement the plan is limited as reflected in the comments that include support for promising practices, wide dissemination of practices, how LEAs will be accountable, and lack of clarity between the narrative and budget categories for the proposed projects.

(ii) The state's support of a broad group of stakeholders is evidenced by:

- Referenced within (A)(1)(iii), 62% of the state's LEAs are participating in the proposed reform agenda which represents 67.4% of the students (71% of students in poverty) and 69.6% of the schools.
- A stakeholder forum was held November 23, 2009 that included the Governor, legislators, members of SBOE, teacher organizations, higher education, business and community members.
- Via a web-based survey, approximately 5000 responses were received from stakeholders. Examples of responses include educators (74.8%), parents (38.6%), citizens (35.3%), community leaders (9.1%) and legislators (0.2%) from areas across the state.
- Six letters of support were received from 4 universities and 2 chamber of commerce.

The response is limited in the extent and strength of broad stakeholder support statewide. Supporting evidence includes the lack local teacher unions' support referenced within (A)(1)(iii) that includes large LEAs and related Appendices reflecting a lack of statements and letters from stakeholders such as local teacher unions, educational association leaders, parent teacher associations, and/or charter school authorizers.

Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the medium range as the lack of support from a broad group of stakeholders limits the strength and potential for implementation of the plan.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	18
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	14

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

(i) Examples of the state's ability over the past several years to make progress in raising achievement and closing gaps include:

- The provision of state funds for the development of content and performance standards (1993 Outstanding Schools Act) and state assessments.
- The use of ARRA funds to allow schools to operate and meet state and federal requirements.
- The provision of unique student identifiers via SLDS.
- Accepting actively certified teachers from other states.
- The existence of accountability plans and the ability to intervene in districts with continued unacceptable student performance.

The application is unclear as to how it has historically worked specifically in the reform area of the development of great teachers and leaders which negatively impacts the demonstration of significant progress. Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the high range.

(ii) As indicated in (A) (3) (ii) Evidence, (Appendix 12) the state provides the NAEP scale scores that reflect mixed results. Upon review it appears that data on assessments required under ESEA since 2003 are not provided. The narrative is lacking specificity in the analysis of the data indicating student outcomes overall and by sub-group since 2003 (Appendix 12). While the response reflects historical efforts and ongoing challenges in reducing the achievement gap, the narrative does not reflect an analysis of the achievement gap data. Although the state has supported work towards reducing the graduation with several programs, e.g., Missouri Options Program, A+ Schools Program, and recent work with the National Dropout

Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities, it acknowledges that the increase in graduation rates have changed minimally since 2003.

The state indicates that connections between the student achievement and the actions that have contributed to the results include:

- The Department adding specificity and direction by delineating Grade-Level Expectations for content areas graded 3-8 and Course-Level Expectations for high school.
- Missouri statute indicating standards established for statewide assessments to be consistent with those established by NAEP
- Teacher involvement in the MAP assessment process
- Annual Performance Report in place of once every five years.

The response is lacking clarity in the extent to which it has improved student outcomes as reflected in lack of data on assessments and the analysis of data within the narrative.

Therefore the evaluation of the criterion is in the middle range. The incremental progress and lack of clarity within the response limits the extent to which the state has demonstrated raising achievement and closing achieving gaps.

Total	125	81
-------	-----	----

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	25
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	5
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
(i) The state's strength in their commitment to adopting a common set of high-quality standards is evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current Show Me Standards, as recent as 2008 was judged as "world-class" by Education Next and that the state was one of the original "New Standards" states for rigorous standards and performance-based assessments. • Evidence for (B)(1)(i) includes a copy of the MOU (Appendix 13) showing it is part of a standards consortium made up of a majority of States in the country (48). • Appendix 14 provides evidence that the common set of K-12 standards are internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness and copies of the current common core standards. Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the high range.		
(ii) The state has made progress towards the adoption of a common set of K-12 standards that is evidenced by the Standards Implementation Timeline and the plan to provide LEA technical support. The progress includes the development and implementation of STEM curriculum aligned to the new standards. The time line reflects that the Common Core Standards will be adopted at or before the August 19-20, 2010 State Board Meeting. Therefore, the evaluation of the criteria is in the low range.		
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5

(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>(i) The state's strength in the commitment to adopt a common set of high quality assessments is evidence by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The passing of the Missouri Outstanding Schools Act (MOSA) mandating large-scale performance-based assessments. • The development of the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) that includes multiple grade levels, content areas and high school End-of-Course assessments. The state has 15 years of experience in creating and scoring assessment. • The State will continue to partner with LEAs in support of formative assessments, as demonstrated with MAP. • Missouri is a governing member of the SMARTER Balance Assessment Consortium to develop formative assessment and summative assessments. • The principles of the SMARTER Balance Assessment system are of high quality that include accountability, involves of educators, and are grounded in standards-based curriculum. • Exhibit 1-Preliminary Scope of Work indicates that the LEA will implement the model P-12 (Pre-K through 12th grade) curriculum that is aligned with the Common Core and College Ready Standards or develop a local model P-12 curriculum that is aligned with the Common Core and College Ready Standards. The LEAs will also focus professional development on implementation of the new model curriculum or the updated local curriculum and expand the number of advanced courses and STEM opportunities. <p>Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the high range.</p> <p>(ii) The State has joined a majority of states (33) in the SMARTER Balance Assessment Consortium. Therefore, the evaluation is in the high range.</p>		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	19
<p>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>The response reflects the state has demonstrated a significant commitment to supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high quality assessments and is evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of P-20 (early childhood through career education) policy and system is evidenced by Senate Bills 580, 389 and Early Learning Standards (Appendix 1) that provides components, standards, indicators with examples. • The P-20 system activities around common core K-12 standards includes alignment of early childhood and Work Ready standards that will support LEAs with the provision of standard transition documents, training/professional development, dissemination and implementation of high quality instrument(s) and assessment materials (Exhibit 1-Preliminary Scope of Work), completion of assessment linking studies and administering MAP in reading, mathematics, writing, listening, and speaking. • There are plans to expand the assessment consortium to all P-20 content. Stakeholders will have access to data through the Show-Me Portal. The state provides activities, timelines and those responsible for the SMARTER Balance Assessment formative assessment work. • Activities are provided in support of increased offerings of advanced course/dual credit, internship and STEM course work for all students that includes, for the class of 2014, the provision of grants to LEAs to afford students the ability to take 60 college credit hours and participate in a minimum of one field career experience. • The response indicates that teachers and leaders will know and be accountable for inspiring and effective instruction for all students. This goal is evidenced by the development of P-12 curriculum framework in 15 areas with a special STEM focus to demonstrate integration across all content 		

areas. Connection of the assessment system across the content areas will incentivize LEAs to align instruction.

- LEAs activities include alignment of district curriculum to the updated state standards and focus professional development on the implementation of the new curriculum.
- The state acknowledges the importance of an electronic bank of formative and interim assessments to monitor student progress and adjust instruction where needed and that the state's teachers will develop and approve the items.

Therefore the evaluation of the criterion is in the high range.

Total	70	54
-------	----	----

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	24
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) The application reflects that the state's SLDS meets each of the 12 elements of the America Competes Act.		
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	5
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) The state's response indicates that the Missouri Comprehensive Data System (MCDS) will provide information/data to inform decisions by a broad group of stakeholders. The timeline to roll out all three parts by December 2010 is ambitious. The state indicates the level of information it plans to have accessible at the Pre-K through grade 12 and post-secondary levels. Access to both formative and summative assessments from the data warehouse will be used to engage parents, students, teachers, principals to further support instruction. The state reflects that the MCDS supports the state's three over arching goals. The state's plan includes key activities, timelines, activities and responsible parties reflecting the extent to which the plan will ensure access and use of state data. Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the high range.		
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	15
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	5
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	5
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	5
(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) (i) The state has a high quality plan supporting the acquisition and use of local instructional improvement systems that is evidenced by: The establishment of Certified Data Teams for state and regional level to serve as resources for LEAs and schools supports the increased adoption and use of instructional improvement systems. The development of a web-based continuing certification process for local Data Teams supports acquisition and use of the (local or state provided) instructional improvement system. The response is fostering the use of data-		

gathering tools that provide real-time actionable data and can serve to inform and improve instructional practices by linking student, teacher and leader performance. The response indicates that proposed RTTT funds will be used to provide resources for designated districts to transition their current data management and instructional improvement system to the MCDA to make instructional decisions.

Therefore the evaluation of the criterion is in the high range.

(ii) The state's plan exhibits appropriate support to LEAs and schools in the use of instructional improvement systems is evidenced by:

- Exhibit I – Preliminary Scope of Work C. LEA actions support the plan for use of Data Teams in every LEA by 2012. Professional development through the Data Team Certification process will serve to support adoption and use of the instructional improvement systems.
- Key Activity 2 reflects that teachers will participate in a research protocol within the instructional data gathering tool in order to link teacher practices to student achievement.
- A pilot project will allow for analyzing data to inform ongoing professional development efforts.

Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the high range.

(iii) The application indicates the provision of mini-grants to encourage a broad range of researchers to investigate narrowly focused questions. The Consortium will assist LEAs, schools, and charters in understanding data to evaluate instructional practice. The state provides examples of areas of research, along with funding, that reflect working towards continuous instructional improvement. Previous work based on the Chicago Consortium of School Research and grant funding from the Eweign Marion Kauffman Foundation grounds the proposed consortium work with the goal to conduct specific studies based on the needs of regions' schools and districts.

Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the high range and acknowledges the plan's extensive timelines, activities, and responsible parties supporting the availability of the data to researchers.

Total		47	44
--------------	--	-----------	-----------

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	9
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	2
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	4
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	3

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

(i) The legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions for teachers and principals is evidenced by:

- Chapter 168.021, Revised Statutes of Missouri (2009) indicates that the SBOE will issue certificates upon college credit and that the professional certificate classification is based from a state-approved baccalaureate-level teacher preparation program.
- The law reflects that the American Board of Certification for Teacher Excellence can serve as an alternate route to certification for a teacher.
- The response does not reflect alternate routes of certification for principals.
- The alternative route for principals provides the option to test out of a course.

The response reflects six alternative options to certification for teachers and three options routes for principals. Within the response, information on which five elements, as defined in the alternative routes to

certification, the teacher and principal routes meet is limited. The American Board of Certification for Teacher Excellence(ABCTE)provides certification with sixty contact hours of which elementary, early childhood education or special education are excluded. ABCTE provides an alternative route for secondary teachers in specific subjects that include mathematics, science, communication arts, and social studies. The response includes a chart that reflects teachers and principals certified through all available routes in 2009. The current options for alternative routes reflect a larger focus on teachers. Based on the routes provided in the response, the number of the five elements within the alternative routes to certification definition, for teachers and principals, that are being met is not clear.

Therefore the evaluation of the criterion is in the low range because the current alternative routes to certification for principals limits the high quality pathways for principals.

(ii) The response reflects six alternative routes for certification for teachers and principals that are in use are six and three respectively. The current alternative routes for principals are associated with IHEs.

Therefore the evaluation of the criterion is in the middle range because the limited extent of the current alternative routes in use for principals, limits the state's ability to provide high quality pathways for principals.

(iii) Teacher shortages are identified through the state's School Core Data system. The options for filling special education positions include Transition to Teaching program, two Tuition Reimbursement programs, and related federal funding. Leadership programs are offered for urban, rural and charter settings.

The response reflects a limited extent to which the state has a process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of shortages for both principals and teachers. There is not a yearly identification of principal shortages and the state does not identify teacher shortages in areas other than special education and guidance. The response indicates that shortages for teachers and principals are being filled by model programs in place in Missouri IHEs for working in unique settings. The response does not provide specificity on the numbers of teachers and principals that are needed and that have been placed in areas of shortage, to include non unique settings.

Therefore the evaluation of the criterion is in the middle range. The state's current status limits its ability to identify areas of teacher and principal shortages.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	41
(i) Measuring student growth	5	3
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	11
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	9
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	18

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

(i) The proposed approach to measuring student growth for each student is evidenced by the establishment of a Reform Initiative Work Group, Measuring Teacher/Leader Effects, made up of a broad group of stakeholders to study theory around Student Growth, Percentiles and Value-Added Models at the classroom, LEA, and state level. Although the states activities reflect committee work on studying two regression-based growth models, there is lack of clarity about how it will measure student growth for each student and between two periods of time. Although the state timeline reflects that it will be "ongoing," the activities for establishing clear approaches to measuring student growth ends summer 2010 with the establishment of a technical advisory committee. The timeline and activities do not reflect a clear approach of when and how many LEAs will use the student growth model.

Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the middle range. The response lacks clarity and specificity to how the state will establish clear approaches to measuring student growth and measure it for each individual student.

(ii) The proposed design and implementation of evaluation systems for teachers and leaders is evidenced by:

- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Exhibit 1 – Preliminary Scope of Work LEA actions includes working with local stakeholders to adopt state models for educator evaluation that includes measures of student performance OR develop a local model that includes the measures of student performance.
- The current Performance Based Teacher Evaluation (PBTE) and Performance Based Principal Evaluation (PBPE) models include the annual student performance data based on standards (Appendix A).
- Project 9: Model Educator Performance Assessment reflects the number of LEAs that will pilot the performance assessment system that includes no less than 391 in Year 3 and 561 in Year 4.
- The state's response indicates that responsible parties to design and develop the teacher evaluation plan include LEAs and charters.
- In educator evaluation planning process includes frequent feedback, opportunities for mentoring, coaching, and individualized professional development.
- Multiple rating categories for teacher evaluations include classroom success, benchmarks, and annual performance based on standards.

The state's response is unclear as to how student growth model will be used as a significant factor for teacher and principal evaluations. The wording within the LEA actions of the Preliminary Scope of Work does not reflect that student growth will be a significant factor in evaluations. The response lacks strength that is evidenced within the PBTE and the PBPE. The response wording reflects that the teacher and leader evaluation systems "should" include multiple measures as opposed to they "will" include multiple measures.

Therefore, the evaluation of the criteria is in the high range. The extent to which the plan uses student growth as a significant factor limits the state's efforts to develop evaluation systems.

(iii) The response reflects that specific groups of teachers will receive observations and principals will receive annual evaluations that include a review of student performance data. The provision and reviewing of student performance measures exists in teacher and principal evaluation models. The response indicates that beginning teachers, teachers with students with unacceptable performance, and effective teachers will receive observations. It is unclear if teachers will be provided student growth for their respective students, classes and schools.

Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the high range and is evidenced by a clear plan of how and when teachers and principals will be evaluated.

(iv) The state's response indicates that the retooled PBTE and PBLE will enable specific professional development needs. Induction/mentoring standards (Santa Cruz model for teachers and Wallace Foundation model for principals) are scheduled to be strengthened and will require collaboration towards a statewide model of induction (Appendix 22). Leadership and Teacher Academies are scheduled to support districts and charter schools in the provision of professional development. The plan lacks specificity of a teacher or principal improvement plan that includes, but is not limited to, recommended areas of growth, how identified deficiencies will be improved, and the plan for related professional development based on the evaluation. The response and implementation plan indicates the development of model policies to be informed by the work of the Reform Initiative Work Group, that includes a current recommendation of two regression-based growth models. Although performance measures indicate progress in compensating teachers and principals, the response does not communicate how the plan will provide opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities. Performance measures indicate projected yearly progress in granting tenure and/or full certification to teachers and principals but it is unclear from the plan whether to grant tenure and/or certification based on use of rigorous standards and transparent and fair procedures. The response indicates the state will work collaboratively with charters, LEAs and professional educator organizations in the development of model policies for removing ineffective teachers and principals (or counseling them into

other fields). The plan does not indicate how the evaluation(s) will be used to inform decisions about removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals.

Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the middle range. The scope of the plan in the areas of compensating, granting tenure or certification, or removing staff is weak and limits the ability to use evaluations to inform decisions.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	15
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	10
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	5
(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>(i) The state indicates it is currently not able to identify highly-effective teachers and principals using data linked to student performance and has no process for ensuring that high-poverty and high-minority students have access to highly effective educators. The state plans to expand upon prior work with Teach for America and the future work of the Highly Effective Teachers Work group to establish criteria for identifying highly effective teachers and principals that includes an audit to determine effectiveness.</p> <p>Activities within the implementation plan include that the Preparation of Teachers and Leaders of High-Needs Schools criteria for identifying effective teacher preparation programs to be incorporated within the Missouri Standards for Educator Preparation. The implementation plan reflects the establishment of the Model Compensation/Contracts subgroup that will make recommendations regarding the development of related policies to be implemented in high-need schools. The response lacks specificity that ensures that high-poverty and/or high-minority students will have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals. Based upon the teacher/principal evaluation system, there is a lack of specificity about how highly effective teachers and principals will be encouraged, e.g., financial compensation or bonuses, to work with high-poverty and/or high-minority students after the second year of the grant. The location of the definition of high-minority and low-minority schools, as defined by the State for the purposes of the States' Teacher Equity Plan, is not found within the response. The response provides a rationale for the performance measures. The performance measure that indicates 25% of teachers and principals who are ineffective will be working in schools by the end of 2013 – 2014, reflects a lack of support for high-poverty and/or high minority schools.</p> <p>While the response reflects the work around developing of a plan, the extent of the plan lacks specificity and aspiration around ensuring high-poverty and/or high-minority schools will have access to highly effective teachers and principals. Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the middle range.</p> <p>(ii) The state currently has incentives in place for new teachers of special education areas that include deaf educators. The implementation plan reflects the establishment of the Recruiting/Retaining Teachers for Hard to Staff Areas subgroup. Based on their recommendation(s) the model recruitment and compensation policies will be developed for use by Participating LEAs and charters. The response does not reflect a focus on STEM to increase numbers of effective teachers in hard-to-staff areas of mathematics and science. The response lacks specificity in how it is currently engaged with higher education, national leaders, and/or the business community to build upon the results of its implementation plan. The implementation timeline beyond 2012 does not provide measures of determining success and adjustments of the plan, e.g., yearly supply and demand, to meet the performance measures.</p> <p>Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the middle range. The limited extent of the plan to increase staff in hard-to-staff areas impacts the state's ability to ensure equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals.</p>		
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	10
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	5

(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	5
<p>(D)(4) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>(i) The state's response reflects that in December 2009 the state compiled the first set of data, linking beginning teachers with their respective preparation program. The response reflects the linking of student achievement and student growth data and that the data will be linked for both teachers and principals. Within the Budget Narrative, Project 10: Improving Teacher Preparation indicates that the MCDS will provide the capacity to link and offer multivariate analyses to student achievement for all educator preparation entities and publicly report the results. The response and budget narrative indicate a process for linking and publicizing student achievement data to teachers, principals and their credentialing programs.</p> <p>Based on the state's appropriate plans to link the teacher and principal data to in-State programs and publicly report it, the evaluation of the criterion is in the high range.</p> <p>(ii) Within the response, through collaboration with IHEs and other credentialing entities, the state describes the future process to expand successful preparation and credentialing programs that includes revision of the current teacher and principal preparation program approval through the Missouri Standards for Educator Preparation (MoSTEP).</p> <p>The implementation plan includes the convening of a blue ribbon task force to review current research on teacher and principal preparation effectiveness to be followed by the development of an educator preparation system.</p> <p>Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the high range. The extent of the plan to expand preparation programs appropriately supports the state's plan to improve the effectiveness of preparation programs.</p>		
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	16
(i) Providing effective support	10	8
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	8
<p>(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>(i) The Missouri Outstanding Schools Act of 1993 provides support for the provision of regional professional development centers and the set aside of professional development funding requiring LEAs to spend 1% of state aid for professional development. The State also requires that new teachers and leaders be provided district sponsored mentoring for their first two years.</p> <p>The states response to providing effective professional development support to teachers and students is evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MOU Exhibit 1 – Preliminary Scope of Work LEA actions indicate the LEA will participate in professional development and training for the use of linked student performance, teacher practice, and leadership decision data to improve student performance. • The expansion of the current Professional Learning Communities (PLC) project to lowest performing schools in the state. The current PLC model includes planned collaboration time, creation of common assessments, and analyzing data. • The Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (BTAP) will be expanded into a statewide mentoring model that is informed by Wallace Foundation funded models and based on TFA model to the Missouri Comprehensive Induction Program. Critical skills that regional centers must possess to address the needs of the lowest performing schools will be identified. • In addition to state content consultant specialists, a master teacher and master principal will work in each regional center. • Professional development includes the use of data by teachers and principals. 		

There is not an identification of the baseline for student achievement to identify the schools or high-students so regional centers can support LEAs with high-need students. Therefore the evaluation of the criterion is high.

(ii) The state's response to measure, evaluate and continuously improve the effectiveness of supports is evidenced by:

- The piloting and annual evaluation the System of Support rubric on the effectiveness of the system to meet LEA needs.
- A biannual implementation audit in support of fidelity in implementation and exploration of the relationship between instructional initiatives and gains in student achievement.
- The linking student achievement data to professional development.

The plan lacks strength and specifics in the way(s) in which it will evaluate the effectiveness of the supports in order to improve student achievement. It is unclear how the evaluation results will be used to within the system of support to improve or remove the support.

Therefore the evaluation of the criterion is in the low range due to the lack of specificity about how to evaluate effectiveness. This limits the ability of the state to continuously improve student achievement.

Total	138	91

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>The state's response successfully indicates that it has legal and statutory authority to intervene in the persistently lowest-achieving schools and is evidenced by LEA161.092 RSMo grants the authority to the SBOE to supervise the public schools. Additional authority is evidenced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Missouri School Improvement Program (5 CSR 50-345.100) provides a process for accrediting schools and serves as the basis for determining intervention at the school level. • Missouri Revised Statue Section 162.081.1 provides the criteria for the lapse of a school district if the district is classified unaccredited for two successive school years by the SBOE. <p>Therefore the evaluation of the criterion is in the high range.</p>		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	30
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	25
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>(i) The state's response successfully reflects definitions, criteria and processes to identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools and any non-Title I eligible secondary schools that would be considered persistently lowest-achieving schools that meet that definition of this notice. Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the high range.</p> <p>(ii) The state's support for LEAs in turning around schools is evidenced by:</p>		

- MOU Exhibit 1 – Preliminary Scope of Work LEA actions communicate that LEAs will implement the Missouri Turnaround Model, School Improvement Plans, or targeted sub-group interventions as appropriate in the school district, charter school or school.
- The state plans to use the following three key activities to implement the turnaround, restart, or transformation model or close identified lowest-achieving schools during the grant period.
 - Implement a statewide framework for Quality Schools
 - Create the Missouri Turnaround Model
 - Provide a braided system of support.
- The state plans to use RTTT, SIG, and State Fiscal Stabilization Funds (SFSF) to support the currently identified Tier 1 and Tier 2 schools.
- Using SIG funds, the state has issued a request for proposal for service providers to assist designated LEAs with identified schools in identifying and implementing a plan that meets the required elements of the intervention model selected.
- Missouri Turn Around Model activities provide support to LEAs in the following ways:
 - Provide competitive grants to recruit and retain effective teachers and principals for low achieving schools
 - Provide incentives to teachers and principals that demonstrate results in turn around schools
 - Work with local boards of education on the effective use of teacher and principal evaluation systems that include student growth.
- RTTT funding will be used to provide competitive grants supporting early learning programs.
- Budget Narrative for Project 12: Regional Service Centers reflects Missouri's plan to create regional support centers that support 100,000 students and with distribution of staff and contracted services determined by the needs of the population serviced.

The extent of the state's plan to turn around the lowest achieving schools is limited with the following serving as examples:

- The response lacks clarity of how the adjusted funding would reflect support for specifically high-need students, lowest-performing, high-poverty and/or high-minority schools.
- The response lacks clarity on the plans for sustainability of the intervention models beyond the grant period.
- It is unclear how the LEAs will be held accountable for the success of the intervention model.
- The response is unclear about the total number of persistently lowest-achieving schools that the State or LEA has attempted to turn around in the last five years, the approach used, and the results (Evidence for (E)(2)).

Therefore, the evaluation of the criteria is in the middle range. The lack of how LEAs will be held accountable and how funding will support high-need students limits the extent to which the state's plan will provide support to turning around the schools.

Total	50	40
-------	----	----

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	2
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	0
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	2
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		

(i) Although the narrative reflects an increase in the financial appropriations for the basic formula in FY 2009, FY 2010 and FY 2011, the response does not include financial data to show that the total revenues for FY 2009 are greater than or equal to the total revenues for FY 2008. The narrative communicates that the state has not cut funding to public schools; but, based on the response, it remains unclear if the revenues increased, remained equal or decreased.

Therefore the evaluation of the criterion is in the low range because the data related to the criteria is not provided.

(ii) The response indicates that where there are high concentrations of students that receive free-and-reduced-price lunches, extra weighting considerations are provided in a formula that allows LEAs and less local wealth LEAs to receive more state aid.

The response does not include state's policies that lead to equitable funding between high-need LEAs and other LEAs, and within LEAs, between high –poverty schools and other schools. Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the low range.

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	16
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	2
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	6
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	0
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	0

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

(i) Based on the state's revised statute 160.400, RSMo. 14. the SDE is authorized to develop standards for professional practice and criteria for sponsorship of charter schools and ensure each sponsor is in compliance with all requirements under sections 160.400 to 160.420 and 167.349, RSMo, for each charter school sponsored by any sponsor.

Of the FY 2009-10 approved charters, 33 are approved with 31 sponsored by universities or colleges. FY 2009 and FY 2010 percentages of charters represent 2% of the total public school buildings.

Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the low range. The current low cap on charter schools, as evidenced by charters representing 2% of the total public school buildings, demonstrates limits on increasing high-performing charter schools.

(ii) The states' laws, statutes and regulations to ensure conditions for high performing charters are evidenced by:

- Section 160.405, RSMo. 6. requires the governing board and charter staff to review the schools' performance a minimum of every two years or at anytime the charter is transferred to another entity.
- The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education is required to commission a study on student performance in comparison with an equivalent group of students in an equivalent demographic and geographic area.
- Along with traditional public schools, charters submit data to the MOSIS and Core Data Collection processes in support of generating annual report cards. For proposed high-risk or alternative charter schools, sponsors shall approve comprehensive academic and behavioral measures to determine whether students are meeting performance standards on a different time frame as specified in that school's charter. Student performance will be assessed comprehensively to determine whether a high risk or alternative charter school has documented adequate student progress. Student

performance shall be based on sponsor-approved comprehensive measures and standardized public school measures.

- Chapter 160.405 section 5 provides financial student performance accountability. The charter will provide an annual audit by a Certified Public Accountant (CPA) that will be published on the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s web site. The charter must design a method to measure pupil progress that is adopted by the SBOE and collect baseline data at least the first three years to determine performance.
- Chapter 160.405 reflects that if a charter sponsor has three or more charters, one-third of the charters will be schools that recruit dropouts or high-risk students.
- Proposed changing in statue includes a performance contract, terms for placing a charter on probation, and allowing the SBOE to close a charter.
- Implementation of the standards for sponsorship and evaluation process are based on the work of NACSA.
- Evidence for (F)(2)(i) reflects a slight increase, albeit it minimum in overall numbers, in the number of applications made in the state and approved.

Therefore, the evaluation of the criterion is in the high range. The lack of information on the history of charter school academic performance limits the extent of the state’s plan to ensure successful conditions for charters.

(iii) The State’s charter school receiving equitable funding compared to traditional schools is evidenced by:

- Senate Bill 287 provides charters the ability to become an independent LEA. For the 2010 school year, all charters will be independent LEAs. A RSMo charter that becomes an independent LEA receives all state and federal payments from the Department. The Department calculates using the formula utilized for traditional public schools.
- Section 160.415.4, RSMo reflects that state school aid for LEA charter schools will receive local tax revenues per weighted ADA and all other state aid attributable to charter LEA students.
- Section 160.415.8 and 160.415.9 provides transportation state aid and can contract to provide transportation of their students to the charter school.

The response reflects that the State’s charter schools receive equitable funding and a proportionate share of the local, State, and Federal revenues. Therefore the evaluation of the criterion is in the high range.

(iv) The extent to which the State provides charter school funding for facilities is very limited as evidenced by:

- There are not applicable state statutes or regulations that would allow for charter facility funding. Charters must provide facilities funding through their operating budgets.
- The state does not provide facilities funding for any public schools, including charters. Therefore the state does not provide direct facility assistance for charters.

Since the state does not provide direct facility assistance for charters the evaluation of the criterion is in the low range.

(v) The response does not reflect that the state currently operates innovative autonomous public schools other than charter schools. Although the response reflects that it will offer funding incentives, it lack clarity in when or how they will be funded. Therefore the evaluation of the criterion is in the low range.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	0
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		

The response does not reflect law, regulation or policy supporting significant reform conditions. A description of applicable key education laws, statutes, regulations, or relevant key legal documents is not provided. Although there is a description of existing innovative models, it does not include conditions that reflect an increase in student achievement or graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps, or other important outcomes. Therefore the evaluation of the criterion is in the low range.

Total	55	18
-------	----	----

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	0

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state's STEM strategies, timelines and responsibilities are correlated within the states' three overarching goals, including an academic goal of the percent of students graduating from high school with a concentration in STEM related coursework to double by 2014-1015 and are aligned within the State Success Factors and designated State Reform Conditions. The STEM plan is evidenced by:

- Working with business and industry experts to define the number of credits and courses for a diploma with a STEM concentration and create STEM applied learning apprenticeship opportunities and incentives for students to participate. This effort will be supported by the state updating the high school graduation requirements to encourage dual credit, internships and STEM opportunities for all students.
- Teachers will receive support based on restructuring teacher certification with a STEM emphasis and related incentives, incorporating STEM into teacher preparation programs, provision of a STEM electronic forum with opportunities for teachers to collaborate and access STEM resources, and the development of partnerships with business and industry to provide alternate routes programs with an emphasis on hard-to-teach STEM subjects.
- The provision of a rigorous course of study with STEM stakeholders drafting a P-12 curriculum with STEM emphasis.
- The provision of competitive grants to teachers and leaders preparation programs to focus on STEM and other high need areas.
- Through the Tier 2 state-wide interventions, the state will identify schools in need of intense intervention with supports to address STEM needs, along with others such as achievement gaps.

The state's response does not reflect how it will address the needs of underrepresented groups and women and girls in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.

Total	15	0
-------	----	---

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

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

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The state application begins with P-20 approach towards educational reform in which teachers and leaders will be held accountable for student success. The academic goals demonstrate a focus on increasing student achievement, decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups, increasing high school graduation rates and increasing college enrollment.

The state demonstrated that 62% of LEAs responded positively to the MOU Terms reflecting a proposed impact on 67.4% of K-12 students and 71% of students in poverty. The state's response also reflects 100% of participating LEAs responding positively across each of the four areas of reform. It is acknowledged that local teacher unions that did not provide letters of support questions.

The state's over arching goals and academic goals are reflected across each of the four education reform areas. The plans are more coherent and comprehensive in the areas of the State Success Factors, Standards and Assessments, and Data Systems to Support Instruction. The response generally lacks clarity in successfully meeting the criterion of the areas of Great Leaders and Teachers, Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools and General criterion. But the level of the state's plans that includes key objectives, activities and timelines merit moving forward with their proposed reform plans. The budget reflects the state and the LEAs will use Race to the Top funds to increase student achievement, decrease achievement gaps across subgroups, and increase rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

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

Grand Total	500	328
--------------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

Missouri Application #3300MO-7



A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	38
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	3
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	25
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	10

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

(A) (1) (i): The State has been working on various reforms for over a decade, some of which are related to the RTTT reform areas and thus has experience in what is needed to move a reform agenda forward. The planned RTTT reform agenda builds on these areas and introduces new areas that are planned with the goal of "getting teachers and leaders to work collaboratively within a statewide system of braided supports to ensure that all students complete high school with the necessary tools to be college and career ready."

The academic goals are ambitious, e.g., 65% of the 4th grade students will be proficient or advanced in grade 4 math by the end of the grant period; the achievement gap between Black and White students in 4th grade math will be reduced by 12% by the end of the grant period, but it is questionable whether the goals can be reached given the timelines for implementation of key parts of the plan. Implementation of key activities that touch the academic lives of students often do not take place until into year 2 and beyond.

The new model of teacher evaluation does not appear to include student growth as a measure of teacher effectiveness. The application states that the new evaluation of teacher effectiveness will include: 1) a peer observation tool; 2) a new Performance-Based Teacher Evaluation tool; and, 3) guidelines for building and district-level decision-making. There is no information about the content of the performance-based teacher evaluation tool.

There is concern that the MoU has not been signed by LEA teacher association presidents in many districts where the number of students in poverty is well over 50%. These are districts where the reform agenda can have the largest impact.

(A) (1) (ii): The MoU clearly states what is expected of each participating LEA and includes the following sections: scope of work section, project administration (participation responsibilities, state responsibilities, joint responsibilities, state recourse for LEA non performance), assurances, modifications, and duration/termination. The MoU is strong and clearly written.

Appendix 5 includes the information about LEA support as indicated by signatures on the MoU. Several signed MoUs were also included and it is not clear why these in particular were included. With the exception of letters of support from 5 universities and 2 chambers of commerce there are no other letters of support from the broad constituency needed to effect a statewide reform.

Although 62% of the teachers association presidents have signed their LEAs MoU, there are 33 LEAs (38%) where the president of the local teachers' association did not sign the MoU. Of these, 14 were small LEAs, 7 were medium-sized LEAs, and 12 were large LEAs. The percent of students in poverty in the small LEAs ranged from 33% to 71%, in medium-sized LEAs from 19% to 83%, and in large-sized LEAs from 20% to 75%. The largest LEA without teacher association support--Springfield with 55 schools--has close to

50% of its students in poverty. The percentages of students in poverty in each of the 33 LEAs represent a lot of disenfranchised students throughout the state who would benefit from the reform agenda planned by the state and who may not receive the needed changes in their districts because the teachers association has not signed onto the reform agenda.

(A) (1) (iii):

As noted in the application, Missouri is a state with a great need for comprehensive reform that is targeted to touch the lives of all of its students, particularly those in poverty. The reform agenda the state has planned includes the components of RTTT and it has targeted goals in each area that appear to be ambitious. However, over one-third of the districts who have stated a commitment to RTTT do not have the support of their local teachers association; this does not bode well for the State being able to build the capacity necessary to translate into broad impact statewide. Teacher bargaining around key issues in RTTT (e.g., teacher evaluation) could thwart implementation of a reform agenda in high-need districts.

There is concern that the number of participating LEAs that may not have teacher support (as noted in above discussion) may effect the state's ability to increase the student achievement targets in its plan. The LEAs that have come on board and have indicated their full support will be in a good position to meet the targeted goals, however, districts where there may not be teacher association support could result in teachers not becoming in reform efforts targeted to raise academic achievement of students. If this occurs, the intention to decrease the achievement gap among specific sub-groups will be affected, as will graduation rates, and increases in college enrollment.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	18
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	16
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	2

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

(A) (2) (i): The Department of education is currently planning a complete reorganization to better support the new state goals.

(a) As part of the reorganization, there will new divisions within an overall category called Learning Services. The new plan will use established positions to ensure that all reforms planned are sustainable. There will be 4 divisions, each associated with a specific RTTT area, e.g., Educator Quality Division for Great Teachers/Leaders.

(b): An audit conducted in May 2010 by Douglas Reeves identified specific programs that have proven to be very effective in improving student achievement. The evaluation process as exemplified by the audit conducted by Reeves will become a way the State makes decisions regarding the effectiveness of delivering services, determining best practices, and disseminating information throughout the state.

(c): Missouri states it will provide effective and efficient operations and processes for implementing its RTTT grant application and oversight, budget reporting and monitoring, performance measure tracking and reporting, and fund disbursement by using the established ePeGS system and the current funds disbursement procedures and systems but it does not explain how this will occur.

(d) The application states that the reorganization of the Department of Education will ensure that the Missouri plan is sustainable. The budget narrative describes a continual partnership with regional service centers. the reorganization of the Department also is a catalyst for a repurposing and redistribution of current budget allocations to support the goals of the state's plan.

(e): The reorganization of the Department of Education will utilize existing personnel who will work in different capacities, all related to the RTTT grant areas, and will use of other sources of revenue available to the State such as Title I, IDEA, Workforce Enhancement Grants that will according to the application enable the State to sustain the RTTT agenda.

The state's budget is adequate to provide leadership to implement the reform plan, support participating LEAs, provide effective and efficient operations and processes for implementing its RTTT grant, and it will use the funds to accomplish RTTT specific goals and activities. The main concern as noted above, is that some of processes are not as clearly articulated as needed for disbursement of funds.

(A) (2) (ii):

(a): A total of 347 of the State's 560 LEAs (representing 62% of the State's LEAs, including charter school LEAs) signed the MoU. However, as noted above in A1:

Although the MoU has been signed by several representatives of 62% of the LEAs, 38% of the LEAs do not have the signature of the president of the local teachers' association. Of these LEAs without a teacher association commitment, 14 were small LEAs, 7 were medium-sized LEAs, and 12 were large LEAs. The percent of students in poverty (which typically translates into low performing students) in the small LEAs ranged from 33% to 71%, in medium-sized LEAs from 19% to 83%, and in large-sized LEAs from 20% to 75%. The largest LEA without teacher association support--Springfield with 55 schools--has close to 50% of its students in poverty. The percentages of students in poverty in each of these 33 LEAs represent a lot of disenfranchised students throughout the state who would benefit from the reform agenda planned by the state and who may not receive the needed changes in their districts because the teachers association has not signed onto the reform agenda.

(b): The State convened a stakeholder forum in November 2009 with a broad group of nearly 300 participants to discuss the elements of the RTTT reform agenda and to plan initiatives in each of the areas. In December 2009 the Department conducted an online statewide survey regarding the RTTT work. Questions were categorized around each of the four assurance areas. There is no way of knowing if any of the questions had to do with support and commitment for the RTTT from constituent groups because the information is missing, i.e., Appendix 9 cannot be found in the application materials. The Letters of Support noted in (A) (1) above "appear" in a non-labeled Appendix 10 and the only information that precedes the 6 letters is a list of individuals who RSVP'd to attend the stakeholder forum, i.e., there is no Appendix 9 that precedes Appendix 10.

Without letters of support from a diverse group of stakeholders it is not possible to determine if groups such as the principals' association, the school board association, the business community, the charter school community, tribal school community, parent groups such as the PTA, foundations, and the non-profit organizations support the MO reform agenda. The survey apparently had respondents from different groups but the survey was not included so it is not possible to determine if responses to survey items can be considered support for the overall reform.

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	15
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	5
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	10

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

(A) (3) (i): According to the materials, Missouri has had longstanding support from educators, policymakers, and the community for instituting reforms in education and has made progress and continues to make progress in each of the four areas. Specifically, over the last several years the State has been engaged in reform efforts related to each of the RTTT reform areas, all of which are highly commendable:

Standards and Assessments: The State has been a national leader to ensure universal proficiency. Its Outstanding Schools Act resulted in the development of rigorous content and performance standards that guarantee that all students leave high school career- and college-ready. State funds supported the development of a comprehensive system of assessments in core content areas. Missouri has established expectations for student performance on statewide assessments that are among the highest in the nation.

Data Systems to Support Instruction: In accordance with the America COMPETES Act, Missouri has successfully implemented a statewide longitudinal data system with unique student identifiers. The use of unique identifiers in statewide assessment administration has allowed LEAs to begin analyzing student performance over time at a variety of levels using a web-based system. The Missouri Student Information System (MOSIS) became fully operational in 2008.

Great Teachers and Leaders: The state only accepts out of state teachers with proper certification to teach in its schools. The Department has established a Leadership Academy which provides ongoing professional development opportunities aligned with the standards of National Staff Development Council for Missouri's teacher and leaders.

Turning Around the Lowest Performing Schools: During the 4th cycle of the Missouri School Improvement program (MSIP) the Department instituted required Accountability Plans for districts that failed to meet performance expectations. At the end of the 2010 school year 74 of the 560 (13%) will have developed Accountability Plans. To be released from an Accountability plan an LEA must demonstrate on two consecutive Annual Performance Reports that the district has met the requirements to be on an Accredited Level. The State has also taken aggressive measures to intervene with LEAs with persistently unacceptable student performance and the application spotlights a district (Wellston) where this occurred and the state had to take over the LEA. Students were assigned to a neighboring district. Similarly, the state removed St. Louis's LEA accreditation in 2007. Several other districts have also had their accreditation removed. Missouri is committed to upholding excellent standards for student performance and to providing the necessary supports for LEAs to improve.

Use of ARRA Funds: ARRA funding has been used to fill budget gaps in the state's foundation formulas for public schools. This additional funding allows schools to continue to meet the requirements of state and federal programs.

(A) (3) (ii):

(a): The evidence in this section was difficult to locate. The narrative states that NAEP data are located in Appendix 12. The Table of Contents for Appendices states that Appendix 12 is located on a specific page but the page is missing. The page preceding NAEP data is for Normandy SD so it is not clear if the NAEP data are for the state or for this LEA. Assuming the **NAEP** data are for the State and not the LEA, the data show the following:

Grade 4 Reading: There have been some minor changes in overall NAEP scores from 2002 to 2009. In 2002, the overall score was 220, in 2003 it was 222, in 2005 it was 221, in 2007 it was 221, and in 2009 it was 224.

Grade 4 Math: There have been positive changes in overall NAEP scores from 2003 to 2009. In 2003 the overall score was 235, in 2005 it was 239, in 2007 it was 239, and in 2009 it was 241.

Grade 8 Reading: There have been some minor changes in overall NAEP scores from 2002 to 2009. In 2002, the overall score was 268, in 2003 it was 267, in 2005 it was 265, in 2007 it was 263, and in 2009 it was 267.

Grade 8 Math: Generally there have been positive changes in overall NAEP scores from 2003 to 2009. In 2003 the overall score was 279 in 2005 it was 276, in 2007 it was 281, and in 2009 it was 286.

The data for the state's test, **MAP**, is in grade ranges, e.g., grades 3-5, and also is presented as Floors e.g., Floor 3-5. The narrative does not explain the difference in these types of scores and the few pages of MAP data that precede the NAEP data do not provide an explanation. The data for grade ranges will be used as evidence of change over time.

Grades 3-5 Math: There has been a decline in scores over a three year period. In 2007, the earliest data available on the chart, the score was 670.4, in 2008 the score was 671.2, and in 2009, the score was 663.4.

Grades 3-5 Communication Arts: There has been a minor decline in scores over a three year period. In 2007, the scores was 673.9, in 2008, the score was 673.4, and in 2009 the score was 672.4.

Grades 6-8 Math: There has been fluctuation over the three year time period. In 2007, the score was 653.3, in 2008, the score was 663.1, and in 2009 the score was 660.2.

Grades 6-8 Communication Arts: There has been an increase in scores over a three year period. In 2007, the score was 667.3, in 2008, the score was 687.7, and in 2009 the score was 691.2.

The application states that there have been increases in student performance on NAEP and the statewide assessment and they attribute the increases to consistent efforts to improve standards, assessments, data analysis, and instructional practices and teacher involvement in the process. However, as the data above indicate, there have not been consistent positive changes in student performance in math and reading/communication arts on either the NAEP or state assessment over time. There has been some positive changes from year to year in some cases, declines from year to year in other cases, and no change from year to year in still other cases.

(b): There is no disaggregation of the MAP data by sub-group. However there is for the NAEP data (W: white, B= Black, H: Hispanic)--again this is assuming it is overall state data and not the LEA data .

Grade 4 Reading: In 2002, W: 226, B: 198, H: no data; in 2003: W: 227, B: 203, H: 218; in 2005: W: 226, B: 200, H: 210; in 2007, W: 226, B: 200, H: 213; in 2009, W: 228, B: 204, H: 216. The changes between sub-groups has been negligible over time except between W and H where the gap is decreasing. Hispanic students are tending to increase their scores over time.

Grade 4 Math: In 2003: W: 240, B: 216, H: 220; in 2005: W: 240, B: 215, H: 221; in 2007, W: 245, B: 218, H: 234; in 2009, W: 245, B: 221, H: 237. The changes between sub-groups has been negligible over time except between W and H where the gap is decreasing. Hispanic students are tending to increase their scores over time.

Grade 8 Reading: In 2002, W: 271, B: 250, H: no data; in 2003: W: 272, B: 243, H: no data; in 2005: W: 270, B: 242, H: 258; in 2007, W: 270, B: 242, H: 248; in 2009, W: 270, B: 246, H: 260. The changes between sub-groups has been negligible over time. However, Hispanic students are tending to increase their scores over time.

Grade 8 Math: In 2003: W: 284, B: 250, no data; in 2005: W: 284, B: 2247, no data; in 2007, W: 288, B: 253, H: 270; in 2009, W: 290, B: 260, H: 284. The changes between sub-groups has been negligible over time except between W and H where the gap is decreasing. Hispanic students are tending to increase their scores over time.

The State acknowledges that reducing the achievement between sub-groups of students has been challenging. In 2004 it initiated a project that focused on closing the achievement gap. Close the Gap was a building level intervention designed to address some of the major roadblocks to improving student achievement. The interventions were helpful but not sufficient to mitigate the accumulated effect of low performance.

(c): The graduation rate has been increasing from year to year: 2007: 51.4, 2008: 53.8, 2009: 56.4.

Total	125	71
-------	-----	----

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	25
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	5

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

(B) (1) (i): Rigorous academic standards that reflect the knowledge and skills necessary for success in a competitive, technology driven world are central to Missouri's reform plan. Missouri's current standards are among the most rigorous in the country. A broad constituent stakeholder group was involved in developing the standards.

(a): The Common Core Standards will be internationally benchmarked following the guidelines recommended in Benchmarking for Success: Ensuring US Students Receive A World Class Education, a report by the National Governors Association, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and Achieve, Inc.

(b): Missouri is working with **48 states** and **three territories** as part of the National Governor's Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers consortium to develop Common Core K-12 standards and College and Career Readiness Standards.

(B) (1) (ii): The State has made a commitment to adopt the Common Core Standards at or before **August 19-20, 2010**. Following adoption the State will develop training for LEAs to implement the Common Core Standards and updated content and process standards across the P-12 spectrum. The State has further plans to link the standards to assessment and curriculum and professional development beginning in fall 2010 and continuing through 2014, the end of the grant period. The State has made some progress in each of these areas by convening groups to work on different parts of the reform agenda. For example, as part of the standards implementation timeline, in April-June 2010, the state worked with early childhood education constituents to align, update, and develop Early Learning standards. During this time the State also worked with the Department of Higher Education to align and update the Core Competencies and Standards to the Common Core K-12 and College Ready and Career Standards. A lot of work has been done during the spring months of 2010.

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

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

(B) (2) (i)/(ii): As part of the state's passage of its Outstanding School's Act , the state developed it first large scale assessment, MAP. It was developed in large part by teachers. Originally it was only for math and communication arts but has since evolved into an assessment that includes other content areas and an end-of-course assessment for high school students. As part of its commitment to relevant high quality assessments of student performance the State will link the current assessment with the Common Core Standards. It will engage with a consortium of **33** partner states participating in the SMARTER Balance Assessment Consortium to develop formative assessment. The consortium's work will be sustained by states' continuous contributions to the assessment system. The assessments will be linked to instructional materials and available to states through a web-based engine that will allow districts to access data in rapid -time in order to differentiate instruction and make appropriate educational decisions. Missouri is also committed to active participation in the development of the common summative assessments with the 33 member states of the Consortium.

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

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

(B) (3): The State has a comprehensive Plan for supporting a statewide transition to and implementation of internationally benchmarked K-12 standards that build toward college and career readiness by the time students graduate from high school. They also are developing high quality formative and summative assessments that are linked to the standards. There are two goals to the state's overall reform plan. For each Goal there are specific activities that are well articulated and that build on one another. There is broad representation of individuals and groups, specifically LEA involvement, that will participate in each activity and sub-activity. Funding appears to be adequate. The following are evidence of the commendable work

planned by the state, including the activities. There is broad involvement of different constituencies in each of the activities.

Goal #1: An integrated, seamless P-20 system will ensure that every child in Missouri is fully prepared for post secondary study and entry into the workforce. The application states there are 3 major activities to reach this goal.

Activity #1: adopt and implement the common core standards for math, reading, speaking, listening, and writing and position the state to adopt common standards in other content areas and across the P-20 spectrum. This activity has 16 sub-activities to ensure the major activity is accomplished. The activities include, as examples, implementing high quality instructional materials and assessment materials based on the common core standards, conducting assessment linking studies and assessment field tests, and administering the MAP assessments aligned to the common core standards for math, reading, writing, listening, and speaking. The timeline for all the activities for this major activity are from January 2010 to August 2012, which is reasonable for meeting targeted goals.

Activity #2: Missouri will expand the assessment consortium system to encompass all P-12 content. This activity has 7 sub-activities that include, as examples, implementing high quality instructional materials and assessment materials based on the common core standards for the formative and interim/benchmark assessments. The timeline for implementation of the sub-activities runs from January 2010 to June 2014.

Activity #3: Increase advance course offerings/dual credit, internship, and STEM coursework for all students. This activity has 7 sub-activities that include, as examples, providing LEA grants to afford all students in the class of 2014 the opportunity to take 60 college credit hours and participate in at least one field career experience, and the Missouri Board of Education adopting updated high school graduation requirements.

Goal #2: Teachers and leaders in every Missouri school and district will have the necessary commitment, knowledge, and skills, and will be held accountable for ensuring that all students receive inspiring and effective instruction. There are two major activities to reach this goal.

Activity #1: Develop a model curriculum framework consisting of course descriptions, unit outlines, measurable objectives, interim/benchmark assessments and scoring guides, evidence based instructional strategies, instructionally timelines, and a state online instruction support environment tied to the common core standards and other content areas in the P-20 spectrum. There are 4 sub-activities planned to meet the specifics of the major activity. They include, for example, aligning district curriculum to updated state standards and focusing local PD resources and plans on the implementation of the new model curriculum, and on evidence based instructional practices. The timeline for implementation runs from October 2009 to June 2014.

Activity #2: Design and disseminate grade and subject specific PD to support the implementation of the model curriculum for all content areas, including construction and administration of formative, interim/benchmark assessments to efficiently determine student needs, and the documentation of effective instructional strategies to shape future instruction. There are 6 sub-activities planned to meet this major activity that include, for example, conducting quarterly evaluations of model curriculum implementation through regional LEA focus groups and online feedback sessions to implement a continuous improvement cycle using both quantitative and qualitative data. The timeline runs from October 2010 to June 2012.

Total	70	55
-------	----	----

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	24
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		

(C) (1): Missouri has been proactive in providing LEAs with important student data and in pursuing support to continue improving and extending the state's comprehensive data system to better meet the needs of LEAs and other stakeholders. Since 2005 the MOSIS has assigned a unique identification number to each P-12 public school student in the state. During the past year the MO Department of Education has worked as part of a multi-agency collaborative to expand its existing data system beyond P-12 to incorporate both early learning and post secondary data, and with IES to capture applicable data for children birth to age five. The State has successfully met all of the requirements of the America COMPETES Act; all 12 elements are included in the system.

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data

5

5

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

(C) (2): The state has developed a quality plan that is strong and capable of ensuring that data from the state's longitudinal system are accessible to, and capable of being able to inform key stakeholders in making decisions. Data from the system will support decision makers in such areas as policy, instruction, operations, management, resource allocation, and overall effectiveness. Evidence of this ability is found in the three components to the The Missouri Comprehensive Data System:

1. A robust statewide Student Information System: this will bring together PK-12 student information such as demographics, registration, medical information, student performance, discipline referrals, etc.
2. A Data Warehouse: the warehouse will support analysis and reporting from PK through higher education and the workforce. At the P level the warehouse will include information such as learning enrollment data and parent educational support data; at the P-12 level it will include data such as formative and summative assessment results, teacher/leader evaluation information, course enrollment information, etc., and at the post-secondary level it will include data such as ACT/SAT results, teacher preparation evaluation information, etc.
3. The Show-Me Portal: this will provide single-site access to P-20 longitudinal data for all stakeholders for timely decision making across al levels. it will serve as a functional query and reporting system for stakeholders across the education community, other agencies supporting children and families, policymakers, researchers, and the public.

Activities within each of these components have been taking place and are scheduled to continue through the end of this year. The responsible parties conducting each activity represent a diverse group of stakeholders such as the Department, the MOSIS Advisory Group, participating districts, charter schools, parents, teachers, students, and the State P-20 Collaboration Group. What is especially compelling about the activities is the way in which they are tightly sequenced, robust, and comprehensive.

(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction

18

16

(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems

6

4

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

6

6

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

6

6

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

(C) (3) (i): The Missouri Comprehensive Data System is deigned to meet the need for linked real-time data. The Department will begin with at least one district in each region to create incubator projects for using longitudinal data to inform instructional decision making, to impact school climate, and to manage resources. The RTTT money will provide resources for these districts to transition their current data management and instructional systems to the state's comprehensive data system. This building capacity strategy is noteworthy. As noted in (C) (2) above, all three components of the comprehensive system will

provide information to teachers, principals, and administrators with the information they need to inform and improve instructional practices, decision making, and overall effectiveness. The only concern is that using only one district may not move the state fast enough in the direction it wishes to go to reach its targeted goals. Thus while the strategy is an effective means for moving the state forward it may not move the state fast (i.e., build capacity fast enough) for a full fledged system by the end of the grant period.

(C) (3) (ii): Missouri has historically invested state resources in support and training for educators, and the state will use RTTT funding to expand its existing statewide system of support to include training opportunities around data analysis and data-driven decision making. The Department will establish Certified Data Teams at the state and regional levels through the existing statewide system of support and existing Professional Learning Community structures. These teams will serve as key resources to local schools, certifying district and building-level Data Teams and providing ongoing technical assistance and support to local teams as they structure instructional improvement and resource strategies to meet each district's needs. In addition to certifying Data Teams the Department will fund local district pilots of Learning Sciences International's iObservation program or other similar instructional data-gathering tools. Such programs will enable LEAs to collect and analyze data that link teacher performance, leader performance, and student performance that can be used for instructional improvement. The pilot will be implemented in Years 1 and 2 of the grant.

The two activities that are planned: 1) using regional support center staff to train and certify data teams in every local district to assist teachers and leaders in data-driven decision making and 2) implementing a system to capture and provide data about educational processes and practices to inform instructional decisions are well designed with a realistic timeline. The responsible parties for carrying out each activity represent a diverse group of individuals.

(C) (3) (iii): The Missouri Comprehensive Data System will not only serve as a resource for long-term studies but will also help policymakers address specific topics of immediate concern. The State will provide mini grants to universities, colleges, school-based researchers, and independent researchers to investigate narrowly focused questions. Mini grants up to \$25,000 will be given to researchers to address the questions. The Data System will also spur innovative partnerships among research consortia and LEAs to improve regional educational outcomes. Using the data warehouse, the consortia will conduct studies specific to the needs of the region's schools and districts, and will help to interpret data for the districts and will assist LEAs, their schools, and charter schools in promoting deeper understanding of data that will lead to change in instructional practices. Although the materials did not explicitly state that data will be used to evaluate the approaches for educating different types of students it is presumed that when needs such as these arise in LEAs and schools, the data will be used to evaluate specific issues related to instructional improvement for these students. The state's plan is credible and realistic.

The timeline for implementing the one activity for this effort--supporting innovative partnerships with research consortia to work with local districts to improve regional education outcomes--is reasonable. The responsible parties represent a diverse group of stakeholders.

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

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	11
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	3
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	3
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	5

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

(D) (1) (i): Missouri law contains no impediments to avenues or methods of preparing new teachers or principals outside the traditional college or university educator preparation programs. Currently, Missouri requires all candidates, except those with doctoral degrees, to pass a content area assessment. Missouri has 6 alternative routes to certification and two innovative alternative pathways that IHEs may incorporate into teacher/leader preparation programs. All but two of the routes (#1, #3 below) require an association with an IHE. There are also alternative routes for principal certification but according to the application, the three programs--New Leaders Project, Collaborative Principal Preparation Program, and Rural Principal Program--"stress the need for intense screening, a high degree of collaboration between district and university, and a heavy emphasis on adult leaning theory".

Alternative Routes to Certification for Teachers and Principals

1. Teachers can be certified via the American Board of Certification for Teacher Excellence.
2. Aspiring teachers and leaders who are not yet fully certificated may be employed by an LEA while earning college credit either online or from an IHE.
3. Individuals who hold a doctorate degree in a content field may obtain certification once they have passed the pedagogy test for the grade level they desire.
4. Teachers and principals may be certified by the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards.
5. Teachers who hold an active Missouri license can add areas of certification through testing or coursework.
6. Missouri accepts actively certified teachers from any of the 49 other states.

(D) (1) (ii): The Table that appears for this sub-section is confusing because the information is not consistent with the information provided for (D) (1) (i). In the above section, 6 alternative pathways or routes were described. In the Table there are 7 routes: 1) alternative college routes, 2) Teach for America, 3) ABCTE, 4) Temporary Route, 5) Doctoral Route, 6) Prepared out of state, and 7) National Board Certification. All of the 7 routes are in use; however the routes do not meet all of the elements in the requirements particularly for principals.

School districts or charter schools and IHEs may form partnerships to train a master teacher for a principal position through an alternative route that will augment traditional coursework and provide for an authentic experience.

(D) (1) (iii): Missouri uses a centralized reporting system to track annual educator vacancies and trends. Districts report educator vacancies and classroom assignments to the Department through the School Core Data system. The Department identifies classes taught by teachers who are not appropriately certified and returns that information to districts. Until state funding cuts in 2009 the state supported two programs to encourage teacher candidates to enter fields with a shortage of teachers. The state currently provides scholarships for the deaf educator program only. The state will begin providing scholarships to paraprofessionals to become certified SPED teachers through a program at Frontborne University. Shortages are also being filled through model programs in place in Missouri institutions of higher education that are preparing teachers and leaders to work in unique settings. Through its reform plan, Missouri intends to identify and replicate other successful model teacher/leader preparation programs in the state's IHEs.

The state is to be commended for its efforts to monitor areas of shortage and fill areas of shortage, and for its commitment to study additional ways to recruit teachers who will commit to teaching in hard to staff areas, hard to staff positions, and in hard to staff positions. There is no comparable effort to recruit principals for these same areas.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	50
(i) Measuring student growth	5	5
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	15

(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	10
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	20

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

(D) (2) (i): Missouri's districts have been able to access and analyze student-level data through the state's online assessment reporting system for nearly a decade. The Department is working to more clearly define the use of student growth measures at the student, classroom, school, district, and state levels. The Department has established a work group that is assigned responsibility to recommend one or more approaches for measuring student growth that will yield valid and reliable data. These data will be used to inform educational decisions. The workgroup is comprised of teachers, district leaders, representatives from IHEs, and research organizations. The timeline for this workgroup is March 2010 through Summer 2010. The percentage of participating LEAs that currently measure student growth at this time is not available. The State has developed annual targets per year of grant with the goal by year 4 to be 100% of the participating LEAs. The plan and timelines are reasonable and realistic.

(D) (2) (ii): Missouri enacted legislation in 1983 requiring districts to implement a performance-based teacher evaluation process for teachers. In 1985 similar legislation was enacted for administrators. Guidelines and procedures for evaluation of teachers and principals were developed by a statewide committee of teachers, principals, superintendents, university personnel, Department personnel, and legislators. In 1999 and 2003 the performance based teacher evaluation process was again updated to include the examination of student performance data. In 2009 Missouri began designing teaching standards for preschool through grade 12.

Teacher Evaluation Process

The current standards span the development of a teacher's skills over four levels:

1. Beginning teachers and teachers whose students are not demonstrating progress: Annual performance based teacher evaluations (PBTE) should consider multiple measures of student success: classroom success, benchmark, annual performance assessment based on standards. The evaluation process should provide for periodic adjustment of professional development.
2. Effective teachers: Annual PBTE should consider multiple measures of student success: classroom success, benchmark, annual performance assessment based on standards and should incorporate input from teacher, master teacher, and principal.
3. Proficient teacher: teachers will be partnered with a master teacher to review and analyze student performance data and instructional processes.
4. Master teacher: those in leadership positions in their schools will be responsible for self-evaluation of multiple measures of student performance.

Participating districts, charter schools, professional associations, IHEs, and the Department are involved in the evaluation system that is aligned with the standards. The timeline is from spring 2009 through the end of the grant period, with implementation beginning in July 2010 (piloting will begin in fall 2011).

Principal Evaluation Process

Missouri will draw upon the ISLLC standards for school leaders to inform the revision of PBPE tools and processes. The same group of stakeholders involved in the teacher evaluation process will be involved in the principal evaluation process. The standards include a three-tiered process:

1. Beginning principals: Annual PBPEs should consider multiple measures of student success including building success, benchmarks, annual performance data based on standards.
2. Proficient Principals: those with a documented history of good building student performance, should be partnered with an administrative mentor to review and analyze student performance data and building instructional processes.

3. Master principals: Master principals--principals in leadership roles in their districts--should contribute to evaluation process with peers and should be responsible for self-evaluation of multiple measures of building-level student performance.

The timeline is from September 2008 through June 2014, with implementation beginning in 2012. The percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying teacher and principal evaluations systems at this time is not available. However, the State has provided targeted goals for the duration of the grant with the goal by year 4 to be 100%.

The plan prepared by the state for both (D) (2) (ii) (a) and (D) (2) (ii) (b) is comprehensive and realistic.

(D) (2) (iii):

As part of the work plan agreements with the Department of Education, participating LEAs and charter schools will ensure that teacher and principal evaluations are conducted "frequently," depending on the educator's level of experience and demonstrated success with students. Each evaluation includes a review of student performance measures.

- Beginning teachers and teachers with unacceptable student performance: observations of teachers are done in their first three years in the classroom and for teachers with unacceptable student performance on a monthly basis, or more often, if needed.
- Effective teachers: teachers beyond their third year of teaching and/or those with a history of acceptable performance, observations and a review of student performance on a quarterly basis.
- Proficient/master teachers: observations and principal walk through on at least a quarterly basis. Teachers will conduct a self-review of student performance data.
- Principals: conducted on at least an annual basis by the Superintendent or a qualified designee, and includes a review of student performance data, comparison of building data to like buildings in the district and state.
- Beginning principals: evaluations conducted at least semi-annually.

The Department will complete an audit of participating LEAs implementation of these instruments by annually collecting, analyzing, and reporting the distribution of teachers and principals among each performance level (unsatisfactory, satisfactory, proficient, excellent, and outstanding) and the distribution of each performance category among high-need schools.

The plan is realistic.

(D) (2) (iv):

(a):

- Beginning teachers and principals with unacceptable student performance: LEAS will offer professional development that is tailored to the teacher's needs and provide a master teacher coach to help the teacher improve. Beginning teachers will also receive assistance from the State's Beginning Teacher Assistance Program.
- Effective teachers: Additional principal observations and meetings to discuss results; if needed, remediation and targeted professional development.
- Proficient/master teachers: teachers will participate in professional development as necessary.
- Principals: the LEA will adjust professional development plans and individual growth goals as needed.

Several key activities are planned to ensure that this part of the plan is carried out including enhancing the statewide system of support to ensure accessibility of master teachers and master principals in all regions and providing a high-quality support program for new leaders through the State's Leadership Academy.

(b): In collaboration with participating LEAs and charter schools and professional development organizations, the Department will develop model policies for compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals based on multiple measures of student performance. The Department will also work collaboratively with these same groups to develop model policies for removing ineffective teachers and

principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve. Implementation of these policies is scheduled to go into effect in September 2011. There is no information about the nature of the compensation or about promoting exemplary teachers, e.g., giving them additional opportunities or responsibilities as a form of compensation. The percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems to compensate, promote, and retain teachers and principals at this time is not available. However, the State has annual targeted goals for the grant period culminating in 100% by the end of the grant period.

(c): The only specific information for this sub-section is contained in a chart (information about the model policies being developed and to be implemented appear in the above narrative). The percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems to grant tenure and/or full certification to teachers and principals is not available at this time. However, the State has annual targets that culminate with 100% of the participating LEAs granting tenure based on data by the end of the grant period.

(d): The only specific information for this sub-section is contained in a chart (information about the model policies being developed and to be implemented appear in the above narrative). The percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems to remove ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals is not available at this time. However, the State has annual targets that culminate with 100% of the participating LEAs removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals based on data by the end of the grant period.

The annual targets for participating LEAs in each sub-section are ambitious, however, given the lack of full support by the teacher associations in all participating LEAs, there is concern that the goals may not be reachable, particularly goals that involve using student growth data to grant tenure, compensate and promote teachers, and removal of ineffective teachers. The goals may be challenged at the policy development and implementation stages.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	12
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	7
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	5

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

(D) (3) (i): To ensure equitable distribution of effective teachers and leaders in Missouri, the state will implement a plan to place effective teachers and leaders in high-needs schools and eliminate percentages of ineffective teachers in buildings that have higher percentages than other schools. (NOTE: the criterion refers to principals and Missouri uses the term leaders; it is assumed that leaders are principals.) The Department will establish the Highly Effective Teachers Work Group comprised of representatives of LEAs, charter schools, professional educator organizations, educator preparation programs, and other stakeholder groups to determine consistent procedures and processes for identifying highly effective teachers and leaders. The work group will focus on a variety of topics including essential data elements, criteria for defining highly effective teachers and leaders, local incentives, recruiting teachers for hard to staff areas, and possible performance measures. Based on the groups' recommendations, the Department will establish and public criteria to ensure that there is an equitable distribution of effective teachers and leaders in schools. Participating LEAs and charter schools will be responsible for identifying and certifying their highly effective teachers and leaders.

The State has several key activities planned to reach its goals in this area including grants to IHEs that prepare teachers and leaders to work in high-needs schools and working collaboratively with local boards of education and professional organizations to draft model compensation policies and contract procedures that LEAs may use to attract and retain high quality teachers and leaders. The annual targets provided for this sub-section for highly effective teachers and leaders in schools are provided. There are no data for the current school year. The annual targets for participating LEAs appear possible for each year, however, the target for year 4 is only 75% for the percentage of highly effective teachers in high need schools leaving 25% for the percentage of ineffective teachers in the workforce. While it is conceivable that it may not be possible to eliminate all ineffective teachers it is a concern that the goal for the end of the grant period is not to have 100% of highly effective and zero ineffective teachers and leaders in high need schools, i.e.,

removal of all ineffective teachers by the end of the grant period. The remaining 25% of ineffective teachers could be in teacher shortage areas such as math, science, ELL, and SPED and there is no assurance that there will be an equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals in high poverty schools.

(D) (3) (ii): In collaboration with participating LEAs and charter schools, the Department will launch a human capital strategy to recruit and prepare teachers for hard to staff areas such as math, science, SPED and ELLs. The incentives that are currently available include a loan forgiveness program for teachers teaching in hard to staff areas and a scholarship fund for prospective SPED teachers. The Department plans to work collaboratively with participating LEAs to develop a plan for providing additional incentives for teaching in hard to staff areas. In addition the Department will explore the expansion of teacher preparation programs through providers not affiliated with IHEs and will partner with business and industry to provide additional alternative pathways into teaching in hard to staff subject areas. The data for the percentage of math, science, SPED, and ELL teachers who were evaluated as effective or better was not available. The goals for increasing the percentages of effective teachers in these areas over the grant period is reasonable, however, the goal by the end of year 4 is only 75% for the percentage of effective teachers in these content areas.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	11
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	6
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	5

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

(D) (4) (i): In 1999 Missouri implemented the Missouri Standards for Educator Preparation (MoSTEP), an approval system that utilizes a 7-year approval cycle of all educator preparation programs' compliance with certification requirements; assurance that candidates complete a basic skills test; subject specific competencies; and 11 national teaching standards. In 2006 the MoSTEP was revised to require preparation programs to anticipate students' needs. Since 2007 the State has been working to develop a statewide system to measure the effectiveness of all educator preparation efforts. In December 2009 the State compiled the first set of data linking beginning teachers and their preparation programs to student growth and achievement.

The State plans to work collaboratively with IHEs, professional associations, and practitioners to develop a rating system for teacher/leader preparation programs based on a revised MoSTEP process. The rating system will also include surveys of beginning teachers and leaders. A critical part of this evaluation system will include public reporting of results by preparation program for both teachers and leaders.

The state has one activity planned to meet the requirements of this sub-section. In September 2010 the State will convene a task force to create the rating system. The system must include multiple measures based at least partially on their graduates' impact on student achievement. Policies and procedures will then be developed and information from the system will be reported to the public on an annual basis. The Department will publicly report these data by September 2012, the 3rd year of the grant. At this time there are no data on the percentage of teacher and principal preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on student achievement and growth. The State is targeting 100% by the end of year 4 of the grant. The targets are ambitious and possible to reach.

(D) (4) (ii): The State will enhance its approval procedure for both teacher and leader preparation programs and credentialing programs in order to expand only those programs that demonstrate effectiveness in improving student achievement. Program approval will be based on the program's ability to develop, enhance and document candidates' content knowledge, develop the necessary pedagogy, engage in a series of real, relevant, and rigorous quality internship experiences, and demonstrate graduates' success in impacting the achievement of students.

The Department will collaborate with IHEs or other credentialing entities, practitioners, and professional organizations to research best practices and their relationship to student achievement. Successful programs will then be required to share their program specifics with other programs.

The State has one major activity for this effort: to revise the State's teacher/leader preparation program approval system where rewards and expanded access to the programs will be available. The activity will also include providing technical assistance to programs that are not adequately effective and close programs that consistently fail to meet expectations. The rating system will be developed in year 2 of the grant and piloted the following year.

The implementation plan timeline is reasonable, beginning in September 2010 and ending one year later. However, this delay of one year for developing the educator rating system will result in only a 50% annual target for the first year--2011-2012--and not 100%.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	16
(i) Providing effective support	10	6
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	10

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

(D) (5) (i): Historically, there have been a number of efforts in Missouri to increase professional development for teachers and leaders: 1) the creation of Regional Professional Development Centers to assist teachers and leaders through the Missouri Outstanding Schools Act, legislated professional development opportunities, state aid for professional development, new teacher and administrator LEA-sponsored mentoring, and teacher mentoring standards that provide statewide consistency. At this time Missouri has several activities planned to increase the support to teachers and leaders:

1. Comprehensive induction protocols for all new teachers and leaders. The State will transform its current Beginning Teacher Assistance Program into a statewide mentoring model. It will include an introduction to school environments, classroom observations and coaching, assessment for learning strategies, ethics, cultural awareness and Missouri Teaching Standards for teachers and effective leadership behaviors for principals.
2. Comprehensive content-centered support for new teachers and leaders, including coaching of specific skills/pedagogy associated with improved student performance. This will be on-site and job-embedded to ensure fidelity of implementation.
3. Expansion of professional learning center project to include those buildings identified as having the lowest achievement in the state.

The timeline for the activities begins in July 2010 and extends through 2011. A large group of constituents are involved in different activities: The Department, practitioners, IHEs, professional associations, LEAs and charter schools, and other stakeholders.

There was mention of the use of data to inform the PD, but it was not clear how data would be used to improve student learning outcomes, particularly its effect across schools in the state.

(D) (5) (ii): The Department will conduct ongoing assessment and evaluation of the support given to teachers and leaders. Several activities are planned:

1. Pilot the use of a System of Support and conduct surveys of the effectiveness of the system in meeting district needs.
2. Biannually conduct an implementation audit using the Leadership and Learning Center's research and model implementation rubrics to encourage and support faithful implementation of effective practices.
3. Develop the capacity to link student performance data to the professional development provided to LEAs and charter schools. This activity is designed to directly address the need for data linking

professional development to student data to assess the effectiveness of the professional development in increasing student performance.

The plan for this section is credible and achievable. One activity began in 2009; the other activities are taking place from fall 2010 to 2014. Work on Activity #3, the key to connecting professional development to student outcomes, begins in October 2010 and continues through 2011. The activities involve the Department and professional associations. The implementation timeline is realistic given the intricate sub-activities that are tightly linked together from one month to the next.

Funding for (i) and (ii) appears to be adequate.

Total	138	100
-------	-----	-----

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10
(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
(E) (1): The Missouri State Board of Education is empowered to intervene directly in both LEAs and schools. The Board may take over or close both school districts and LEAs that are financially stressed or unaccredited for two consecutive years due to poor student performance.		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	40
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	35
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
(E) (2) (i): The State has a long history of work in school improvement at the building and district levels. Its school improvement efforts are three-tiered:		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Generating criteria to identify the persistently, lowest-achieving buildings that are in need of immediate and definitive action. 2. Generating criteria to identify districts and buildings in need of intense intervention. 3. Ensuring that all students exit school systems ready to be successful. 		
The State has done a good job in clearly defining the criteria it uses for identifying the lowest-achieving schools (any Title 1 school in improvement, corrective action or restructuring and any secondary school that is eligible for but does not receive Title 1 funds), as well as clearly articulating the steps involved in how to determine the State's lowest-achieving schools using a series of step-by-step calculations. The state provides a list of the corresponding schools in an Appendix.		
(E) (2) (ii): Missouri has an ambitious, credible, and achievable plan to ensure that identified schools, districts, and charter schools implement the turnaround, restart, or transformation model, or close identified lowest achieving schools between 2010 and 2015. The evidence for the state being able to achieve its goals are the carefully delineated activities. Three activities are planned, two of which are directly related to this sub-section. The sub-activities within each activity are well designed and build on one another both in timeline for completion and in content. The responsible parties include a diverse group that include department personnel, participating districts, and charter schools, as well as professional educators.		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Missouri will develop and implement a statewide framework for Quality schools with 3 key components: 		

- a. **Turnaround intervention** for schools that have already failed and need immediate and definitive action.
- b. School improvement support for all schools to address achievement gaps, STEM needs, high school reform, or other areas in need of attention.
- c. Early learning programs to ensure a strong foundation and early intervention for all students.

The State will align its RTTT funding, SIG funds, and State Fiscal Stabilization Fund to turnaround its schools, districts, and charter schools.

This activity will involved the Department and participating districts/charter schools

2. Develop and implement a **Missouri Turnaround Model** to train teachers and leaders in turning around the state's low-performing schools, districts, charter schools, and groups of students. Turnaround training and support components will become a part of school leadership/administrator preparation for the State's future leaders and teachers. The approach used is similar to the transformation model. Launching of the Turnaround model at the local level is to begin by July 2011. These activities will involve the Department, IHEs, professional educator associations, and participating school districts/charter schools.

The plan is credible, ambitious, and achievable.

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

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	3
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	0
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	3
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
(F) (1) (i): There are no data provided for FY 2008. However, there has been an increase from FY 2009 to FY 2010.		
(F) (1) (ii): LEAs that have a high concentration of students who qualify for free and reduced lunches receive extra weighting consideration in the formula. LEAs with less wealth receive more aid. There is no information about the distribution of funding <u>within LEAs</u> for high-poverty schools and other schools.		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	18
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	2
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	0
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	0
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
(F) (2) (i): Missouri's current charter school law limits the establishment of charter schools geographically to the Kansas City LEA and the St. Louis LEA. However, within these districts there is no limit to the number		

of charter schools that may be established with the school district's boundaries or to the number of traditional school/buildings which can be converted to charter school status.

For both the 2008-09 and 2009-10 school years charter schools represented approximately 2% of the total public school buildings in these LEAs. The majority are sponsored by universities and colleges.

(F) (2) (ii): Missouri's charter school law requires that the sponsor and the governing board and the staff of the charter school jointly review the school's performance, management and operations at least once every two years or to any point where the operation or management of the charter is changed or transferred to another entity, either public or private. The law also requires that the Department commission a study of the performance of charter school students in comparison to their counterparts in traditional non charter schools in a similar geographic area. In addition to this formal evaluation, charter schools and traditional schools must submit data to MOSIS and Core Data collection processes.

The law also address charter school authorization and re-authorization, accountability (including fiscal, programs of instruction for regular and high-need students, and conditions for closure and license revocation. Since 2004-05 there have been 37 charter school application, 29 approved, 6 denied, and 5 charter schools closed.

(F) (2) (iii): Missouri essentially has two laws for funding charter schools. If a charter school is an independent LEA, which all are at this time, the Department calculates the state aid payment for charter schools utilizing current year information and the formula utilized for all public school districts. It receives an annual amount that is essentially equal to a similar traditional LEA (at the school level). Charter schools also receive a commensurate share of other state aid and federal program monies that a local LEA might otherwise be entitled to receive for services provided to students including transportation. Once a charter school that was in a LEA becomes independent and its own LEA, payment that would have gone to the public LEA is reduced. If a charter school remains within a public LEA, which none currently are in Missouri, the distribution of state aid for charter schools, the amount paid to the charter schools is weighted with a formula.

(F) (2) (iv): Missouri does not provide direct facility assistance for any public schools, including charter schools. The state funding provided to charter schools may be used for facilities, assistance with facility acquisition, access to public facilities, the ability to share in bonds and mill levies, or other supports.

(F) (5) (v): Currently the state does not enable LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools other than charter schools.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	0
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
(F) (3): There is no evidence that there are laws, regulations, or policies that have increased student achievement or graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps, or resulted in other important outcomes.		
Total	55	21

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	0
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
The state does not provide evidence that it addresses the needs of underrepresented groups and of women and girls in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.		

Total	15	0
-------	----	---

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

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

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

The State has done a commendable job in planning a comprehensive reform agenda that will touch the lives of students through participating LEAs. The activities in each RTTT area have been developed thoughtfully, with the active participation of key stakeholders, an adequate budget, and they are designed to close the achievement gap. The plan is coherent and comprehensive. The State proposes to use as many existing staff as possible in its reorganization, which may not be sufficient to reach its ambitious goals. In order to realize the kind of changes that are necessary to build the capacity within LEAs, additional staffing may be needed during the 4-year period, as well as beyond the life of the grant to sustain change that is taking place. For example, although the Department states that achievement has increased over the last several years, a close look at the NAEP and MAP data suggests fluctuations in achievement over time. A stronger infusion of staff to work closely with LEAs and low performing schools may be necessary to ensure that achievement increases and that it is sustained beyond the life of the grant.

A second concern is the number/percentage of participating LEAs that do not have teacher association support. With few exceptions, these LEAs have high poverty rates, which typically translates into low academic performance. Without the full support of the teachers association in each of these LEAs it is quite possible that any reform efforts, in particular those that are to result in changes in teachers' performance, will be thwarted. Students in large LEAs such as Springfield SD with 55 schools will be greatly affected.

A third concern is the limiting charter school law. Charter schools in Missouri have positively changed the academic lives of students. The models should be able to be replicated throughout the state and not limited to the two LEAs covered by the law.

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

Grand Total	500	342
--------------------	------------	------------



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1

Missouri Application #3300MO-5



A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	37
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	22
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>The State proposes a thorough, integrated plan that has very ambitious but achievable goals -- e.g., top 10 in NAEP, reducing achievement gap by half, and increasing the graduation rate from 85% to 93%. The State articulates a commitment to the key reform areas and builds on its prior experience with its Missouri School Improvement Program (MSIP) that has evolved in a way generally consistent with the Race to the Top reform agenda. High points are awarded for (i).</p> <p>Participating LEAs account for 62% of school districts, 67% of students, and 71% of students in poverty. Among the participating LEAs, 72% of the local teachers' unions signed on. This moderate level of participation is further compromised by a scope of work that appears to omit several significant portions of the standard scope (especially in the area of Great Teachers and Leaders), and by the addendum from the Kansas City union qualifying its commitment by saying implementation "will only take place when there is mutual agreement." It is not clear why the State included selective examples of executed MOUs in the appendix. Medium points were awarded for criterion (ii) because of the overall level of participation, the reduced scope of work, and the qualified support in Kansas City.</p> <p>The State's prior experience and long-term commitment to many aspects of the RTTT reform agenda are likely to translate into statewide impact, but the successful implementation may be tempered by limited participation or teachers' union inflexibility. Medium points are given for (iii).</p>		
(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	20
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	15
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	5
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>The State has a solid plan to ensure it has the capacity to implement the reforms. The re-organization of the department is apparently meant to align its resources better with the elements of the proposal, but it is not clear this is a substantive measure. The State clearly assigns its deputy commissioner as the project manager and it will assign four assurance managers (one for each reform area) to oversee the 13 specific projects. The State included a detailed third-party report as evidence of its commitment to objective internal assessment of the quality of its program implementation, and will rely on the existing regional system of support to function as the conduit for supporting participating LEAs. The State's approach to grant administration through its existing systems seems adequate and it is committed to aligning other resources</p>		

to the goals in this proposal. The State's proposal and budget emphasize human capital development and infrastructure as a way to leverage its proposed RTTT investment, and coordinate with other funding streams. Based on the evolution of the MSIP and its focus on sustainability, the State is likely to maintain an ongoing commitment to its proposed reforms. High points are given for (i).

The State held a significant stakeholder forum with over 300 participants and also received almost 5,000 responses to an online survey to capture input on its plan. The level of support evidenced by this survey varies by area of reform and reflects significant stakeholder support but also realistic concern about some aspects of the reform agenda. The letters from several universities and chambers of commerce contain similar and only mildly supportive language, and there are no letters from any other potential stakeholder groups. The net effect of this mixed evidence is an award of medium points for (ii).

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps	30	16
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	12
(A)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The State provides good evidence of past progress in each of the key reform areas, especially in its supporting the development of frameworks for standards and assessments, its early adoption of unique student identifiers (data systems), and intervening in low-performing districts. High points are given for (i).</p> <p>The State's track record of improving student outcomes is mixed, with a few bright spots like the middle school communication arts results on the state tests and the 2009 NAEP results in math and 4th grade reading. The state did not provide subgroup information for its State test, and the achievement gap information it provided for the NAEP does not demonstrate much progress (as confirmed in the narrative). There was some moderate increase in the high school graduation rate over the three years of data provided. The net effect of these data on State's record of improving student outcomes is an award of medium points for (ii).</p>		
Total	125	73

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	25
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	5
(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The State is a member of the Common Core Standards consortium of 48 states, and plans to adopt those standards as soon as they are completed. The timing of the outside date for adoption given in the plan is the August 19-20, 2010 State Board of Education meeting. This date is later than August 2, 2010 so low points are awarded for (ii). The State does provide a clear plan for implementation of the standards.</p>		
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
The State is a member of the SMARTER Balance Assessment Consortium of 33 states, which meets the requirements of these criteria.		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	20
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
The State provides a thorough plan that underscores its historical commitment to implementing high quality standards and assessments. That commitment is based on the foundation of the Outstanding Schools Act, which established regional service centers on university campuses. The State has a progressive approach toward integrating the standards and assessments across the P-20 spectrum. It also has an ambitious plan to begin reporting against the new standards in P-12 through the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP) in the 2011-2012 school year, with very ambitious targets for dramatic NAEP gains and achievement gap reductions. The State provides a detailed implementation plan that includes clear goals, activities (e.g., developing a P-12 curriculum framework, interim assessments, evidence-based suggested instructional strategies, and online support for teachers, with appropriate professional development), timelines, responsible parties, and outcome targets. The plan is supported by significant project budgets, including \$8 million for item bank development, \$7 million for standards adoption and related professional development, \$50 million of LEA-directed funds for local infrastructure to support the assessment, and \$5.5 million for the development of a model curriculum and related professional development. Overall this is a bold, robust plan with ambitious goals.		
Total	70	55

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	24
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
The State has a longitudinal data system that meets all of the elements of the America COMPETES Act based on its Missouri Student Information System (MOSIS). The State has also taken additional steps to improve data quality.		
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	5
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
The State has an ambitious plan to create the Missouri Comprehensive Data System. Its key activities include implementation of the new student information system, linking it to a multi-agency, P-20 data warehouse, and launching a user-friendly Show-Me Portal to provide a single point of access to a broad stakeholder audience. This plan is the foundation for classroom, school and district-level development of instructional improvement systems, as well as informing overall policy and resource allocation decisions.		
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction	18	18
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	6
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	6

(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	6
(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The State has a high level plan with key activities and assigned responsible parties to make comprehensive data available to improve instruction. The plan meets all of the three criteria for increasing the use of instructional improvement systems to provide teachers, principals and administrators with information and resources, supporting them with effective professional development, and making the data available to accessible to researchers to evaluate instructional improvement systems (e.g., through the Kansas City Area Educational Research Consortium) . High points are awarded for all three of these criteria.</p> <p>The State's plan is creative in several of the ways it meets these criteria. It proposes an "incubator project" strategy to co-operate with districts to assist in the transition to the Missouri Comprehensive Data System and adopt or refine local instructional improvement systems. Its Data Team Certification process is another creative approach -- with appropriately aggressive timing -- to ensure teachers and principals can apply the data and make informed decisions based on the data. Further, the State plans to fund district pilots of instructional data-gathering tools, as well as mini-grants to universities to encourage independent research on instructional improvement systems. The State's budget proposal supports the importance of this reform area in the State's plan. It budgets \$8 million for the system and \$41 million of LEA-directed funds for schools and districts to implement the system.</p> <p>The State's overall approach to using data to improve instruction is bold, creative, and well-designed.</p>		
Total	47	47

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals	21	9
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	3
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	4
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	2
(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The State allows for at least one alternative route to certification for teachers that appears to meet at least four of the elements listed in the definition of alternative routes to certification. But there does not appear to be another qualifying route for principals, so medium points are given for (i).</p> <p>The pathways are in use for both teachers and principals, although the most significant route is out-of-state preparation. Several other routes were used for teachers, but for principals the only alternative pathways used were temporary certification or prepared out of state (which do not meet the definition of alternative routes to certification in the notice). So medium points are awarded for (ii).</p> <p>The State tracks information about classes taught by uncertified teachers through its School Core Data System, but the State does not provide any supporting data or analysis for this reporting mechanism. The State eliminated two programs in 2009 that focused on filling shortages in special education and counseling. There are some existing IHE programs that are focused on either urban or rural education but no information is provided about their scale or effectiveness. Overall, the State's process for highlighting areas of shortage is basic, and its mechanisms for preparing teachers and principals to fill them are very limited, so low points are awarded for (iii).</p>		

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	40
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	13
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	9
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	14
(D)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The State demonstrates its commitment to measuring student growth by having been approved to implement a student growth model for NCLB purposes. The State has already made good progress on its plan, so high points are awarded for (i).</p> <p>The State's plan for developing evaluation systems -- specifically, revising the performance-based teacher and principal evaluation models -- will have multiple rating categories, include student growth as a significant factor, and will be designed with teacher and principal involvement. Its language is a bit tenuous around "creating model processes which local districts and charter schools can adopt or adapt," but its plan and timelines are reasonable and consistent. High points are given for (ii).</p> <p>The State already provides for annual evaluations, and its plan clearly articulates a process for providing constructive feedback that incorporates student growth data, earning high points for (iii).</p> <p>The State's plan provides good support for using the evaluations to support teachers and principals, including specific induction protocols, mentoring supports, and ongoing professional development. But for each type of key decision to be informed by the evaluation systems, the State's plan is limited first to developing model policies, and then annually collecting data from participating LEAs on actual practices. Again, this is a reasonable first step but falls short of constituting a high quality plan. The proposed budget for Project 9 may be insufficient to implement successfully such an important initiative. The performance measures proposed by the state (30-50% of participating LEAs using qualifying evaluation systems to inform these decisions in 2012-13, and 100% in 2013-14) are therefore inappropriately ambitious. Medium points are awarded for (iv).</p>		
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	6
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	4
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	2
(D)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The State does not provide the requested evidence of its definition of high-minority and low-minority schools. In its proposal for criterion (i), the State sometimes uses the term "effective teachers and leaders," which differs from the defined term "highly effective" in the criterion. Its plan starts by establishing consistent "procedures and processes" for identifying highly effective teachers and leaders, without reference to being consistent with the definition in the notice. The State's plan is limited to drafting model compensation policies and contract procedures to encourage access to highly effective teachers by students in high-need schools. But this effort is neither bold nor ambitious. Low points are given for (i).</p> <p>The State's plan for ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas is likewise uninspiring. The State has had a loan forgiveness plan available to teachers in hard-to-staff areas and scholarship funds for new special education teachers. But its plan is limited to steps like "The Department will work collaboratively with participating districts and charter schools to develop a plan..." and "The Department will explore the expansion of teacher preparation programs..." There is no mention of STEM teaching with respect to this criterion. Low points are awarded for (ii).</p>		

The performance measures proposed by the State are ambitious, but unsupported because of the lack of specific actions, strategies and supporting evidence to make its plan credible.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	9
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	5
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	4

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

The State already links data for beginning teachers and their preparation programs with student growth and achievement data, and plans to expand these efforts to rate the teacher and principal programs and expand the good ones. The plan is a simple one: establish the rating system, pilot the data collection process, and report the data. The state has already made significant progress in this area with respect to teacher preparation programs, and its targets of 100% in 2013-14 for public access to program effectiveness data for teachers and principals are ambitious yet achievable. High points are awarded for (i).

The State's plan for expanding effective programs is reasonable, but somewhat vague about how it will provide incentives and support for good performance. The State does commit to obligating programs that fail to meet the targets to seek assistance or close. The plan does not clearly connect successful programs with the definitions of "effective" and "highly effective" in the notice, i.e., program approval criteria will include "positively impacting the achievement of students", but the implementation plan specifically refers to highly effective teachers and leaders. The plan earns medium points for (ii) because of its lack of specific supporting evidence to connect the activities to the stated goals.

(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals	20	17
(i) Providing effective support	10	8
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	9

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

The State's plan to provide effective support to teachers and principals includes steps to create collaborative school and district cultures through Professional Learning Communities in schools and at districts, create comprehensive induction protocols by transforming the Beginning Teacher Assistance Program, and deliver content-centered support through master teachers and master principals in each regional center.

The State is experienced at evaluating consistently and formally the fidelity of its program implementation through a third-party and will continue to conduct these evaluations biannually. The State will also use the System of Support rubric and conduct district surveys, and link student performance to professional development programs within the system of support.

The State's plan for providing effective support to teachers and principals is solid, and high points are awarded for both criteria.

Total	138	81
--------------	------------	-----------

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

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

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

The State has the authority to intervene directly in persistently lowest-achieving schools and LEAs.		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	14
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	9
(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The State has an approved methodology for identifying the persistently lowest-performing schools as required by criterion (i).</p> <p>Its plan for turning around these schools is weak. The plan includes implementation of a framework for Quality Schools that is not aggressive, transition from the University of Virginia's Turnaround Specialist Program to the development of a "localized" turnaround model, and provision of braided community-based support. The turnaround plan budget simply includes grants to program providers of up to \$35,000 per principal for 57 principals, plus \$1.5 million per school for five schools. The \$35 million proposal for regional support centers that is associated with this criterion seems more likely to support the other reform areas, based on the budget detail narrative. The plan does not clearly address the four intervention models in the criterion -- specifically, it is not clear that the Missouri Turnaround Model meets the definition of a turnaround model in the notice (i.e., replace the principal and at least 50% of the staff). The plan features more reinforcement of approaches that may not have worked in the past, rather than creative or bold interventions, so low points are given for criterion (ii).</p>		
Total	50	24

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	1
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	0
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	1
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The State does not provide the percentage of revenue used to fund education in FY09 and FY08, nor does it provide the dollar amount of education funding in FY08. In the absence of dollars or specific percentages, no points are awarded for (i).</p> <p>The State does not provide sufficient detail about equitable funding between high-need LEAs and high-poverty schools, other than to say that LEAs with high concentrations of low-income students receive extra weighting in the state formula and that the formula also deducts for local wealth. This response insufficiently addresses the requirements of the criterion, so low points are awarded for (ii).</p>		
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	18
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	2
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	0

(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	0
(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The State has a reasonable charter school presence in the St. Louis and Kansas City 33 school districts. But these two districts in total enroll less than 5% of the students in the state, so even if these entire districts were converted to charter schools the State would still meet the definition for a low cap. It appears that a spring 2010 legislative attempt to expand charter schools into low-performing districts failed. Low points are therefore awarded for (i).</p> <p>Despite the geographic constraint on charter schools in the State, the law provides for appropriate authorizing conditions (e.g., priority to applicants that serve high-risk students, and the use student achievement as a basis for non-renewal), and the State plans to improve the available processes for monitoring and intervening in low performing charter schools, so high points are awarded for (ii).</p> <p>Charter schools in the State appear to receive an equitable level of operating funding, but do not receive any facility support, so high points are awarded for (iii) but no points for (iv).</p> <p>The state does not report any condition that enables LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools so no points are awarded for (v).</p>		
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	1
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The State does not prohibit LEAs from creating innovative school models and programs, but these conditions are passive. The State incorrectly treats this criterion as a reform plan criterion rather than a state reform conditions criterion, and proposes a plan to develop an innovative school grant program. Overall, the State does not demonstrate other existing reform conditions or provide evidence to support them, so low points are awarded.</p>		
Total	55	20

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	0
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The state's plan does weave STEM initiatives throughout the key reform areas, and plans to improve rigor, involve partners, and create more opportunities for STEM coursework. The plan does not, however, address the needs of underrepresented groups in the STEM areas and therefore does not meet the priority.</p>		
Total	15	0

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1
Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform		Yes
Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>The State's plan is comprehensive and coherent, and addresses all of the four education reform areas. It is stronger in standards and assessments and data systems, moderate in its plan for great teachers and</p>		

leaders, and weakest in its school turnaround plan. The State's budget proposal reflects these priorities with a significantly disproportionate share of its request focused on the first two reform areas -- for example, \$16 million for item bank and standards development supported by \$50 million of LEA-directed funds, \$6 million for model curriculum development and training, \$11 million for comprehensive data systems supported by \$41 million of LEA-directed funds, and \$20 million for data certification in LEA-directed funds. This emphasis on the first two reform areas may actually strengthen the credibility of the State's plan because the other areas are dependent on the successful implementation of the standards and assessment and data systems initiatives. Overall, the State's application meets the absolute priority.

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

Grand Total	500	300
-------------	-----	-----



Race to the Top

Technical Review Form - Tier 1



Missouri Application #3300MO-6

A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it	65	31
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	4
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	22
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	5

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

(A)(1)(i)

Missouri has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that clearly articulates its goals for implementing reforms in the four RTTT priority areas [(A)(1)(i)]. Missouri scores in the high range for its handling of this first criterion.

The state opens the proposal with an excellent presentation of 25 years of reform history that has set a clear foundation for RTTT. Under the label of the "Missouri School Improvement Program" (MSIP), the state has been working for over two decades on standards and assessments, accountability systems, data analysis and data based decision making, performance based teacher and leader evaluation, professional development, and pre-service education.

The proposal organizes the history into five "MSIP Cycles," each of which has entailed growing sophistication and progress in the design and application of major reform elements. Cycle One (1984) saw the first use of standards and quality indicators to assess and approve district accreditation, with student performance included as a measure. The second cycle (1993) saw the institution of more rigorous standards and growing authority of the state to intervene in academically deficient schools. Cycle three (2001) brought the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP), which established a statewide assessment system, annual performance reports for districts, and the creation of regional professional development centers. In the fourth cycle (2005), the state intensified attention on those districts where the annual performance reports indicated accreditation problems. Regional school improvement teams were tasked with helping to improve districts and schools facing the greatest difficulty.

RTTT, as Missouri proposes, will comprise MSIP's fifth cycle and guide at least the next decade of reform in the state. The proposal smartly weaves the four RTTT priorities—standards and assessments, data systems, teaching and leaders, and school turnaround—across three goals that form the basis of the coming reforms. Simply stated, the goals are to create an integrated, seamless P-20 system; develop high capacity teachers and leaders; and establish a statewide system of support for reform. By weaving the four RTTT priorities across these large goals, Missouri makes the RTTT framework its own. In explaining each of the three goals, the proposal pinpoints particular aspects of each of the four priorities. The STEM priority also is addressed under each goal, signifying that Missouri plans to be systematic in its approach to advancing science and math education.

At this early point in the proposal, Missouri shows great promise. Each of the RTTT reform priorities can be seen as logical outgrowths of what has been learned from 25 years of effort. The presentation brings coherence to the wide-ranging work, organizing it around standards and assessments, data based decision

making, high quality teaching and leaders, and school turnarounds. The question to be answered going forward in the proposal is how the elements of the reform plan will remain linked, coherent and produce real action and results in schools and classrooms.

(A)(1)(ii)

Missouri stumbles in its presentation of the commitment of participating LEAs to the type of far-reaching reform proposed in the opening section. On the face of the presentation, commitments appear deep and extensive, but a close examination of evidence in the various appendixes prompts tough questions.

The MOU used by Missouri is solid and fits the standard model recommended by the RTTT process.

States have to commit to all aspects of the reform work, other than in two districts with opt out options (i.e., the modest sized district of Ozark R-IV and large district of Kansas City).

The first of two problems regarding this criterion is that the "scope of work" documents raise questions as to how much of the RTTT agenda will be required or at least strongly encouraged among participating districts. The list of work areas is adequate, but leaves out key RTTT areas such as assessment, STEM (other than one mention), comprehensive data systems, data-use for instruction, alternative credentialing paths and its value to LEA teacher/leader capacity, and equitable distribution of teachers and leaders. Several of these items could be considered the primary responsibility of statewide agencies rather than participating LEAs. However, implementation of any of these items will matter most at the LEA, school and classroom levels, and ideally would be reflected in scope of work documents.

The second problem pertains to the extent of signatures from LEA superintendents, school board presidents and local union leaders. The percentages of signatures at first glance are impressive: 100 percent of the superintendents and school board presidents in participating LEAs, as well as 72 percent of the local union leaders in the participating LEAs. Unfortunately, it appears that the extent of union support is far slimmer than the 72 percent figure indicates. Appendix Four documents that the majority of larger districts lack signed support by teacher union leaders. Of those districts with enrollment of over 10,000 students, just five of 14 locals signed, and one that did sign (Kansas City) has a major opt out clause for collective bargaining. In addition, of the districts larger than 1,000 students, 31 have union signatures, while 25 do not. The result is that, considering only the districts larger than 10,000 students, the percentage of students touched by RTTT in districts where all three sets of key leaders agree to participate could be as low as 40 percent.

As a result, the state scores in the midrange on this criterion [(A) (1) (ii)]. The score is pulled up by the strength of the standard MOU and the 100 percent commitment (signatures) by superintendents and school board presidents. In turn, the score is pulled down by the less than complete scope of work outlines and the apparently weak commitment from union leaders in the mid-size and large LEAs.

(A)(1)(iii)

On the face of it, Missouri has reasonably strong commitment to RTTT that touches well more than 50 percent of critical entities and groups. Indeed, some 62 percent of LEAs, nearly 70 percent of schools, 67 percent of all students, and 71 percent of poor students reportedly will be direct beneficiaries of RTTT reforms.

Unfortunately, as noted in the preceding criterion, the extent of union ownership for the reforms does not appear to be strong in the mid-sized to large LEAs. A rough calculation of the number of students in the districts lacking union support suggests that about 40 percent of all Missouri students, not the stated 67 percent, would benefit from the reforms. Even though these LEAs have 100 percent support from their superintendents and board presidents, the early reluctance of union leaders may well hamstring the aspects of RTTT that will require teacher collaboration. Thus, the extent of statewide impact beyond half of the student population appears to be in question.

Missouri sets bold goals in each of the performance areas highlighted by RTTT (i.e., student growth, achievement gaps, high school graduation, and college enrollment). Just looking at the individual goals, however, the state provides little substantiation as to the likelihood of achieving in just several years a series of daunting changes: increasing college matriculation rates from 66 to 80 percent, college retention

rates from 73 to 80 percent, and high school graduation rates from 85 to 93 percent; or cutting NAEP achievement gaps by 50 percent. Lofty goals are appropriate, but explanation and evidence of how they will be achieved is necessary, especially when past records show that the proposed gains will be out of the ordinary for the state.

Combining the challenge of weak teacher union support with unsubstantiated progress goals, it appears less than likely that significant statewide impact will emerge from what is proposed. As a result, Missouri scores in the low midrange on this criterion.

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans	30	19
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	15
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	4

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

Missouri’s presentation bounces back when it turns to “building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up and sustain plans” [(A)(2)]. The state scores in the high range for plans to ensure the necessary capacity for implementation, but falls to the midrange for its handling of stakeholders.

(A)(2)(i)

Most impressive for institutionalizing solid statewide leadership [(A)(2)(i)(a)] is the planned reorganization of the state department of education around the three big goals for the RTTT reform (noted earlier in this write-up). Missouri is wise to attempt to change the structure of the department so it is organized around functions rather than money flows. The result should be greater coherence in reform. For instance, all curriculum development and evaluation will occur under the “Standards and Assessments Division,” regardless of schooling or higher education level. Each of the new divisions will carry responsibility for the RTTT work, placing it at the heart of the retooled agency’s agenda.

The proposed approach to supporting participating LEAs is sensible in its conceptual order and experiential roots [(A)(2)(i)(b)]. Conceptually, the state is smart to develop a process that uses the three goals as touchstones in what is sure to be a highly dynamic effort—thereby keeping participants focused on what matters as challenges and obstacles emerge. Similarly, the state will use process evaluations to keep LEAs and their support structures effective and efficient. It is good to learn that Missouri will build the support structure around the existing regional school improvement centers and school improvement teams. Missouri argues that this structure is known and has developed trusting relationships up and down the education hierarchy. The state also intends to bi-annually replicate a major departmental audit that was completed recently—thereby providing independent reviews of reform progress and support quality at the state and LEA levels. The primary question left unanswered in this presentation is how effective the regional support structures and teams have been to date. Building on existing structures is wise, but only if they are worthy of continuation and expansion.

In terms of “effective and efficient operations and processes... for grant administration and oversight” [(A)(2)(i)(c)], Missouri will use an existing system, which arguably has worked well for the state. While it is a good idea not to create a new mechanism, the proposal does not convey the effectiveness of the current system.

Missouri’s handling of the proposal budget is first-rate [(A)(2)(i)(d)]. The budget’s projects and line-items align visibly with the narrative, both in the body of the proposal and in the introduction to the budget. The budget presentation offers excellent clarity on work plans in each project area, as well delineating the management team and members of the department of education who will be reallocated to RTTT. Lastly, Missouri intends to take the important step of aligning nearly all Federal and state grants with RTTT.

The proposal at this point does not address strongly the use of “fiscal, political and human capital resources” to continue reforms funded by the grant [(A)(2)(i)(e)]. However, the overarching strategic focus of the proposal—to use funds to build capacity and infrastructure—is spot on considering the likely one-time

nature of the RTTT grant. Missouri will attempt to ensure continuation of work after the RTTT grant concludes by using the funds to build long-term capacity—human and technical.

(A)(2)(ii)

Turning to the second part of this criterion [(A)(2)(ii)], Missouri fails to make a good case for the support pending from a “broad group of stakeholders to better implement its plans.” As a result, Missouri scores near the bottom of the midrange on this criterion. The level of organized teacher support is in doubt due to the above noted problem with signatures from local teacher union leaders. On the upside, Missouri’s stakeholder survey, conducted in planning for the RTTT submission, has encouraging feedback from an array of groups. A caveat is that survey respondents came predominantly from LEAs and communities with a minority of the state’s teachers, principals and students. In addition, Missouri was wise to conduct a stakeholder forum in November 2009 for 300 participants and to follow-up with webinars that reached an additional 700 people.

Despite the stakeholder survey and forum, the state does not present a strategy for energizing major external partners, such as philanthropic foundations, businesses and higher education. Missouri is rich in each of these sectors, but the proposal does not appear to indicate how these entities will systematically assist the reform plan and ensure it is sustained. The letters of support are notable, but they are limited in number and in several cases do not come from the top leaders in an organization (i.e., education school deans signing letters, without joint signatures from provosts or presidents, which would indicate university-wide support).

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

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

Missouri is above average in “demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps” [(A)(3)]. Scoring quite high on the first part of this criterion, the state is solidly in the midrange on the second part.

(A)(3)(i)

The proposal’s opening section makes clear that the state has an uncommon record of reform endeavors [(A)(3)(i)]. Over the past five years, Missouri has been concentrating on areas that are central to RTTT. Standards and assessments appear to be a forte for Missouri, with intensive work on content and performance standards and aligned assessments dating back to 1993. A statewide longitudinal data system was fully instituted in 2008. Known as MOSIS, it includes identification information at the student level. Teacher and leader quality has been a long-standing feature of educational policy, evidenced by the regional support structures, partnerships with higher education to establish leadership academies (that are aligned with National Staff Development Council criteria), and such practices as accepting teacher certification from other states (as a way to reduce barriers to high quality teachers moving to Missouri). Regarding school turnarounds, the state has a process in place to intervene in under performing districts and schools by requiring and monitoring performance based “Accountability Plans”. Approximately 75 districts have been so identified. Moreover, the state has been “lapsing” district accreditation based on performance measures since the mid-1970s. Four districts have had their accreditation held back over the past five years.

(A)(3)(ii)

As is well understood, reforms do not necessarily produce improved student outcomes. Echoing this all too common reality, Missouri’s many years of hard work have produced a mixed record of improving student performance [(A)(3)(ii)]. The state has made excellent strides in math and science achievement as measured by NAEP. Reading results, however, have been flat or declining, albeit hovering typically close

to the national average. The proposal provides reasons for the improvements: crediting standards and assessments, data analysis, improved instructional practices, and the work of the regional support centers and teams. In addition, teachers have been involved in shaping and monitoring the Missouri Assessment Program—establishing a corrective connection between the assessment system and instructional practices. Unfortunately, the proposal does not discuss why math and science results appear to have benefited from reform while reading results in reading have not.

Little progress has been on the two other outcomes featured in this criterion. Repeating the challenging pattern found nationwide, Missouri has not cracked the achievement gap, despite focused efforts going back to at least 1996. Similarly, the state has been instituting a range of programs to improve high school graduation, but with only marginal results.

Missouri honestly and wisely uses this mixed record as a springboard into the next sections of the proposal. The extensive experiences with reform arguably position the state to use the rigor and resources of the RTTT process to establish comprehensive and coherent plans that will make a real difference in school performance and student learning. Going into the next parts of the proposal, the question looms whether Missouri can capitalize on this promise.

Total	125	69
-------	-----	----

B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	25
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	5

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

(B)(1)(i)

Missouri scores a perfect “20” for participating in a consortium of states that are working towards common standards[(B)(1)(i)]. Missouri is part of the joint National Governor's Association (NGA) and Council for Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) initiative, which includes 48 states and territories. Standards are one of Missouri's special strengths; indeed, the state has been recognized by independent bodies for its rigor. High quality standards are central to the state's overall reform plan. A broad group of stakeholders have been involved in shaping, implementing and monitoring standards. Lastly, the state's theory of action regarding standards is spot on: using them to connect and hold coherent work on data systems, teaching and leadership quality, and school turnarounds.

(B)(1)(ii)

Regrettably, Missouri scores in the low range because it does not appear to meet the RTTT requirement of common standards being “adopted by August 2, 2010” [(B)(1)(ii)]. Revealing language in the proposal includes, “proposed to adopt...,” “upon their adoption...,” and “Adopt Common Core Standards at or before the August 19-20, 2010 State Board of Education meeting.”

While the missed deadline for adoption forces the state's state's score into the bottom range, planning strengths keep the score at the top of the low range. The proposal includes a clear, logical description of action steps, with assigned work responsibilities and timelines. The proposal also outlines important checks and balances on the quality of standards—educators and content experts, locally and nationally, will review the final common standards. Lastly, the implementation plan is clear in terms of professional development, support for teachers and evaluation.

(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments	10	10
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5
(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) <u>(B)(2)(i)(ii)</u> Missouri earns all possible points for “developing and implementing common, high quality assessments” [(B)(2)(i)(ii)]. Matching its work on standards, the state has a long record of attention to assessment systems, dating back to at least 1993. The feature is the Missouri Assessment Program (MAP), which has evolved over time to match nationwide advances in the science, policy and practice of gauging student learning. Teachers and other front-line educators have been central to the creation and monitoring of MAP. The state now is developing formative assessments in collaboration with the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium, which includes 33 states. Missouri is one of 13 governing members of the Consortium. Rightly so, the new common core standards are central to the emerging assessments, and it is anticipated that the assessments will be modified as their merits are proven in practice.		
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments	20	20
(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) Missouri is in excellent form regarding its support for transition to “enhanced standards and high quality assessments” [(B)(3)]. The state’s long record of work on standards and assessments is a boost to its reform plans. Missouri smartly lays out five major activities to advance implementation. All are tied to the proposal’s major goals. Taken together the activities form a coherent, logical sequence of effective implementation: first, the core standards would be adopted and implemented through statewide and school level involvement; second, special attention would be paid to what student level data suggests about best approaches; third, model curriculum frameworks would be created; fourth, STEM would be included as a visible priority for curriculum and other academic programs; and fifth, extensive professional development would be offered. At the heart of the plan are the regional support centers (on college campuses), which will help implementation proceed more smoothly since these are known entities with proven track records.		
Total	70	55

C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system	24	24
(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) Missouri earns all 24 points available for “fully implementing a statewide longitudinal system” [(C)(1)]. The recently established “Missouri Comprehensive Data System,” as described in the proposal, meets all 12 required elements of the American COMPETES Act.		
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data	5	5
(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) Missouri continues its strong run regarding data systems with a nearly perfect score for “accessing and using state data” [(C)(2)]. The state explains the limits to how data in the new Missouri Comprehensive Data System (MCDS) can be accessed and used. A particular problem is that the system is still largely		

comprised of annually collected data. Obviously, this shortchanges the ability of teachers and school and district level educators to work with the data to make rapid corrections in instructional plans and practices.

In an impressive move, the Missouri Department of Education has worked collaboratively with other agencies to determine the additional data components and systems that are necessary to make the MCDS effective for educational decision making. Three key components have been identified:

1. Robust Statewide Student Information System – It will bring together PK-12 student information on demographics, registration, attendance, scheduling, medical information, student performance, discipline referrals, career planning, IEP tracking, transportation, and food service in a single, standardized platform.
2. A Data Warehouse – It will support analysis and reporting from PK through higher education and into the workforce. At the primary level, the warehouse will include early enrollment data, parent educational support data, and relevant program data; at the P-12 level, data will include summative and formative assessment results, teacher/leader evaluation information, course enrollment information, attendance, and discipline referrals; and at the post secondary level, data will include ACT/SAT results, post secondary enrollment information, teacher preparation evaluation information, and economic development workforce data.
3. Show-Me Portal – It will provide single-site access to P-20 longitudinal data to allow timely decision making. It will be available to stakeholders across the education community, other agencies supporting children and families, policymakers, researchers, and the public.

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

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

"Using data to improve instruction" [(C)(3)] is another high scoring area for Missouri.

(C)(3)(i)

The section opens with a valuable preamble on the state's approach to using data to improve instruction. It stresses that data systems and their use need to be better across LEAs; that a key step will be to identify local best practice examples; that these best practices would then be fostered through "incubator projects in each region;" and, that RTTT funds would transition the districts to be fully functional with MCDS. Plans and the budget align well around the incubator projects, with ample activities and resources allocated to encourage the good work in the incubator sites to expand to other LEAs. In addition, the intent to link student performance data to real-time practices of teachers is positive.

(C)(3)(ii)

The proposal is especially strong on "supporting participating LEAs in using instructional improvement systems" [(C)(3)(ii)]. A notable idea is the plan for "Data Team Certification," which would create teams of teachers and principals certified in data use in every LEA by 2011 and every school by 2012. The teams would enable all teachers and principals to make effective use of the Show-Me Portal. The accompanying implementation plan outlines definite tasks, responsibilities and timelines. Missouri is to be applauded for pushing hard for wide-scale LEA and school level data capacity.

(C)(3)(iii)

Nearly as compelling are Missouri's plans to "make the data...available and accessible to researchers..." [(C)(3)(iii)]. Showing a sophisticated understanding of researchers and how data can

become usable knowledge, the state proposes incentives and a multi-institutional structure to boost the availability of and access to data.

- **Incentives:** Missouri intends to establish mini-grants for researchers to encourage them to use the MCDS to tackle critical policy and practice questions.
- **Structure:** More complicated is the plan to bolster the fledgling Kansas City Area Education Research Consortium, which is modeled on the highly successful, 20 year old Chicago Consortium on School Research. The Kansas City Consortium brings together four university partners and works with 28 school districts and 24 charter schools surrounding Kansas City.

Missouri is wise to use RTTT funds to give the new consortium a big boost. If it can be as productive as the Chicago model, it will provide participating districts and policy makers real-time research and analysis. Missouri is taking an important step with the consortium model to bring alignment between the intellectual and analytical capacity of higher education and the inquiry needs of elementary and secondary schools.

The only negative in this section is that Missouri fails to specify how the data incentives and structures will encourage researchers "to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional materials, strategies, and approaches for educating different types of students" (quote from RTTT notice). This required element of the criterion apparently is not addressed, resulting in a slight drop in scoring.

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

D. Great Teachers and Leaders

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

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

Missouri does a borderline job of conveying the extent of plans for "providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals" [(D)(1)]. The presentation is progressively weaker across the three sub-criteria.

(D)(1)(i)

RTTT sets out five elements in its definition of "alternative routes to certification" [(D)(1)(i)]. Missouri meets three of these elements: evidence is provided that supervised, school-based experiences can count toward a credential; that coursework may be limited by test-out options; and, that the same credential is eventually awarded. On the remaining two elements Missouri appears to fall short. Missouri has no legal, statutory or regulatory provisions that may create barriers to alternative, non-higher education affiliated teacher and principal preparation programs. However, the evidence in the proposal indicates that the current set of programs do not operate independently of higher education. Lastly, the proposal does not show that any principal preparation programs meet the RTTT criteria.

(D)(1)(ii)

Missouri lists a series of alternative pathways for teacher and principal development, but none of them fully meet the RTTT criteria. Multiple teacher pathways exist: traditional college routes, alternative college routes, Teach for America, the American Board of Certification for Teacher Excellence, and doctoral routes (individuals with doctoral degrees in a relevant content area can be certified). The mix of principal

certification options includes the New Leaders Project (focused on St. Louis), the Collaborative Principal Preparation Program (focused on Kansas City) and the Rural Principal Preparation Program.

The actual use of alternative pathways appears to be minimal based on evidence provided in the proposal, resulting in a low score on this criterion. Summary data presented in the proposal suggests that only a small share of the 8,230 and 740 teachers and principals, respectively, certified in 2008-09 came through alternative approaches. Roughly 475 of the teacher certifications (about five percent of the total) used alternative pathways, including 350 from Teach for America. Apparently none of the 740 principals were certified via alternative pathways. Products of the alternative principalship pathways noted above may be counted under "traditional college route (including post-baccalaureate and innovative programs);" if so, it is impossible to give Missouri credit in this review because the evidence is not visible.

(D)(1)(iii)

Historically, Missouri has had a good system for tracking teacher and principal shortages [(D)(1)(iii)]. Until 2009 the state had two programs filling teacher shortages, but those have now been cut due to budget problems. Principal shortages have been addressed recently by the three above noted programs targeting St. Louis, Kansas City and rural communities. However, the state offers no evidence that it currently has a robust process for monitoring, evaluating and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage. The proposal directs readers to Criteria D, but little evidence is found in that discussion of a reasonable system for monitoring and addressing teacher and principal shortages. Thus, the state scores in the low-range for this criterion.

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance	58	37
(i) Measuring student growth	5	4
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	12
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	8
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	13

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

Missouri has attempted to "improve teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance" for over a decade [(D)(2)]. Nevertheless, the state receives mixed scores relative to this RTTT criterion.

(D)(2)(i)

The state is committed to using student growth as a major measure of teacher and principal performance [(D)(2)(i)]. Missouri is in a strong legal position regarding performance based teacher and principal evaluations, having no legal statutory or regulatory obstacles to link student growth to teachers and principals. Missouri also has good technical capacity after a decade of providing districts access to student level data. Recently, linear growth trajectories were established for student performance, and Missouri is one of 15 states in the nation using a "Growth-to-Student Model" for NCLB. Based on this experience, the state has a good concept for applying a growth indicator: multiple measures, including growth data, are essential for all high stakes decisions regarding teacher and leader effectiveness. With this combination of legal, technical and conceptual strengths, Missouri scores in the high range for this criterion.

(D)(2)(ii)

Missouri also scores in the high range for "designing and implementing rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals" [(D)(2)(ii)]. As noted above, the state has a long history of performance based teacher and principal evaluation—with major policies set in 1983, 1985, 1999, 2003 and 2009. The appendix includes documents that demonstrate the strength of the state's work on teacher and principal evaluation. From the beginning, the design process involved teachers, principals, superintendents and university-based experts.

The next steps, to be fueled by RTTT, are to retool the measures of teacher effectiveness, advance an excellent set of teaching standards developed in 2009, and develop new tools and processes for teacher evaluation. Four levels of teacher effectiveness will be developed with the assistance of stakeholders.

Principal evaluation will receive comparable attention. The highly regarded Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards for principals will be used to revise the evaluation system; broad stakeholder involvement will be secured; and multiple categories of performance will be developed. Lastly, the proposal indicates that the performance evaluation systems will tie back to the MCDS—the state's comprehensive data system.

(D)(2)(iii)

Missouri is well positioned to conduct at minimum annual evaluations of teachers and principals [(D)(2)(iii)]. The state has been conducting annual evaluations for some time. Now, the evaluations will be linked to the MCDS and eventually incorporate student growth data. An important goal is to provide feedback in rapid-time, allowing teacher and principals to make timely adjustments to improve their performance. To help keep the system working well, the state will conduct annual audits of LEAs' evaluation information and practices.

(D)(2)(iv)

Improved decision making will be a major purpose of Missouri's evaluation systems [(D)(2)(iv)]. The proposal conveys strongly that the evaluations will be used to develop teachers and principals, and to identify various support and intervention needs, including mentoring, professional development, coaching and induction assistance. The evaluations also will be analyzed for insights on the quality of higher education and alternative preparation programs.

High stakes decisions—compensation, promotion, tenure, removal or termination—will take longer to achieve [(D)(2)(iv)]. Missouri is ready to create model policies in each of these critical human resource areas, but does not anticipate that it will have 100 percent participation for over four years. Given that the first year is expected to have 25 percent participation, the state is projecting a four-fold increase. The proposal is unclear on what incentives or requirements will be instituted to quadruple LEAs use of high stakes evaluation systems in just four years. Part of the problem is that the presentation is quite brief, other than to note that, after the models are developed collaboratively, the Missouri Department of Education will offer incentives for LEAs to adopt the models and will later collect and analyze data to track progress. Otherwise, reviewers are given no additional guidance on what will be the likely work. Indeed, budget documents do not shed any more insight on the details of Missouri's plans.

(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals	25	7
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	5
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	2

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

Missouri falls short in its handling of the criterion “ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals” [(D)(3)]. The primary problem is that the proposal presents what may be described as a “plan to plan,” rather than a plan ready for implementation with RTTT support. As a result, reviewers are left without a view of what will be the likely work—in design, extent, quality or impact.

(D)(3)(i)

Regarding the distribution of teachers and principals in high poverty and high minority schools [(D)(3)(i)], the state wisely acknowledges the trouble it has had identifying and addressing shortages. The state also is good to make clear that it will connect future work on such shortages to its larger school improvement plans (MSIP) and comprehensive data systems (MCDS), thereby making the efforts more coordinated and systematic. However, Missouri is only ready to launch a process to develop a plan for implementation, which would have as a centerpiece yet to be determined models of comprehensive policies for attracting talented teachers and principals to high need areas. Of the three major activities described in this section

of the proposal, only the final activity deals directly with the criterion and then in only a weak fashion. Through collaborative efforts with local boards and professional associations, the state will draft model compensation and contract procedures to use to attract high-quality teachers and principals. Beyond this statement, however, little else is described.

(D)(3)(ii)

Regarding the provision of human capital in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas [(D)(3)(ii)], Missouri again fails to provide a credible plan. The state is good to acknowledge that it ranks relatively low on teacher expertise, underscoring the need for focused work on teacher quality. An interesting idea, only generally mentioned, is an incentive program to attract teachers. Regrettably, reviewers are not able to anticipate or evaluate the value of plans because they are sparsely presented. Missouri is right to develop plans collaboratively with districts and charter schools, as the proposal advises, but more needed to be presented at this point to help reviewers know what would be the likely work.

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs	14	8
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	5
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	3

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

(D)(4)(i)

Missouri is highly committed to "improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs [(D)(4)(i)(ii)]. Since at least 1999, the state has had various initiatives and programs that have been monitoring the quality of preparation programs. Upgraded regularly, the monitoring system as of 2009 began linking student performance data back to the relevant preparation institutions. Going forward, Missouri is ready to increase the emphasis placed on student achievement records, even to the point of tying program approvals to such results. Multiple indicators and measures, including student achievement, would be used in rating program quality. Missouri plans a collaborative approach—a Blue Ribbon Task Force, drawing on teachers, principals, state officials, higher education faculty and administrators, and researchers—to identify best practices in education preparation and credentialing and to develop a plan to monitor and improve state preparation programs.

(D)(4)(ii)

Missouri is less strong on plans for "expanding effective programs" [(D)(4)(ii)]. The state takes the stance in the proposal that "programs with less success or which have failed to meet required targets will be obligated to seek assistance or close." To this end, Missouri is good to lay out a set of criteria for judging program quality, with special attention to an entity's ability to:

1. Develop, enhance and document candidates' content knowledge;
2. Develop the necessary pedagogy;
3. Provide a series of relevant and rigorous internship experiences;
4. Demonstrate graduates' success in improving achievement of the students for which they are responsible.

Unfortunately, the state does not go deeper in the proposal at this point than "planning to plan." That is, the proposal presents a plan for how Missouri will plan, rather than the plan to be implemented. Given its excellent history, and the good concepts shared here, Missouri should have included a high-quality plan, not delayed its formation until after RTTT funding is awarded. As a result, the state scores in the low middle range on this criterion.

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

(i) Providing effective support	10	7
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	7
<p>(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>"Providing effective support to teachers and principals" [(D)(5)] has been a longstanding priority for Missouri. The state appears to be adept at both providing and evaluating support programs. As analyzed below, both parts of this criterion deserve to be scored in the high range. Unfortunately, repeating a pattern that began several sections ago, this part of the proposal is light on deep planning. More so than seems appropriate for such a major moment in Federal funding, Missouri leaves too many plan elements to be determined in subsequent planning. Reviewers are left unsure of what will result from the pilots and preliminary planning in terms of final plans. As a result, an otherwise strong handling of this criterion is scored in the middle range.</p> <p><u>(D)(5)(i)</u></p> <p>Missouri has ample experience at "providing effective, data-informed professional development, coaching, induction and common planning and collaboration time to teachers and principals" [(D)(5)(i)]. As of 1993, the state established nine regional professional development centers, required LEAs to spend at least one percent of their annual budget on professional development, and required all new teachers and principals to receive two years of district sponsored mentoring. Since that time, the state has modified its professional development policies and practices regularly to keep abreast of leading research and practice. Professional learning communities, for instance, have become a priority mechanism to ensure that teacher and principal development is relevant to particular school problems and needs, and has the best chance to produce improved student learning. Going forward, Missouri intends to expand the concept of professional learning communities to the lowest performing schools, to collaboratively create comprehensive induction protocols, and to focus support as much as possible on content needs.</p> <p><u>(D)(5)(ii)</u></p> <p>Missouri's history should inform future efforts for evaluating and continuously improving teacher and principal support [(D)(5)(ii)]. Most recently, the state conducted a major "Leadership and Learning Center Audit" (2010). As proposed for RTTT, Missouri will conduct such audits biannually to gauge program effectiveness. In addition, the state will institute what it calls a "System of Support Rubric" as the basis for regularly judging program effectiveness. The rubric will be used by LEAs and the state department of education. Lastly, evaluation efforts will be tied into the MCSD system—the state's comprehensive data system. Taken together, these three elements form a near fail-safe system for tracking and improving program quality. Given the complexity of the monitoring structure, it will be piloted in several locations initially and then disseminated when it can advance what the proposal calls "deep implementation."</p>		
Total	138	73

E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

	Available	Tier 1
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs	10	10
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>Missouri receives full points for the criterion "intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs" [(E)(1)]. Based on evidence in the proposal, the state has full authority to intervene directly in both LEAs and schools.</p>		
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools	40	30

(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	25
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</p> <p>Missouri starts strongly with the criterion "turning around the lowest-achieving schools" [(E)(2)]. But the presentation loses pace in the second half.</p> <p>(E)(2)(i)</p> <p>The state has a 20 year history of tracking school and district quality, as well as a respectable record of "identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools" [(E)(2)(i)]. A sophisticated three-tiered school improvement system has emerged, with the first level focused on individual schools, the second level on the intersection of schools and districts, and the third level on district level functions. Definite criteria have been established for what is considered "a tier one, tier two or tier three issue," and for how and why schools and districts will be judged "low achieving." The state also has developed transparent calculations for defining low achieving.</p> <p>(E)(2)(ii)</p> <p>Missouri's proposal slips to a medium score regarding the larger matter of "supporting its LEAs in turning around schools..." [(E)(2)(ii)]. The state does a good job of connecting the proposal back to the lessons it has learned from long work in this arena. For instance, the proposal notes that systemic change is needed, not just project-based interventions, and that the deeper the need in a school, the greater the turnaround challenge. Similarly, Missouri is wise to consider how to draw on multiple agencies and sectors in school interventions, having learned that schooling challenges are not limited to what occurs within the buildings, but have a lot to do with community, family and home factors.</p> <p>Three main activities are proposed to advance school turnarounds. Together, they represent a comprehensive approach that should address the major requirements to move schools to more effective performance. First, the state will establish a "Quality Schools Framework," around which it will align funding streams, such as the federal School Improvement Grant. Second, a "Missouri Turnaround Model" will be developed through a collaborative process with a wide array of stakeholders. Central to the development effort will be the Darden/Curry Partnership for Leaders in Education, a philanthropically funded effort by the University of Virginia's Darden School of Business and Curry School of Education to work with teams of state, district and school level administrators on building the capacity of low-performing schools. Third, Missouri will develop a state model for a "braided," seamless community-based system of support for children and families. The braided system will include education, health services, social and emotional services, after schools programs, and community based education programs necessary to provide optimal learning environments in school and beyond.</p> <p>Missouri's outline for supporting school turnarounds is compelling: it is multi-faceted, draws on innovative work with the Darden/Curry Partnership, and weaves together resources from multiple sectors to improve schools and student performance. Once again, however, the state leaves too much unexplained about the actual plans. For instance, the proposal does not indicate which of the four preferred turnaround models are likely to be implemented, leaving that to the collaborative planning process. Ultimately, Missouri drops from a high to midrange score as the outline of innovative elements is weighed against sparse evidence of deep planning.</p>		
Total	50	40

F. General

	Available	Tier 1
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority	10	0

(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	0
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	0
(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<u>(F)(1)(i)</u>		
<p>Missouri receives a "zero" for this criterion [(F)(1)(i)] because the required data is not presented. The proposal apparently does not include financial information for FY2008, only for FY2009 and FY2010. Moreover, the state failed to include the percentage change for the fiscal years they did submit (i.e., FY09 and FY10). Only actual dollars are listed for those two years.</p> <p>While the RTTT criterion require a low score, Missouri appears to have protected the level of total funding available to elementary, secondary and higher education between FY09 and FY10 The proposal lists total dollars allocated to education for the two years: \$2.94 billion in FY09 and \$3.00 billion in FY10, an increase of roughly \$60 million dollars. The proposal indicates that there have been "significant budget cuts in all state programs."</p>		
<u>(F)(1)(ii)</u>		
<p>The proposal provides no evidence that Missouri "policies lead to equitable funding between high-need LEAs and other LEAs, and within LEAs, between high-poverty schools and other schools" [(F)(1)(ii)]. Only two sentences are presented, and neither of them indicate whether or not the requirements for this criterion have been met. As a result, a "zero" is awarded for this criterion.</p>		

(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools	40	18
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	2
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	8
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	8
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	0
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	0

(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>Missouri is dedicated to "ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools" [(F)(2)]. Nevertheless, state regulations and policies are inconsistent in the extent to which they promote and support charters and innovative schools statewide.</p>		
<u>(F)(2)(i)</u>		
<p>Missouri's charter school law does not limit the number of charters, but it requires that they be in either the Kansas City or St. Louis school district. This rather severe geographic limitation results in a low score for the first criterion related to charters [(F)(2)(i)].</p>		
<u>(F)(2)(ii)</u>		
<p>In contrast, Missouri scores strongly for setting and abiding by rigorous standards and accountability systems regarding charters [(F)(2)(ii)]. While over the past half-decade few applications have been denied (six out of 38) and few schools closed (five out of 29), the state holds charters to strict performance and operational requirements. Criteria pinpoint academics, management, governance, finances, facilities, safety, parent satisfaction, enrollment rates, graduation rates, and MAP test performance and aggregate growth over several years.</p>		
<u>(F)(2)(iii)(iv)</u>		

Missouri's funding for charters meets RTTT's criterion that "a state's charter schools receive equitable funding compared to traditional public schools" [(F)(2)(iii)]. At the same time, no funding is provided to assist charters with facility acquisition or upkeep, resulting in a low score on this particular criterion [(F)(2)(iv)].

(F)(2)(v)

Regarding support for "innovative, autonomous public schools" [(F)(2)(v)], Missouri provides only a one sentence explanation. The state intends to offer funding incentives to encourage LEAs to develop and implement independent innovative schools. Despite the problem of a sparse presentation, this section scores very low because it does not meet the requirement that "innovative, autonomous public schools" already are a proven priority, not a future endeavor.

(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions	5	1
(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>Missouri also scores poorly in "demonstrating other significant reform conditions" [(F)(3)]. Tying back to the previous criterion, the state lists examples of innovative, autonomous schools as evidence of positive reform conditions. The majority appear to be in St. Louis and Kansas City, and include magnet schools, open enrollment schools, theme-focused schools, virtual programs, special education cooperatives, alternative schools and technical programs. In too brief a fashion, the proposal says that Missouri intends to encourage more innovative schools through "statewide support." Little explanation is provided for how the support will be provided nor for how it will result in more high quality innovative schools. Given that the bulk of the examples are in the two largest urban centers, it would be helpful to know how additional support would spawn innovative schools in a truly statewide fashion. Lastly, no evidence is provided of how the work to date has improved student outcomes. The criterion calls for evidence that the "other significant reform conditions" have produced growth in student learning. The array of innovative schools in St. Louis and Kansas City may well be generating excellent academic results, but the proposal is silent on this matter. All in all, reviewers are left to conclude that the state's "other significant reform conditions" have been isolated to the two largest cities, and may not have made much of a difference academically.</p>		
Total	55	19

Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

	Available	Tier 1
Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM	15	15
Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)		
<p>Missouri does an excellent job of developing and conveying a comprehensive plan for the "Emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)." The state has combined with higher education institutions, businesses and "meaningful out-of-school time experience providers" to develop a series of innovative STEM learning activities. Throughout the proposal, Missouri weaves in STEM as an important piece of each RTTT reform priority. Indeed, the following highlights of the STEM plan visibly touch on each of the four RTTT priorities: developing a diploma with a "STEM concentration," providing continuous professional development on STEM, scaling up successful STEM courses in high schools, restructuring teacher certification to incorporate STEM, incorporating STEM into teacher preparation, creating an electronic forum and network for LEAs and schools to share best practices in STEM education, tracking performance and process data related to STEM in the MCDS, training STEM content specialists to serve in the regional support centers, and developing apprenticeships in STEM careers.</p> <p>Missouri's major shortfall with its proposed STEM programs is that there is no specific mention that they are designed to target underrepresented groups and women and girls. The hope and assumption is that Missouri's robust plan for advancing STEM with students will directly benefit women and girls, and other</p>		

underrepresented groups. The strength of the plan outweighs this oversight of a key element of the criterion. As a result, the full 15 points available for STEM are awarded.

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

Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

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

Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Going full circle in this review, it is right to conclude that Missouri has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that clearly articulates its goals for implementing reforms in the four RTTT priorities. The state's well documented 25 years of reform history has set a clear foundation for RTTT. Under the label of the "Missouri School Improvement Program" (MSIP), the state has been working for over two decades on standards and assessments, accountability systems, data analysis and data based decision making, performance based teacher and leader evaluation, professional development, and pre-service education.

The proposal smartly weaves the four RTTT priorities—standards and assessments, data systems, teaching and leaders, and school turnaround—across three goals: create an integrated, seamless P-20 system; develop high capacity teachers and leaders; and establish a statewide system of support for reform. By weaving the four RTTT priorities across these large goals, Missouri makes the RTTT framework its own. The STEM priority also is addressed under each goal, signifying that Missouri plans to be systematic in its approach to advancing science and math education.

Nonetheless, Missouri stumbled at key points in the proposal, struggling to show how the elements of the reform plan will remain linked, coherent and result in real action and results in schools and classrooms. The state also fell into a pattern of presenting a "plan to plan," rather than the final action plan that had been finalized prior to submitting the RTTT proposal. By not undertaking what might be called "deep planning" ahead of the submission, Missouri leaves too much for reviewers to question as to what will be the final set of plans and work.

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

Grand Total	500	316
--------------------	------------	------------