



# Race to the Top

## Technical Review Form - Tier 1

### Washington Application #4550WA-6



#### A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>55</b>
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	5
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	40
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	10

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

(i) The narrative in this section presents a comprehensive and powerfully presented case for Washington's education reform strategy in the context of historical experience and with a clear alignment of the State's reform agenda and the requirements in this competition consistent with the four education areas described in the ARRA. The approach presented tells an impressive story about Washington's commitment to quality education for all of its children in a vividly illuminated, substantially logical portrait of specific goals, carefully-reasoned capacities and measurable expectations. The application shows strong evidence of viewing the requirements of the Race to the Top competition as a tightly embraced benchmark from which Washington has built upon in meaningful ways that have included local participation in the overall process resulting in deeper investment in supporting a statewide agenda. In the aggregate, this indicates a thoughtful commitment to what Washington expects of itself, independent of any competition, and removes any doubt that this is an application built to narrowly check the requisite boxes in order to secure funding.

It is important to acknowledge the State's impressive structure in developing the application and specifically the legislative achievements designed to substantiate the long-term commitment to achieve the State's four goals. The path presented is very credible, logical and ambitious. The program set forth in this section fully meets the requirements of the criterion.

(ii) Washington has exceeded the minimum guidelines of the MOU by significantly enhancing numerous elements unique to the State through its Washington Partnership Agreement. The State has secured the commitment of a large proportion of its LEAs to the State's plans and further increased this commitment by incorporating a signature from a local principal's representative reflecting a substantial 86% participation by applicable principals. The Terms and Conditions are expansive and serve to tightly commit the LEAs to keep to their responsibilities. The scope-of-work is also fulsome in detail, expectations and specific responsibilities. The proportion of signatures is very high among the three required signatories as well as the additional element of the principal commitment. It is unfortunate that the 69% participation level of eligible teacher's unions stands apart from each of the other signatories that are in excess of 85% and it is my professional judgment that this prevents a perfect score.

(iii) With participating LEAs representing 90% of all LEAs, 95% of all schools, 97% of the student population and 98% of students in poverty, the application more than satisfies the criterion that the reforms will translate into broad statewide impact across student subgroups. However, participation by 69% of applicable local teacher's union leadership does not reflect a high level of commitment to statewide reform resulting in a reduction in points. The application indicates ambitious yet achievable goals for increased student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, increasing high school graduation rates and

increasing college enrollment. The State's performance targets in each of these areas are clearly explained and reflect reasonable time frames against high expectations.

The application provides each element of evidence required by the criterion.

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

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

(i) The application provides a credible plan outlined in the narrative for how the State will provide sufficient capacity to implement its reform agenda. The Steering Committee for Education Reform and Innovation is a well structured organization that demonstrates a deep level of support across a broadly represented team. The leadership for Race to the Top in Washington is comprised of the highest levels of Washington's government indicating their strong commitment to the reform agenda. The application provides clearly established roles and responsibilities that offer a rich tapestry of support, monitoring capability and sustainability across the grant period. Specifically, the creation of the Quality Education Council provides an impressive dimension to the State's capacity. Also, the engagement of a wide array of critical stakeholders in advisory positions takes full advantage of the important degrees of expertise available in Washington and aligns them with the goals of the State's reform agenda. By developing a new Office of Education Reform and Innovation within the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, a position equal to that of a Deputy Superintendent, the application presents an important commitment to a leader with strong authority to support the important responsibilities required. The plan operates with a lean central staff in favor of decentralized personnel across the State which supports the commitment to statewide reform. The expectations and responsibilities of the Director of Education Reform are clearly identified along with the process of selecting this critical individual. The application provides clear evidence of strong leadership and dedicated teams to implement the statewide education reform plans.

The application provides strong evidence of its plan to support LEAs in successfully implementing the reform agenda with regard to identifying promising practices and processes for evaluating these practices statewide. However, the application is silent in explaining how the State intends to cease ineffective practices, specifically hold LEAs accountable and any description of how the State will intervene when necessary as required by the criterion.

The State has a credible and detailed plan for implementing a performance management system that uses data to identify promising practices and to reward innovations. The application makes a credible plan for sharing best practices across the State through this data driven system. The six month timeline for Washington's Race to the Top Restructuring is well-presented and logically organized.

The application narrative does not address a process for budget reporting and monitoring or fund disbursement as required by the criterion. The application does provide evidence of a reasonable plan to provide effective and efficient operations to implement the grant with regard to grant administration and a data system for performance measure tracking and reporting.

The budget narrative takes great care in aligning the three major federal grants that the State has won or hopes to win in order to garner maximum impact to support the 2010 State Education Reform Plan. The budget is organized in a very logical manner with clear evidence of how the State intends to align Race to the Top funds to support its initiatives consistent with the requirements and spirit of the competition: standard and assessments, data systems to support instruction, teachers and leaders, supporting

struggling schools and STEM. A reasonable amount of approximately 3% of the requested funds are budgeted for administration therefore ensuring that a maximum amount is spent directly in support of the reform goals. Further, the budget provides ample evidence that the grant funds will be additive to existing State budget allocations suggesting a capacity to sustain efforts beyond the grant period however the narrative does not adequately meet the criterion for specifically explaining the State's plan for using the fiscal, political and human capital resources to continue reform efforts after the period of funding has ended. Included in the budget narrative are well-described annual benchmarks for required activities to support aggressive, statewide implementation of the grant.

(ii) The application includes an impressive number of quality letters of support from a variety of critical stakeholders including legislative and political leaders, citizen support through postcards, STEM-related advocates and partners, all teacher and principal organizations, and leaders from a wide-array of Washington's diverse ethnic communities. Letters of support from the charter school community are not included.

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

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

(i) The application provides clear evidence of progress over the past several years in each of the four education reform areas. In particular, Washington's work in these areas has been comprehensive and results-oriented. For example, the creation of the Comprehensive Education Data and Research System has enabled a rich collection of data to inform instruction and develop a public reporting mechanism. In addition, the State has enjoyed significant progress with regard to standards development and implementation beginning in 1993 and has also achieved success for improved support for teachers through the creation of the Professional Educator Standards Board. Finally, Washington has utilized the data in its accountability system that has been developed through performance-based assessments introduced in 1993 and its statewide accountability system created in 2005 to more precisely focus energies and resources on strategies for struggling schools. The narrative effectively describes progress as well as credible evidence of ongoing utilization of Federal and State funds targeted to support the four specific reforms.

(ii) The application is thorough in its analysis and description of student outcomes overall and by student subgroup. The narrative presents the results in a straightforward manner absent any obvious attempts to disguise the facts. It is clear that, overall, student outcomes have remained largely flat in recent years with only a few sporadic exceptions in 8th grade NAEP for math and across several sub-groups in the NAEP reading and math scores. Student performance on the 8th grade NAEP math scores increased across all subgroups. The narrative points out that the State has seen higher participation rates in reading assessments than the national average with regard to sub-group as an explanatory factor in the test results. With regard to NAEP reading scores by subgroup, all scores decreased except for American Indian/Alaskan Native students and where the scores are flat for White students. 8th grade NAEP reading scores demonstrate gains in all subgroups except for Black students. In sum, the results over recent years are flat or mixed with evidence for only minor occasional increases.

When examining student performance on Washington's State assessments, the story presents several encouraging elements regarding what are some significant gains in 4th, 7th and 10th grade math scores and gains in reading scores for 4th, 6th, 7th and 10th grades.

While Washington has sustained a strong focus on improving graduation rates, at this point, the overall graduation rates remain flat. One notable exception, however, is the increase in graduation rates for Black and Hispanic students between the 03-04 and 07-08 school years.

The achievement gaps between White students and other ethnic groups in recent years remain between 15% and 25% which presents a considerable challenge for the State. On State assessments, however, achievement gaps for reading are slightly decreasing while the gap in math persists. The application does not provide a description of the strategies undertaken to reduce this gap beyond stressing this as a priority for the State.

Total	125	92
-------	-----	----

**B. Standards and Assessments**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>25</b>
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	5
<b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>(i) Washington is one of 48 States and three Territories participating in the Common Core State Standards Initiative. The standards being developed will be internationally benchmarked and are to be clearly aligned with college and work expectations by the time of high school graduation. The detailed information provided in the appendix further supports Washington's demonstrated commitment to adopt a common set of high-quality standards.</p> <p>(ii) The criterion requires evidence of a commitment to adopt a common set of K-12 standards by August 2, 2010 or, at a minimum, by a later date in <b>2010</b>. The application indicates that Washington may <b>provisionally</b> adopt the Common Core set of K-12 standards by August 2, 2010 but indicates that the legislature will not be able to finalize adoption of the standards until the early part of 2011, which is beyond the timeline allowed by the criterion.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5
<b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>(i) Washington is participating actively in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium. Several key leaders from Washington have important roles within the Consortium which further amplifies Washington's commitment to the development and implementation of common, high-quality assessments.</p> <p>(ii) There are 32 States participating in the Consortium as evidenced by the MOU provided in the application.</p>		
<b>(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>Washington provides evidence of a rich history in support of the implementation of standards and assessments which provides an excellent foundation to move forward with its plan for supporting a statewide transition to and implementation of internationally benchmarked K-12 standards and assessments. The State's plan places the responsibility for accomplishing the transition and implementation upon the Regional Implementation Support Network and the Washington State Professional Development Cooperative. The application indicates that the State intends to utilize Race to the Top funds</p>		

to augment capacity among the nine regional Education Service Districts through adding data coaches and literacy/English language arts coordinators. The narrative outlines a process that includes the support of institutions of higher education and high capacity LEAs as implementation partners. The State's overall plan is comprehensive for rolling out the new standards and assessments statewide with clear responsibilities and reasonable timelines, except in one significant aspect. The State does not plan to formally adopt the new common core standards until Spring 2011, losing a calendar school year in the process. This presents a definite limitation with regard to the aggressive expectations inherent within the competition. The narrative does not provide a specific explanation for this delay beyond a suggestion that legislative requirements are a factor.

Total	70	47
-------	----	----

### C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> The application provides clear evidence that Washington has an existing statewide longitudinal data system that includes all 12 of the America COMPETES Act elements.		
<b>(C)(2) Accessing and using State data</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> Washington has an existing track record of ensuring that data from the State's statewide longitudinal data system are accessible to the public, particularly key stakeholders, as required by this criterion. The State legislature examined this issue again in 2009 in focusing on the identification of reports and other information to be made accessible to the public on the internet. The State's plan also calls for the Comprehensive Education Data and Research System to generate reports available through web portals that will provide feedback to educators, administrators, policy makers, researchers and the general public. These reports will take the form of data dashboards, alerts, formatted reports and extracts. The plan also articulates an ongoing initiative to identify the critical research and policy questions that need to be addressed by the statewide k-12 education data system as well as plans for making data reports available to the public. The application presents a credible plan and commitment that meets the criterion.		
<b>(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17</b>
(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	6
<b>(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> (i) The application provides robust evidence of a credible plan that will increase the acquisition, adoption and use of qualifying local instructional improvement systems. The Partnership Agreement between the State and LEA's, in fact, requires the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction to assist participating LEAs that do not currently have a local instructional improvement system in adopting a qualifying system. The application also describes the element within the Partnership Agreement that provides for enhancements to local instructional improvement systems from the State including access to web-based		

components, state-level summative data, student growth data and access to an early-warning dropout prevention system.

(ii) The State presents a credible plan for using data coaches through the nine regional Educational Service Districts to assist educators in the use of local instructional improvement systems to develop understanding and interpretations of the data and to help educators apply those findings. The plan also contemplates additional staff to conduct statewide professional support in this area. Washington's plan also provides for the hiring of a statewide education data coordinator who will have the ultimate responsibility for developing and implementing professional development relating to the use of instructional improvement systems. The data coordinator will in turn rely upon the nine data coaches at the regional level to execute an annual work plan consisting of specific activities expected against ambitious yet reasonable time frames.

(iii) The application presents a strong plan for strengthening the State's existing commitment to make data available to researchers and, through the Race to the Top Partnership Agreement, requires participating LEAs and their local instructional improvement systems to do the same. The narrative provide specific evidence of how the State substantially supports researchers through access to the State's data system through the Education Research and Data Center as a central location for researchers, legislators and other individuals to access substantial amounts of data related to early learning, K-12, higher education, and employment data demonstrating the State's proactive plan to make data from instructional improvement systems widely available.

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

**D. Great Teachers and Leaders**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>15</b>
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	7
(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)**

(i) The application narrative and appendix provides evidence of statutory authority passed in 2010 enabling expanded alternative routes to certification of teachers and principals specifically including providers in addition to institutions of higher education. Of the five elements included in the definition for alternative routes to certification, Washington's plan provides detailed evidence that it meets each of the elements through statutory and/or regulatory provisions.

(ii) Washington has four types of alternative certification routes for teachers and principals that have been in place since 2002. Within these routes, seven programs are currently operating in eleven sites and have produced 1100 teachers. While the application provides ample evidence for teacher alternative programs currently in use the criterion also requires evidence for principals. The narrative offers no evidence of alternative programs in use for principals.

(iii) The plan presents a credible and well-constructed process for monitoring, evaluating and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortages. The State conducts a semi-annual survey of district educator need, perception of the available talent pool, and difficulty in hiring for each teaching endorsement and educator certification type. To strengthen this effort, recent legislation requires multiple state entities to engage with school districts in a deeper level of data analysis and planning on current and projected status of Washington's educator work force beginning in the 2010-2011 year. Washington has a number of programs that address teacher shortages and also undertakes several outreach initiatives to provide significant returns in recruitment of effective candidates into pathways to education. The plan also

effectively incorporates new alternative route programs. However, it is not clear from the plan how principal shortages are addressed beyond broad references in part to "educators" without specifically indicating that principals are a priority focus as required by the criterion.

<b>(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>18</b>
(i) Measuring student growth	5	2
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	7
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	6
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	3

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

(i) The application makes clear that Washington measures student growth for each individual student and that the specific definition provided in the notice is now embedded in Washington State law. The State articulates a reasonable process as part of its plan to determine the most effective ways to measure student growth consistent with Washington's reform agenda. The clear approaches required by the criterion are not identified in the application. The State expresses its intentions for how it will define these approaches but they are not now specified but are being developed.

(ii) The application presents a credible and comprehensive plan to develop and implement fair evaluation systems. It remains to be seen how rigorous and transparent these systems will be in practice. The plan articulates a process for defining multiple rating categories but seems to remain silent on ensuring student growth will be used as a significant factor in both teacher and principal evaluations. Statements are made that say how evaluations will "provide information about the district's progress toward using student growth data as part of its principal and teacher evaluation processes," and how the State emphasizes student growth as in "Washington intends for all teachers to be responsible for student growth" without ever making the direct commitment to utilize student growth as a significant factor. In another statement, the application reads "Teacher and principal evaluation is one area in which student growth data *can* be used to provide feedback." This does not meet the requirements of the criterion. The application provides solid evidence of expansive participation of Washington's teachers and principals in designing and implementing the State's evaluation systems.

(iii) As evidenced by statutory language included in the appendix, Washington augmented its long record of conducting annual evaluations of teachers and principals to include specific protocols for how the evaluations are to be conducted and what steps are to be taken when an employee's work is judged unsatisfactory. Included are detailed consequences for any failure to comply with this statute therefore underscoring the State's commitment to quality annual evaluations of teachers and administrators. Finally, among the required forms from each evaluation is to document the sharing of constructive feedback. The application provides a reasonable and comprehensive plan for developing new evaluations and for improved feedback in a timely manner that is consistently focused on student growth information. The narrative is not clear about how student growth data intends to be provided to teachers and principals for their students, classes and schools.

(iv) The narrative does describe a process to provide professional development, as well as some coaching and induction support evidence based on the completion of the work to develop new evaluations for teachers and principals.

The narrative is completely silent on the issue of compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals on the basis of evaluations where student growth is a significant factor.

The application does not address the issue of granting tenure and/or full certification to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.

The application is completely silent on describing any process for removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent and fair procedures.

<b>(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>11</b>
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	8
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	3

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

(i) In trying to align the definition in Section D(2) of Washington's Evaluation Criteria of its principals and teachers with the definition of highly effective principals and teachers provided in the notice, it is difficult to identify where Washington will use student growth to effectively measure high rates of achievement. This is an essential requirement in understanding the numbers and availability of highly effective principals and teachers yet it is absent in the State's plan. Therefore, it is equally challenging to lend credibility to the State's plans for ensuring that highly effective principals and teachers are equitably distributed in the service of students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools. The State's plan does address a long-standing initiative through the Washington holders of National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification who qualify for a financial stipend for service in challenging schools. The funds available for this initiative have also been increased. Further, the plan provides evidence of an effective monitoring system designed to validate the efficacy of bonus strategies in drawing teachers to challenging schools. In addition to financial incentives, the plan enumerates four actions in support of the equitable distribution of effective teachers -- noting, however, that the criterion speaks to "highly effective" and that the plan avoids this terminology throughout. The State does have a mechanism in place for tracking high-quality instruction through its evidenced-based certificate. The performance measures indicated in the plan might be deemed reasonable by the State but fall short of the "aggressive yet achievable" spirit inherent in this competition.

(ii) The application presents a very weak plan for how the State will meet the criterion to increase the number and percentage of effective teachers teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas including mathematics, science, and special education; teaching in language instruction and in other areas identified by the State or LEA. The narrative only speaks to initiatives in the mathematics and science areas though references these as they apply to a small number of LEAs and not as a statewide effort. There is no reference to the other subjects required of the criterion beyond where the performance measures are indicated. The performance measures are aggressive, however, the narrative offers no details with regard to how the State intends to achieve these targets. The plan falls short, overall, in explaining how Washington would increase the supply and availability of effective teachers as required by the criterion.

<b>(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5</b>
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	3
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	2

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

(i) The application presents a credible plan to link "student-based evidence" to the teacher preparation program. Again, it is not evident from the application that the definition of Washington's "student-based evidence" is consistent with the definitions of student achievement and student growth required by the criterion. The criterion also requires evidence for principals as well, however, and this is not present in the plan.

(ii) Washington presents a weak plan for meeting this criterion in describing a credible approach for how the State intends to expand successful preparation and credentialing options that produce effective teachers and principals. The plan does not specifically address how principals will be incorporated nor

does the plan offer supporting details for the broader statements that simply outline the creation of a state task force and mentioning a few objectives.		
<b>(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4</b>
(i) Providing effective support	10	4
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	0
<b>(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>(i) The criterion requires a high-quality plan for data-informed professional development, coaching, induction, and common planning and collaboration time to teachers and principals. The narrative addresses a reasonable process for disseminating professional development across the state to teachers and describes a plan for developing the Washington State Leadership Academy to provide professional development support to principals. However, the application fails to provide specific detail with regard to how data will be used to specifically drive the professional development delivered in the State. It is difficult to ascertain from the application how the State's plan would provide ongoing, job-embedded data-driven professional development as required by the criterion.</p> <p>(ii) The criterion requires a credible plan that demonstrates how the supports to teachers and principals will be measured, evaluated and continuously improved in order to improve student achievement. The application does not provide any evidence as required by the criterion.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>53</b>

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

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>Washington has recently enacted legislation which enables the State Board of Education and Superintendent of Public Instruction to intervene directly in the State's persistently lowest-achieving LEAs. However, although the narrative indicates that the legislation requires intervention in the lowest-achieving schools using a state/local partnership aligned with the federal school improvement definitions and guidelines, this suggests indirect intervention by the State rather than the direct intervention required by the criterion. Further, a review of the legislative summary provided in the appendix provided excellent detail about the State's ability to intervene at the LEA level but was silent on any provision for direct intervention at the school level.</p>		
<b>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>34</b>
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	4
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	30
<b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>(i) The application presents a comprehensive plan for identifying the State's persistently lowest-achieving schools including evidence that this process is currently in use as of December 2010. The timelines included for implementing the State's plan for adopting criteria for identifying persistently lowest-achieving schools and designating LEAs for required action are ambitious yet achievable.</p> <p>(ii) The plan presented clearly aligns the State's support of its LEAs in turning around lowest-achieving schools with the four school intervention models required in the criterion and the competition. Historically,</p>		

the State has relied upon a voluntary program when addressing school turnaround which can make success more elusive. The application indicates a commitment to Race to the Top funding to increase support to additional persistently lowest-achieving schools with up to five schools in the lowest five percent of the schools and districts that volunteered to participate in the program and up to three schools that are required to participate in the Required Action Intervention. It is difficult to determine if this is a significant increase relative to the total number of persistently lowest-achieving schools resulting in a reduced score. The application meets the criterion for providing historical evidence of those schools who have undertaken one of the four required turnaround models. Of the 102 schools served in School Improvement Assistance, nearly 60 percent exited improvement status or made Adequate Yearly Progress which demonstrates a high level of success.

Total	50	39
-------	----	----

**F. General**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	2
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
(i) The application presents evidence that the percentage of total State revenues available to the State to support elementary, secondary and public higher education increased from 44.2 percent in FY 2008 to 45.4 percent in FY 2009.		
(ii) The State's plan does not specifically address the requirements of the criterion for evidence that the State's policies lead to equitable funding between high-need LEAs and within LEAs between high-poverty schools and other schools. The narrative includes a reference that State funding formulas exist to ensure equitable funding that recognizes variable costs of districts and the special needs of disadvantaged students but then fails to supply supporting details and evidence for how this is done.		
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	0
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	0
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	0
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	0
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	0
<b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
(i), (ii), (iii), (iv) Washington's laws do not allow for charter schools in any capacity.		
(v) The application does not address this criterion.		
<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		

The application provides substantial detail of the State's actions that have created conditions favorable to education reform or innovation. Washington has experienced a dramatic increase in the number of innovative, student-centered, performance-based schools during the past twelve years resulting in a 12 percent representation of alternative schools as a percentage of Washington's public schools. Washington has enacted positive legislation that reduces the regulatory burden on its public schools while giving more flexibility to teachers and principals while shifting the overall focus to accountability for student performance and away from the historical emphasis on "seat-time." Parents have the flexibility to move within school districts if a financial, educational, safety or health condition of the student would be improved. Parents could also transfer their student if the school was closer to child care or the parent's workplace. The State has a rich tapestry of innovative schools in both high schools and elementary schools statewide. Further, the State allows for school districts to contract with alternative educational service providers under a very flexible framework. However, the criterion also requires evidence that these reform conditions have led to increased student achievement, graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps, or resulted in other important outcomes. The application does not provide evidence to address this which results in a reduction in points.

Total	55	10
-------	----	----

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

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

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

The application provides clear, consistent and robust evidence throughout that meet the criterion regarding STEM. Starting with the inclusion of STEM as one of the four primary Washington Education Goals, the State's plan has a very precise agenda for achieving four aggressive goals that are specific to STEM. The Partnership Agreement with participating LEAs is firm in its requirements that LEAs increase the availability of opportunities to apply and integrate STEM content areas going even as far as to create the Washington STEM Center to ensure that innovation is developed and made scalable across the State. The State's plan also incorporates STEM is a focus for one of its very innovative Innovation Clusters. This aspect of the application is one of the most impressive.

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

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

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

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

Washington has presented a well-reasoned education reform agenda when considering that the application comprehensively and coherently addresses all of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria as required for the Absolute Priority. The State has secured strong participation from its available LEAs and presents evidence of solid support across an impressive array of critical stakeholders. Most impressive of all is the detailed requirements included in the Partnership Agreement which remove any ambiguity for what is expected by the State's agenda should it be successful in this competition. The Partnership Agreement is imaginative and visionary with a clear direction for Washington's children. Washington provides ample evidence of its commitment to decreasing the achievement gap across all student subgroups and increase graduation rates and college and career readiness. The challenges within the application that do not fully meet the spirit of the aggressive reform

expected in a unique competition like Race to the Top are in a consistent inability to frame objectives and goals that rely upon student growth as a significant factor along with frequent assertions that are devoid of specific detail to support how these aspects will be supported that are indicated throughout the comments.

The narrative frequently talks around the issue of student growth using other language that suggests a lack of commitment in this regard. Finally, the absence of a charter school statute presents a large, unavoidable hole in the overall score. In sum, Washington is on a path toward meaningful, scalable education reform inclusive of a number of very special and innovative elements.

<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>
--------------	--	----------

<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>302</b>
--------------------	------------	------------



# Race to the Top

## Technical Review Form - Tier 1

### Washington Application #4550WA-7



#### A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>49</b>
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	3
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	35
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	11

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

A(1)(i)

The applicant provides a detailed, comprehensive, and coherent reform agenda based on past success with reform initiatives, other grants obtained and submitted (e.g., SLDS, i3, etc.), and input from a wide variety of stakeholders and education experts. The state proposes four broad goals for the reform agenda, which are also indicated throughout the document: (1) all students will enter kindergarten prepared for success; (2) all students will compete in math and science nationally and internationally; (3) all students will attain high academic standards regardless of race, ethnicity, income or gender; and (4) all students will graduate able to succeed in college, training and careers. In addition, the application indicates that state leaders are committed to pursuing the reform agenda even in the absence of RTTT funding – an important aspect of any reform plan (i.e., firm intent). However, the purpose of RTTT is for rapid implementation of carefully-developed reform plans, and Washington has provided (through various sections of the narrative and Appendix A) evidence of experience developing and implementing modern education reform since the 1990s. Many of the historic accomplishments discussed in the application are strong, though it does eventually lead to some question about the ability of Washington to implement rapid reform to address identified needs of youth in the state. For instance, Appendix A discusses the Core24 initiative, which was approved in July 2008, yet the plan for implementing this reform had not yet occurred when the Appendix was written and it is unclear when the reform will actually take hold. Reforms proposed in RTTT cannot be successfully implemented at that pace (i.e., taking over 2 years to develop an implementation plan after the original conceptual plan was introduced). In addition, the applicant states that 50% of participating districts expressed a commitment to participate in at least one optional/competitive innovation cluster. However, two of them are part of the key reform areas required by the RTTT initiative (i.e., developing great teachers and leaders; jump-starting improvement in struggling schools (turning around lowest achieving schools)), while another (improving college and career readiness and reducing achievement gaps) is a foundational element of the state's application and would be expected to receive 100% commitment from participating districts. It seems that these "clusters" are enhancements to the requirements of participating districts (as per the RTTT Partnership Agreement and Appendix A(1)-6), but it is unclear why only a very limited number of districts/schools will be eligible and/or willing to be part of these four clusters. This section receives moderate points.

A(1)(ii)

In addition to strong support from the governor, legislature, and community (as evidenced throughout Appendix A), the application was able to garner strong commitment by the participating LEAs to the proposed RTTT plan, with 265 out of 295 districts participating. It was also a strength of the application,

and likely to have assisted with such levels of LEA support, to see that Washington engaged stakeholders via a public website and conferences prior to finalizing and submitting the RTTT application. Appendix A1-12 provides a letter, submittal information, and the partnership agreement ("Agreement") between the SEA and the participating school district. The Agreement includes a very brief, but appropriate, description of the RTTT and some of the preliminary plans of the SEA, including the RTTT goals and roadmap for achieving said goals. Exhibit 1 of the Agreement shows the detailed elements to which participating LEAs and other signatories were agreeing, as well as locations for the LEA superintendent to initial conditional agreement to be considered for the four innovation clusters. The incorporation and descriptions of the "innovation clusters" is helpful, but it is unclear whether the LEAs and other signatories were provided the more detailed versions of these clusters (provided to reviewers earlier in Appendix A). Although based on the standard MOU, the agreement included a "collective bargaining" clause that allows any element of the agreement to be bargained in "good faith" without any repercussions of not engaging in the requirement components of the RTTT reform plan (e.g., a stronger agreement would have been to exclude the district if they are unable to fully implement the RTTT reform agenda). Also, in most "State Commitments" and "District Commitments," the Agreement does not outline any tentative timeline for implementation of these reform efforts, meaning that some could take many years to implement while still remaining within the scope of services outlined in the Agreement (see reviewer comments for A(1)(i) for concerns about delays in implementing some reform efforts in Washington). In addition, the Agreement only required the signature of the district superintendent for the LEA to be considered a "partnering LEA," but included the ability for districts to obtain signatures from the school board president, principal representative, and the president of the local teachers' union. Including a space for a principal representative to sign the Agreement is certainly a positive aspect of Washington application, and Appendix A1-15 provides the detailed tables showing which districts gained principal support. However, only 86% of the principals actually signed the agreements. This does raise some concern as to why 14% of participating districts did not receive support from the local principals, and the concerns are further exacerbated in those districts where there are only a few schools and none of the principals signed the agreement (e.g., Evergreen School District, Great Northern School District, and Green Mountain School District all have one school and the principal did not sign the agreement). Given that principals must be heavily involved in the reform efforts proposed in the RTTT application, it would be helpful to understand why such a percentage of districts were unable to garner their support for the application. There is also concern (particularly with the inclusion of the collective bargaining clause) that only 69% of Local Teachers' Unions (out of 249 LEAs with such local unions) agreed to the terms and conditions contained in the Agreement. In addition, it is noted that 10% of the local school boards did not approve and sign the RTTT Agreement, again raising concern about those districts without such support. Finally, only 50% of the districts indicated interest in at least one innovation cluster, with some foundational clusters receiving a low level of interest (e.g., Teacher and Leader Development only received interest from 79 districts). While it is understood that the innovation clusters provide an opportunity for districts to implement additional plans and activities with RTTT funds, it is unclear why such a small general proportion indicated interest in these clusters. Barriers to enticing districts to buy into the innovation clusters could speak to a larger issue of convincing districts to implement the full complement of the RTTT initiative and Washington reform plan. In terms of scoring this section, the terms and conditions reflect a strong commitment by participating LEAs, the scope-of-work provides descriptions that require participating LEAs to implement significant portions of the state's RTTT plans, and signatures were obtained from 265 out of 295 LEA superintendents. However, given the concerns listed above, there are some questions about the content of the Agreement and about the extent of leadership support within the LEAs. As such, this section receives moderately-high points.

#### A(1)(iii)

Concerns listed in A(1)(ii) continue into this sub-section, particularly in reference to the level of support from principals, school boards, and local teacher unions among participating LEAs. However, the concern shifts to consideration about whether the difficulties of LEAs to obtain such supports would negatively impact the potential for the reform agenda proposed in the RTTT application to translate into broad, statewide reform and achievement of stated goals. In some districts, there is support from neither principals nor teachers, whereas others have support only from the LEA superintendent. This is not necessarily crippling to the RTTT reform plan proposed, but it would seem to limit the ability to have statewide impact. It would have been helpful for the applicant to discuss and/or explain the difficulties, challenges, and/or reasons that

signatures and agreement were not obtained from principals, school boards, and unions in all participating LEAs. That being said, it is important to note that the SEA obtained substantial support and agreement from LEAs – with 90% of all LEAs agreeing to participate in the RTTT application. Moreover, the LEAs participating represent 95% of all schools, 97% of the student population and 98% of students in poverty (as defined by Washington). It is unclear whether ethnic minorities are represented at the same numbers, as this information was not included in the tables provided within the application. This section was also scored with consideration of the laws provided in Appendix A, which show a commitment to broad, statewide reform aligned to the RTTT application (particularly Appendix A1-10: Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill 6696). This section receives a low-high score, with some consideration for concerns indicated above.

<b>(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>20</b>
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	12
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	8

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

A(2)(i)

Throughout the application and within this section, the applicant provided evidence that directly and/or indirectly supported their assertion that Washington has the capacity required to implement the proposed RTTT plan. See comments in A(1) and A(2)(ii) for discussion of statewide support in evidence of state capacity to implement RTTT. Further supporting statewide capacity to implement the plan, Appendix A1-7 presents a listing of specific individuals for a number of committees and workgroups (e.g., steering committee, coordinating committee, standards and assessment committee, computer systems and instructional improvement system committee, etc.). The individuals listed on these committees (under the assumption that they have agreed and/or have been assigned to these committees) represent a variety of individuals and expertise. Moreover, while most are from the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, several members represent a number of agencies where appropriate. The honesty of the statement in the A(2)(i) narrative that the number of state offices, committees and workgroups is both a strength and a challenge is appreciated. The fact that the director for RTTT will be a deputy superintendent shows both dedication and potential for strong leadership at the state level, though there is some concern that the narrative does not specifically indicate that the coordinating committee (or the workgroup for education reform and innovation) will be continued throughout and beyond the 4-year RTTT funding period (it is, however, implied). The organizational chart is very helpful in showing the state capacity and leadership for this grant.

In terms of the budget (A(2)(i)(d)), the applicant provides a detailed budget that follows the minimum requirements of an RTTT budget. The applicant has indicated three federal sources to coordinate with RTTT funding (State Fiscal Stabilization Funds, longitudinal data system grants, and school improvement grants). It is particularly impressive, as indicated by the applicant, that the entire \$819M in SFSF funding has been allocated to school districts in Washington. The budget model presented in "Budget – 5" is helpful to visually see where the funding is currently proposed for allocation – split into six categories (main administration, STEM, and the four reform areas of RTTT). The budget narrative indicates contracts with the nine Education Service Districts, which is an interesting concept but raises questions about why these services cannot be provided directly by the state or the individual districts, as the concept of Education Service Districts was not well-defined in the application. In addition, there are several other anomalies in the budget that raises some concern. For instance, in the "Teachers and Leaders" section of the budget, there are two contracts for two individuals, both for \$495,000 over three years – thus raising the question about reasonableness of these costs in relation to the other costs in the grant (i.e., can these tasks be completed by an individual(s) making less than \$165,000 per year).

While the applicant demonstrates strong leadership and dedicated teams to implement the statewide education RTTT reform plans, as well as a plan for providing effective and efficient operations and

processes for implementing the RTTT reforms, the applicant did not provide (within the narrative) high quality plans or substantial information regarding the capacity of the state to provide support to LEAs in implementing the plans or how the state will use its fiscal, political, and human capital resources to continue the RTTT reforms after the period of funding has ended. That said, there is information provided in the budget section regarding general activities for providing professional development within several of the budget categories, though these activities do not meet the standards provided within the RTTT guidance for "high-quality plans." In other words, there are no specific goals, clear activities, detailed timelines, indication of responsible parties, or performance measures that relate to providing these required components regarding capacity to provide support to LEAs or leveraging resources. Ultimately, this section receives a moderate score.

A(2)(ii)

As mentioned in scoring criteria A(1)(ii), the applicant has support from a wide variety of stakeholders and leaders – including the Governor, US Senators, state legislators, colleges, the state PTA, state unions, principals' association, the Washington Roundtable (group of top-40 business leaders), and other state and community leaders and organizations (as evidenced throughout Appendix A). In addition, the application received commitment from LEA superintendents, with 265 out of 295 districts participating in the RTTT application. However, the same concerns as noted in A(1)(ii) remain regarding principal, teacher, and teacher union support of the RTTT plan and agenda. There is also concern that several letters are "cookie cutter" support letters that do not specifically state how the letter-writer's agency will be involved with RTTT or how they specifically support RTTT - at times it is not readily apparent how the agency writing the letter is related to education and/or the goals of RTTT. The stated planning that the applicant put into the application process (e.g., formation of workgroups, providing information and soliciting support via websites). This section receives low-high points.

<b>(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>11</b>
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	4
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	7

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

A(3)(i)

The applicant demonstrates a commitment to and progress within each of the four education reform areas: standards and assessment, data systems to support instruction, great teachers and leaders, and turning around lowest performing schools. The applicant clearly indicates using and leveraging other federal, state, and private funds to pursue such reforms (e.g., Institute of Educational Sciences, Gates Foundation, etc.). These reforms started in the early 1990s, though most of the significant progress has been made in the last several years and some as recently as March, 2010 (e.g., 2010 E2SSB 6696). Much of the progress and commitment in Washington has been focused on state standards and assessments and the data system, though progress in the other areas is not unimpressive given the relative lower amount of external funding secured for these activities. The state mentioned in A(2)(i) that the entire \$819M in State Fiscal Stabilization Funding was provided directly to school districts, but it is not indicated how (or if) those funds are being used to support the four reform categories proposed by the RTTT application. Overall, the applicant does not provide any indication as to the use of ARRA funds in implementing any of the RTTT reform initiatives. As such, this section receives a moderate-high score.

A(3)(ii)

The applicant provides a narrative in A(3)(ii) that discusses improvement since 2007, though the criteria for this section requires improvement since at least 2003. However, the applicant provided full data reports on the NAEP assessment since 1996 in Appendix A. In essence, the applicant accurately identified that "Washington still has work to do on closing significant achievement gaps." Since 2002 and 2003, Washington has not demonstrated any significant improvement in 4<sup>th</sup> and/or 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading scores on

the NAEP assessment, neither overall nor for any subgroup. Because there was no improvement in any specific subgroup, there was also relatively no change in the achievement gaps between subgroups (though the achievement gap between White and Black students, White and Hispanic students, and ELL and non-ELL students all had relatively widened since 2003). In terms of NAEP results for mathematics, while there has been a relative plateau in improvement since 2005 for fourth grade math and 2007 for eighth grade math, the data clearly shows significant improvement in NAEP scores and percentages of students at higher levels of performance since 2003. However, the achievement gaps continue to grow for Washington. For instance, among 4<sup>th</sup> grade math scores, while there has been a significant decrease in the percentage of students identified as White, the average scale score and proportion of students at or above proficient have both increased for the White students yet remained unchanged for Blacks, Hispanics, Asian/Pacific Islanders, and American Indian/Alaskan Natives. This remains true for the 8<sup>th</sup> grade math scores, with the exception of Asian/Pacific Islanders, where there was also a significant increase in the average scale score and the proportion of students at or above proficient. In addition, since 2003, 4<sup>th</sup> grade students identified with disabilities have not improved in the math NAEP assessment, while non-disabled students have seen gains in the average scale scores. Among 8<sup>th</sup> grade students, students with disabilities increased average scale scores in math from 2003 to 2005, with relative stability thereafter, whereas students without disabilities have seen increases since 2003. Finally, among both 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade students, those identified as ELL demonstrated no significant increase in average math scale scores since 2003, but non-ELL students have shown significant increase in that time. Overall, the achievement gaps in mathematics since 2003 have relatively widened for all subgroups, with the exception of a slight decrease between average scale scores of Black and Hispanic students. Finally, in terms of graduation rates, data provided by the applicant shows (since 2003), there has been an increase in the percentage of students that did not finish high school, and a decrease in the percentage of students that receive some education after high school. Based on the data provided, there has been relative stability of percentage of high school graduates and college graduates (it was not explained by the applicant how the percentage of dropouts could increase while the percentage of high school graduates remained consistent).

Other data to address this criteria are summarized in the grant narrative and do not have supporting data in the Appendix. Although this does not impact the scoring, it results in an absolute reliance on the information summarized in the narrative. The discussion of AP scores shows a commitment of the state in enhancing the college readiness of students, though it does not demonstrate a significant impact on the achievement gaps in the state. It is not clear the purpose of including SAT data, as it does not address the requirements of this section (improvement in overall and subgroup outcomes since 2003). In terms of graduation rates, the state uses the term "stubbornly stable" in reference to overall and subgroup changes in graduation rates since 2003 – a term that can also be appropriately applied to the dropout rate since 2003-2004. There have been relative improvements that cannot be ignored (2,000 fewer dropouts since 2003-2004), even though these differences may not be significant. The applicant could have provided more information about why these rates have remained stable (e.g., mediating or moderating factors).

Science state assessment shows tremendous gains overall since 2003 or 2004 (5<sup>th</sup> graders were first tested in 2004), though the differences since that time and 2009 shows a widening achievement gap between White students and students identified as Black, Hispanic, and American Indian/Alaskan Native (the table is difficult to interpret as columns do not have the correct headers). In terms of mathematics state assessment results, although the overall gains since the year of first administration are not as large as those in science, the overall and subgroup gains are similar – wherein there has been a relative increase over time for all students, though White students have increased faster than Black, Hispanic, and American Indian/Alaskan Native students. This pattern does not hold true for reading and writing state assessment results, where the "minority" subgroups of students all had greater improvement than White students – though White students still improved, this is the pattern of results that can eventually close the achievement gaps (i.e., all students improve, with subgroups improving at higher rates). There are some declines in achievement over time for reading (in grades 5 and 8), where grade 5 is the most concerning given that Black students declined at a greater amount than White students.

There is little discussion about the connections between the data and actions in the state that have contributed to any increases and gap closures, and even less discussion about those situations and actions that have been unsuccessful in generating improvements and/or closures of achievement gaps. Given that the applicant has provided substantial information to laud the accomplishments of education reform in the state, it is concerning that such efforts since the early 1990s have not resulted in significant improvements across most core subjects and have not addressed the growing achievement gaps in the state. This section receives low points, as the basic criteria were not adequately addressed.

Total	125	80
-------	-----	----

**B. Standards and Assessments**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>20</b>
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	0

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

B(1)(i)

Although the state has worked to revise and implement new standards over the past few years, the applicant has demonstrated a strong commitment to the Common Core Standards by joining 47 other states in the development and adoption of the Common Core Standards coordinated by the Council of Chief State School Officers and the National Governors Association. The applicant also indicates intention to join with the National Research Council to develop common science standards. This section receives full points.

B(1)(ii)

The applicant provides information in the grant narrative and Appendix A1-10 (Engrossed Second Substitute Senate Bill 6696) regarding the adoption of the Common Core Standards. This criterion for RTTT requires states to adopt the common standards by August 2, 2010, or by a later date in 2010 specified in a high-quality plan towards which the state has made significant progress. Part 6 of the law provided (passed March 29, 2010) is consistent with the grant narrative – that the state superintendent can provisionally accept common core standards, if desired, in math, reading, writing, and communications. However, these standards cannot be implemented until reviewed and approved by both the House and Senate. The superintendent must provide a report for their review by January 1, 2011, and the actual implementation is not likely to occur until after the 2011 legislative session (as per Part VI). Thus, it appears that the common standards will not be formally in place until about one year after August 2, 2010. To quote from the bill: “the superintendent of public instruction shall not take steps to implement the provisionally adopted standards until the education committees of the house of representatives and the senate have an opportunity to review the standards.” While it is commendable that the law was written to allow the adoption of the standards, the timeline does not support the RTTT intention of rapid reform. This section receives no points, as the standards will not be formally adopted and integrated into the state’s model until 2011.

<b>(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	4
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5

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

The applicant is working towards jointly developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments aligned with the common core standards. Currently, the applicant is a governing member of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium of 34 states (though the narrative indicates 32 states) – a merger of three consortia in response to RTTT. Under the leadership of Washington, the consortium will apply for a RTTT assessment grant in June 2010. The Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium position paper (Appendix B2-4) and the flyer (Appendix B2-5) are well developed and provides a clear picture of the intention behind this consortium. However, in B(3), the state indicates that the progress and continued development of these common assessments hinges upon receipt of the federal award through RTTT, thus suggesting that the state is committed to developing the assessments only insofar as the effort is funded by the federal government. The applicant provides no "backup" plan should the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium not receive federal funding. As such, B(2)(i) received moderate-high points and B(2)(ii) receives full points.

<b>(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>13</b>
--	-----------	-----------

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

The applicant proposes a four-phase model for transitioning to the Common Core Standards and assessment systems: adoption and alignment; developing resources; professional development; statewide capacity for comprehensive college and career readiness programs. The applicant plans on providing transitional support through the Regional Implementation Support Network and the Statewide Professional Development Cooperative, which are provided by contractual agreements with each of the nine Educational Service Districts (totaling about \$13M of the total RTTT budget). This professional development will be advised by the Washington State Education Coordinating Council. Educators at all levels of the system will have access to professional development, data system, web-based resources, and other resources to enhance utilization and understanding of the common core standards. The applicant also provides a detailed timeline in the B(3) narrative, as well as a more graphic representation in Appendix B(3)-5. Although not required, it is impressive that the state will be aligning the early learning standards to the state's K-12 standards. Overall, the state has developed a carefully-considered plan that patiently implements the Common Core Standards and assessments, though there are several concerns about the proposed plan. First, the applicant introduces the 2005 Mater Plan for Higher Education and, although approved in 2005 and although the legislature called for a new test in 2007, these efforts have not been productive due, at least in part, to budget shortfalls (as per the applicant). This raises concern about whether the state will be effective at implementing a far more comprehensive and complicated plan for reforming education and implementing the Common Core Standards and assessments. Second, the applicant reintroduces the fact that the state is participating in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, but includes a caveat that the development and subsequent implementation of common assessments will only occur if this consortium is funded through the RTTT competition. If this were not to receiving funding, the applicant does not provide any sort of back-up plan for developing and implementing common assessments. Third, the applicant provides a performance measures table where LEAs will be involved in piloting and utilizing the state-supported instructional improvement system, but the increase is not considered ambitious or rapid reform. Finally, towards the beginning of the sub-section, the applicant stated they were looking ahead to the 2013-2014 for full implementation of the standards, though the "provisional adoption" of the standards would be in August, 2010. The purpose of RTTT funding is for swift reform of educational programs and systems to address the needs of our Nation's children. As shown in the timelines, the state is not planning for full implementation of the standards and assessments until at least the 2013-2014 or 2014-2015 school years. This section receives a moderate score.

<b>Total</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>42</b>
--------------	-----------	-----------

**C. Data Systems to Support Instruction**

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>
--	------------------	---------------

<b>(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>
<p><b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b></p> <p>The applicant reports developing and implementing a comprehensive statewide longitudinal data system with the assistance of the Washington Education Data and Research Center, federal SLDS grants, and (mentioned in a previous section) private funding from the Gates Foundation. The state also has laws (e.g., Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2261) that were provided in the appendices and have sections on education data and data systems. Ultimately, the state provides information that their current data system (which will be further expanded and improved through RTTT) adheres to all 12 requirements of the America COMPETES Act. Table C-1 goes through each of the 12 requirements and concisely outlines how Washington addresses each of the components. According to the application, the state was recognized by the Data Quality Campaign secondary to efforts on establishing the state longitudinal data system. This section receives 24 points for having 12 required elements.</p>		
<b>(C)(2) Accessing and using State data</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b></p> <p>The applicant has provided substantial background information throughout the application regarding progress towards developing and implementing a comprehensive statewide system for tracking and reporting important student and teacher data. Indeed, the system currently in place sounds quite strong and provides for collection of a wide variety of important data. With the support from the federal grants and the Gates Foundation, the applicant reports having all necessary resources to fully develop a system for P-20 data collection via a connected system of databases. The applicant also describes some of the recent work to guide the development of an enhanced data system, including the creation of the K-12 Data Governance Group, Data Management Committee, and retention of the Public Consulting Group. However, as per the application, it seems the primary deliverable to date from these groups (developed in 2009) are reports and manuals, though it is not clear whether actual changes have occurred to the data system. There is also concern that the 2008 SLDS grant received by Washington has not yet implemented the data warehouse system nor the online tools and portals proposed (as per the future tense statements in the RTTT application). The state is also working towards other reforms of the CEDARS that have not yet occurred (e.g., transfer of student records, student growth model, and dropout early warning system). The applicant also provides a timeline for when some of these items will be completed, though the timeline is very general and it is not clear when some items will be implemented (or if they will be implemented). For instance, the dropout early warning and interventions system has a due date for the report to the legislature, but no indication when or if the system will be incorporated into CEDARS. In addition, several elements are not slated for completion until 2013, which is not in line with the rapid reform agenda of RTTT. Ultimately, the applicant did not provide a comprehensive plan for ensuring that data gathered from the enhanced SLDS would be accessible to, and used to inform and engage, key stakeholders, nor that data would support decision-makers in the continuous improvement in areas identified by the RTTT requirements. This section received moderate points, as the system in place and slated for enhancement meets part of the requirements of this section.</p>		
<b>(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>12</b>
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	4
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	3
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	5
<p><b>(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b></p> <p>C(3)(i)</p>		

The applicant provides a brief background on the local use of instructional improvement data systems in Washington, including a brief discussion of challenges associated with the different types and models of systems used by various school districts across the state (e.g., some districts have sophisticated systems, a little more than half are members of the Washington State Information and Processing Cooperative, and some are members of the Washington Summit District Improvement Program). Regardless, by way of the RTTT partnership agreement, the state has agreed to provide a web-based improvement system and access to state summative data for all districts. In the designing of the LIIS (local instructional improvement system), there is no discussion of linking and making the LIIS congruent with CEDARS and the other data systems proposed for consolidation in C(2). Given the wide range of already existing systems, and the multiple facets proposed for revision and development for CEDARS, it seems counter-productive to create yet another system for data use. There is a statement that the two LIISs that would be piloted in Phase 1 of the implementation plan would need to be interoperable with any online summative assessment system and the district's student information system, yet there is no mention of CEDARS or the state's longitudinal data system being created/enhanced. The dashboards and reports planned for teachers, principals, and administrators are good ideas, but they seem to duplicate the information that would be available through the SLDS and, given the description in the narrative, would require entry into a separate LIIS. In terms of phase 2 of the plan, it is assuming funding of the Smarter Balanced Consortium and assumes the assessment developed will be ready for integration into the LIIS – though the applicant does not provide a clear plan or timeline for when or how these will be integrated into the systems. The applicant does not explain why there are two years needed for piloting the LIISs, nor is it clearly explained what will happen during the pilot phase of the implementation of the LIIS. Finally, there is no indication that the state will monitor or evaluate the use of the pilot or final LIISs to determine whether the systems are being used, how they are being used, or to identify methods for increasing the use of these systems. Overall, this section receives a low-high score.

#### C(3)(ii)

The applicant indicates, as with the previous section, that there is no standardized, comprehensive method for providing support to LEAs and schools on using data and LIISs for continuous instructional improvement. The state does report some varying efforts by state, district, and local agencies and groups to provide some level of training, but admits to having no systematic approach. The RTTT budget includes funds for "data coaches" through the Educational Service Districts to provide professional development to all districts, while the RTTT partnership agreement requires districts to identify a district-level instructional improvement coordinator and have teachers and principals participate in professional development on how to use and apply the results of LIISs. The overall plan provided is very brief and hinges upon hiring a state data coordinator and nine ESD data coaches. The plan provides five general goals for the professional development provided to districts, and includes a timeline focused on acquiring staff and beginning trainings in July 2011. There are no specifics about how the trainings will be provided, what will be provided in the initial year of trainings (as the previous sub-section indicated the LIIS will not be implemented until 2012), or how the professional development will be evaluated and monitored. Given that the ESDs will be receiving at least \$13M in contracted funding for this effort, it would be important to evaluate and adjust the professional development system as necessary to ensure increased use of the LIIS and associated reports/dashboards. There are also no specifics on other ways (other than hiring 10 staff for professional development) in which the state will support the LEAs in using these systems and the resulting data to support continuous instructional improvement. This section receives moderate points.

#### C(3)(iii)

As with the previous sub-section, the applicant provides a brief background of current systems and followed with a brief plan for addressing the RTTT requirements under this sub-section. The current systems, as per the application, provides for access to specific data by researchers through the state educational agency. Such data includes state-level, district-level, school-level, and student-level data on finances, student achievement, and educator data. The applicant states much of this data is already available on the SEA's website by way of comprehensive files, but the SEA also provides databases in response to individual requests. The applicant and partnership agreement also show that districts are required to provide access to data from LIISs to researchers, and the state will provide information about how to safeguard student and

employee personal information. The plan itself is rather brief and provides little information about specific processes and activities associated with updating CEDARS for use by researchers, updating the current online data systems mentioned earlier in the sub-section, or specific assistance that will be provided to districts in how to provide data to researchers (i.e., providing information is likely insufficient to protect districts and provide specific procedures on how to disseminate requested data to researchers). In addition, neither the timeline nor the narrative provides an indication of when process for requesting data will be distributed to researchers or how the process will be distributed. Given that the current system provides for access to data and the intention is to enhance the current system, this section is provided a moderate-high score.

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

**D. Great Teachers and Leaders**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>15</b>
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	7
(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)

The applicant notes and provides documentation (via E2SSB 6696) that the state has a current law that allows for alternative teacher and principal training programs. Part 5 of this law also includes specifics on selected admissions criteria, training requirements, testing requirements at end of training program, requirements for state-funded conditional scholarship awards, as well as requirements for state and district assessments related to needs for teachers and needs for additional training programs to develop new teachers. Ultimately, the law provides statutory provisions that allow for alternative routes to certification that permit providers who operate independently of IHEs, requires specific selective admission standards, requires supervised and school-based experiences, provides for the same certificate as traditional routes, and limits the coursework by basing the training requirements on competencies rather than credit-bearing coursework. It is particularly strong to see that the Washington Professional Educator Standards Board is already working with several alternative providers prior to the date for such providers to seek state approval. Finally, the state allows for out-of-state institutions approved in other states to operate as approved training programs in Washington. This section receives full points.

D(1)(ii)

Although agencies outside of IHEs are not currently authorized to provide alternative routes to certification programs in Washington until after September 2010, the applicant indicates that there are currently seven programs operating in partnership between districts and IHEs throughout the state. These programs have specific requirements and the applicant provided data to demonstrate that these programs have been relatively effective in training teachers, particularly in high need areas. However, because there are no teacher routes that meet criterion (a) of the RTTT definition of alternative routes (i.e., providers outside of IHEs) and there is no description of alternative routes for principals, though acknowledging that there are alternative routes for teachers that meet most of the requirements, this section receives moderate points.

D(1)(iii)

Washington's E2SSB 6696 requires for the development of state and district methods to identify needs related to teacher shortages and to develop methods to determine the needs for additional training programs to develop new teachers. In addition, as per the law and as indicated in the application

narrative, the state provides scholarships for alternative route teachers or interns - restricted to those seeking to teach in state- or locally-identified shortage areas, such as math, science, special education or English Language Learners. In addition to these provisions, the applicant states that Washington has traditionally utilized several sources of data to determine teacher and principal shortages and inform strategies for addressing these shortages. However, as has been common in the application, Washington recently came to realize that the methods being used were insufficient and has set out to reform their methods. The applicant discusses how the new law requires the Education Data and Resource Center to provide biennial projections identifying shortages and the Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board must establish "service regions" and determine whether adequate access to educator preparation programs is being offered. The applicant also discussed current mechanisms in place for addressing teacher shortages, such as alternate route programs, scholarships, and outreach initiatives. However, while the applicant initially attempts to convince the reader that there are already systems in place, the final paragraph of this sub-section states that "in the past, the state's response to unanticipated shortages has been scattershot strategies that did not ensure that increased production actually met demand." It leaves the reader questioning whether the list of strategies currently in place are remnants of a scattershot approach, or whether they were carefully developed and implemented. Associated with this concern, the applicant does not provide any data related to the effectiveness of the currently implemented mechanisms for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage. As such, it is difficult to assess the quality of the indicated mechanisms in light of the statements made in the closing paragraph of this sub-section. This section receives low-high points.

<b>(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>19</b>
(i) Measuring student growth	5	0
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	9
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	6
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	4

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

D(2)(i)

The applicant provides a brief overview of teacher and principal evaluations in the state of Washington, which nicely explains the system that was first codified in 1985 for teacher evaluations. Regardless, the history of statutory guidance for teacher evaluations is impressive, as is the realization that the model used for many years was insufficient and the efforts to change the statute with the major reform of 2010. The E2SSB 6696 provides, as per the application, new evaluation criteria for both teachers and principals, including the requirement that teachers and principals use student data to guide instruction. This criteria requires the applicant to provide a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs establish clear approaches to measuring student growth for each student. To address these requirements, the applicant proposes a two-prong approach: (1) developing a system based on the Colorado Growth Model and (2) relates to piloting evaluation models in selected school districts (though the application is not particularly clear as to whether this is the second approach). It seems, however, that the applicant may have misunderstood the requirements for this sub-section, as there is no discussion of a plan for measuring student growth and the timeline provided does not suggest any plan for measuring student growth has been developed (all dates are N/A or TBD). Given previous sections and information from appendices, it is known that Washington has state assessments to measure student achievement, so it is not clear why a system has not been developed to measure growth on the state assessments over the course of time. Moreover, it is not clear why a plan for developing a system for such comparisons at the individual student level would not involve the LIISs discussed in the previous section (C). Ultimately, the applicant does not provide a clear plan for implementing assessment of student growth at the individual student level, nor are the proposed annual targets ambitious. The basic criteria for this sub-section are not met and the sub-section receives no points.

## D(2)(ii)

The applicant references the recently-passed E2SSB 6696, which outlines the requirements for teacher and principal evaluation. The applicant references two lines (one for teachers and one for principals) which are reported to evidence the requirement that evaluations focus on student growth. However, the actual text of the law is not so clear as to suggest these are requirements that student growth be a significant factor of the teacher and principal evaluations, only that the evaluation must incorporate "multiple student data elements" – which can be interpreted in ways other than use of student growth data (which is student achievement data compared at multiple points in time). Regardless, the statute provides a clear indication of what is required for evaluation of both teachers and principals, and the applicant appears dedicated to developing a system through the use of pilot districts, their teachers and principals, and their local unions and associations. The applicant also reports that principals and teachers were involved throughout the process of writing E2SSB 6696 and developing the language regarding evaluation requirements (though it would have been beneficial for the support letters to be more clear in that regard). Ultimately, the plan provided starting on page D-23 is sufficiently detailed and well-considered, and the timeline provided in D-5 is clear and consistent with the rest of this section. However, the intent of RTTT funding is to provide substantial funding for swift and efficient reform of the Nation's education systems. Given that the evaluation system will not be implemented until the 2013-2014 academic year, it seems that the state is not proposing ambitious goals for RTTT funding. Given that the well-considered plan is qualified with the ambiguous inclusion of student growth (and no indication that this will be a significant factor), little discussion of transparency, and a slow timeline for implementation, this sub-section receives moderate points.

## D(2)(iii)

The applicant clearly indicates (as does the newly-implemented state law) that the evaluations of both teachers and principals will include timely and constructive feedback. The applicant states that student growth data and data from the "student data information system" will "provide student data that are timely, usable, and relevant to the evaluation process." The applicant also states that forms will be developed to share "constructive feedback." However, the applicant does not provide a clear and unequivocal statement that student growth for students, classes, and schools data will be included in the evaluation feedback to teachers and principals. Given that the statute provides strong guidance for feedback requirements, this section receives a moderate score secondary to the lack of detail about including student growth data in evaluation feedback to teachers and principals.

## D(2)(iv)

The applicant introduces the concept of "fit" as a goal of the new evaluation process – this is a bold and ambitious initiative and goal, though the applicant provides no further plan or information about how such "fit" would be accomplished through the evaluation process. The second goal for the new evaluation system, as per the application, is to provide "high-quality information" and "educator development" for each educator (which is assumed to mean both principals and teachers based on statements later in this sub-section). Although the RTTT application and other funding sources will provide general professional development to teachers and principals, this sub-section requires a plan for using the evaluations to guide professional development – there is no discussion about whether the evaluations will be used to guide development or how this process might be implemented. The state law contains language (again summarized in the narrative) that requires new teachers to be hired in provisional status for three years unless they receive one of the two highest evaluation ratings during the second year of employment. The law also provides some conditions under which a teacher or principal will not have their contracts renewed. However, the application does not provide a clear plan for how the criteria of this sub-section will be implemented (aside from stating the requirements are in the law and general statements that these considerations will be discussed alongside the new evaluation system). For instance, there is no plan provided for using evaluations to guide compensation and promotion of teachers and principals (though there is mention of an innovation cluster that will include only a small percentage of the participating LEAs). In addition, the intention of RTTT is rapid and efficient reform to address the needs of the Nation's children. The timeline provided on page D-19 indicates that, for the most part, the systems for teacher and principal evaluation will not be implemented statewide until, at the earliest, the 2013-2014 school year, though the

language is rather ambiguous and it could be significantly later (particularly for items required in D(2)(iv)). Ultimately, the information provided for D(2)(iv) does not meet the standards provided within the RTTT guidance for "high-quality plans" (i.e., goals, activities, timeline, parties, performance measures, and credibility). This section receives a low score.

<b>(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>12</b>
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	8
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	4

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

D(3)(i)

The applicant again references the requirements for evaluation outlined in the new state legislation (E2SSB 6696), stating that districts will be required to submit data to the state regarding teacher and principal evaluations. The application indicates that the district is responsible for assigning staff and ensuring learning needs are supported, but the application does not provide a plan for how this will be accomplished. While the district (via the partnership agreement) has agreed to use "evaluation systems to inform decisions regarding professional development, assignment practices, and career advancement," the application again does not provide a plan for how this will be accomplished within the RTTT initiative. In terms of state-level actions within this sub-section, the applicant discusses two focus areas of the TEP: data and reporting systems and policy coherence (six additional focus areas were listed, but not discussed as relevant to RTTT and this sub-section). While the data and reporting systems may assist with identifying when high poverty and high minority schools are disproportionately served by ineffective teachers, it is not clear in the application what will be done with this data and/or how the state will address such situations when they arise. The application does state that additional compensation is provided to teachers with national board certification and to those working in high poverty schools, and provides preliminary information of the effectiveness of this program for high poverty ("challenging") schools. The applicant also briefly mentions the innovation cluster for teacher and leader development, though this is expected to benefit only a small portion of the LEAs participating in the RTTT. Overall, the applicant did not provide a detailed plan consistent with the "high-quality plan" indicators, did not provide ambitious goals, and did not provide an adequate timeline of planned activities and reform efforts. In addition, Table D-7 shows that the state will make no progress towards ensuring equitable distribution of highly effective teachers until at least 2013-2014, and assumes that the distribution will be equal immediately upon implementing a procedure for assessing "highly effective" teachers and principals. The application would have benefited from initial plans to address the unequal distribution of highly effective teachers and/or developing a provisional definition based on available assessment data to ensure equal distribution of effective teachers and administrators. Due to the absence of required elements of a high quality plan and ambitious annual targets, while taking into account the current practices for enhancing equitable distribution, this section receives a moderate score.

D(3)(ii)

The applicant provides some information regarding work that is being done throughout the state to determine the needs for teachers and principals (e.g., Study of Leadership for Learning Improvement, the New Teacher Project, and the NCTQ study on human capital in urban districts). In addition, the application discusses the Teacher and Leader Development and Effectiveness Innovation Cluster, which will emphasize alternative routes for teachers in STEM subject areas and attracting teachers to rural areas. The state is also working to revise credentials for elementary mathematics specialists. In addition, as per the law and as indicated in the application narrative, the state provides scholarships for alternative route teachers or interns - restricted to those seeking to teach in state- or locally-identified shortage areas, such as math, science, special education or English Language Learners. The applicant stated that all LEAs (as per previous law) evaluated teachers and principals, yet Table D-9 suggests that teacher effectiveness is not currently being evaluated. Indeed, this suggests that the state will not have evidence of effective teachers until at least 2013-2014 (though the new evaluation system will not be implemented until 2013-

2014, so the state will actually not have data until 2014-2015). As with the previous sub-section, the state provides some background and basic information in response to the criteria, but does not provide a high-quality plan as to how the state will increase the number and percentage of effective teachers in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas. Due to the absence of a high quality plan and ambitious annual targets, while taking into account the current practices (such as scholarships), this section receives a moderate score.

<b>(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4</b>
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	2
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	2

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

D(4)(i)

The applicant states that it will not wait until after the implementation of the new teacher and principal evaluation system to link student achievement and growth data to the state's teacher preparation programs. The applicant reports being one of 14 states participating in a pilot of the national Teacher Performance Assessment (a classroom-based assessment of teaching effectiveness), which will be available in 2012-2013, one year before the new teacher and principal evaluation. The applicant states that aggregate data will be linked back to the preparation program of the teacher. The applicant also discusses the ProTeach Portfolio for assessing teacher effectiveness and determining continued licensure – wherein the applicant states this will be the “sole determinate for continued teacher licensure,” though this seems to go against the statements made in the previous sub-sections about the teacher evaluation system and the statute regarding teacher evaluation. Overall, aside from statements that the data will be linked, the applicant does not provide a clear plan for how such data will be linked to the preparation program (e.g., teacher ID numbers, tracking system, etc.) or how the data will be accessible to the public. In general, goals are not identified for this process and the annual targets are not ambitious. Table D-11 indicates that no progress will be made until 2013-2014, at which time the state will achieve 100% access – this seems unlikely, as the basis for this delay is secondary to the new evaluation system being released that year. As such, it seems that the public will not be able to access this information until at least the 2014-2015 academic year. However, it is unclear why the state cannot use current assessment data to report on student achievement until such time as student growth can be added to the system. Ultimately, the applicant does not provide a high-quality plan as defined by the RTTT request for proposals and does not provide ambitious annual targets and goals. This section receives a low score.

D(4)(ii)

The applicant provides limited information in this section and previous sections about expanding preparation and credentialing options that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals. The applicant reports a “fundamental redesign” of the preparation program accreditation system, which will incorporate a broader range of evidence in terms of “completer effectiveness.” The applicant also indicates that the state will work to increase the presence of district-based residency preparation programs. However, the applicant does not provide specific information about how these mechanisms will be implemented and does not provide a specific plan for expanding programs that are found successful at producing effective teachers and principals. The information provided in this section is very general and does not meet the high-quality plan requirements provided in the RTTT guidance (i.e., goals, activities, timeline, parties, performance measures, and credibility). In addition, secondary to the delay in developing and implementing the teacher and principal evaluation, the goals for this sub-section requirements will not be realized until after 2015. Ultimately, secondary to the lack of a clear and high-quality plan for expanding successful preparation and credentialing options, this section receives a low score.

<b>(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>9</b>
--	-----------	----------

(i) Providing effective support	10	7
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	2
<b>(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
D(5)(i)		
<p>The applicant indicates that Washington is planning on revising the Teacher Assistance Program (professional development system) following a two-year pilot of the newly-developed system. The applicant provides five initiatives to support this new Teacher Assistance Program, though one of them appears to be no longer implemented (funding during the 2007-2009 biennium). Using a performance management systems approach (based on student performance and growth), the Washington State Professional Development Cooperative will lead the professional development efforts for educators and principals. The cooperative will be advised, in part, by the state chapter of the National Staff Development Council. The applicant provides information about the data that will guide the provision of professional development (e.g., longitudinal data system, DEWIS, student assessments, etc.). The applicant provides six functions of the cooperative (it states there are seven, but only provided six). The plan for data-based professional development is good, but the applicant does not address coaching, induction, or common planning and collaboration time. In addition, the plan does not address whether the professional development activities identified will be job-embedded or ongoing. Table D-14, which provides performance measures of number of teachers receiving training by the Data Coaches each year of RTTT, also raises concern. Namely, although there are over 58,000 teachers and principals in the participating LEAs, less than 22% will have received training by the end of RTTT, with less than 7% in each of the first three years of RTTT funding. Finally, the timeline provides has very broadly-defined activities and goals. In light of the planning regarding the cooperative, this section receives a high-moderate score.</p>		
D(5)(ii)		
<p>The applicant indicates that the design of the Washington State Professional Development Cooperative includes program evaluation and direct response to evaluation as a "centerpiece of the work." In addition, the application provides a brief discussion of the Teacher and Leader Development and Effectiveness Innovation Cluster (which will likely only impact a small percentage of the participating LEAs). However, aside from the statement that evaluation will be a part of the cooperative, the applicant does not provide a plan for how the supports will be measured, evaluated, and continuously improved. As mentioned in the review of the previous sub-section, the applicant does not address several types of supports indicated in the RTTT request for proposals and, as such, also does not indicate how they will be measured and evaluated. In terms of the professional development and technical assistance provided by the cooperative, it is not clear exactly how the activities will be measured or how the evaluation will be used for continuous improvement to ensure teachers and principals improve their effectiveness to impact student achievement. In addition, there is no timeline for when the evaluations will take place (e.g., weekly, monthly, annually, etc.). This section receives low points.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>59</b>

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

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
E(1)		
<p>The applicant provides evidence that it has legal authority to intervene in school districts with the state's persistently lowest-achieving Title I and Title I eligible schools. The applicant reports that the law requires</p>		

intervention in the lowest-achieving schools using a state/local partnership aligned with the federal school improvement definitions and guidelines, including the required implementation of one of the four federal intervention models - yet this is not elaborated upon and only district-based interventions are discussed. Within the law, these districts are termed "Required Action Districts" and the requirements and repercussions are clearly outlined in the statute (e.g., completion of a required action plan, reopening collective bargaining agreement, etc.). This system will not be in place until 2011, and it is not clear which districts would currently meet the Required Action definition. There is no indication that the state has authority to intervene directly in a school (in addition to the district), which is required by this sub-section of the RTTT initiative. This section earns 5 points.

<b>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>
(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 applicant defines persistently lowest-achieving schools as any Title I school or Title I Eligible school that is among the lowest-achieving 5-percent of all Title I or Title I Eligible schools in the state. This is an appropriate definition that meets the minimum expectations of RTTT. The applicant will also use RTTT funds to provide similar services to additional schools that do not meet this definition, but meet an alternative definition (i.e., up to 23 additional schools, but still in the lowest-achieving 6-10% or identified with extraordinary needs). This section earned full points.

E(2)(ii)

The applicant reports a comprehensive system of performance and accountability to support School Improvement Grant schools and districts to be used with low-achieving schools and Required Action Districts. According to the applicant, this comprehensive system will also be used and enhanced through the RTTT initiative. At the state level, support to LEAs is provided through four primary structures: the Performance Management and Turnaround Office identifies the persistently lowest-achieving schools, allocates funding and resources, provides administrative and evaluation services, provides technical assistance, and monitors and provides oversight for district/school improvement and accountability; the Washington Performance Management Framework determines the range of services and supports offered to districts and schools based on performance and growth; the Washington Improvement and Implementation Network provides technical and evaluation assistance; and the Professional Development Cooperative provides professional development in design, development and implementation. The applicant also provides all necessary elements for a high-quality plan, as defined by the RTTT request for proposals. In terms of evidence of past experience in working with persistently lowest-achieving schools, the applicant notes that school turnaround was voluntary prior to the current law. However, since 2004-2005, the applicant reports 73 schools in corrective action and 40 schools in restructuring. Overall, the state seems to have been relatively successful in implementing the turnaround initiatives, as demonstrated by improvement in reading and math state assessments. That said, the applicant does not provide information on "lessons learned" in order to guide and inform the turnaround model proposed in the RTTT proposal. Regardless, the sub-section meets all requirements of the RTTT request for proposal and provides a high-quality plan for turnaround of the state's lowest performing schools. This section receives full points.

<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>45</b>
--------------	-----------	-----------

**F. General**

	Available	Tier 1
--	-----------	--------

<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	3
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>F(1)(i)</p> <p>The applicant reports the percentage of total revenues available to the State that were dedicated to education increased from 44.2% in 2008 to 45.4% in 2009, which also represents an actual increase in total funding. This section receives full points.</p> <p>F(1)(ii)</p> <p>The applicant reports efforts at the state level (both within law and policy) to ensure equitable funding is provided to high need LEAs and other LEAs, primarily by providing the majority of funds using a formula based on the total student population in the district and a statewide salary allocation model. Other funds are provided based on student needs, and the state reports partially equalizing local levy funding for property-poor school districts. Although the applicant discusses the Quality Education Council and studies of the state legislature, the applicant does not provide information as to why it will take until 2018 to develop a new funding model to ensure equitable distribution of funds. Further, the applicant does not demonstrate equitable funding to high-poverty schools (the RTTT requirements include both equitable funding to districts and to schools). This section receives moderate points.</p>		
<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>2</b>
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	0
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	0
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	0
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	0
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	2
<b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>F(2)(i), F(2)(ii), F(2)(iii), F(2)(iv)</p> <p>Despite several attempts, the state of Washington has no Charter School law.</p> <p>F(2)(v)</p> <p>The applicant describes Substitute Senate Bill 5953 (1992), which provides flexibility to school districts, through deregulation and restructuring, to allow for the funding of performance-based schools and programs (alternative schools). In Washington, alternative schools are characterized by curricular emphasis or themes, variations in mode, timing for delivery of instruction and/or programmatic focus. Examples include parent partnering programs, part- and full-time online learning schools, evening schools, dropout recovery programs, STEM high schools and other programs to meet the unique needs of students. The applicant reports that the number of innovative, student-centered, performance-based schools has increased from 122 in the 1996-97 school year to 270 in the 2009-2010 school year. Alternative schools represent more than 12 percent of Washington's public schools. There is no indication that these are autonomous schools that meet the criteria for this section and there are no charter schools in the state. Although it does not impact the scoring of this section, it is important to note that the applicant did not</p>		

respond to F(2)(v), as the information on innovative schools was provided in F(3). This section receives low points.		
<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> F(3) The applicant has demonstrated, throughout the narrative and appendices, a commitment to reform and provides information on several reform conditions previously implemented at the state level. These initiatives have been broadly applied, including the SSB 5953 (student-centered, innovative schools), ESHB 1209, freedom for parents to take their children out of a resident school district, implementation of tribal schools, alternative education service providers, online learning environments, the Running Start program, and skill centers. The applicant describes these within the application and provides information in the appendices. However, the applicant does not provide clear or specific evidence that these reform conditions have had positive impact or outcomes for students. This section receives moderate points.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>13</b>

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> The applicant has provided mention of STEM initiatives and supports throughout the application and provides additional detail in the 5-page STEM section of their grant application. It is clear from the whole of the application that the state is committed to providing reform, in part, geared towards implementing a strong STEM initiative. As demonstrated by other sections of the application, some STEM initiatives are already in place to some extent at the state and district levels. In addition to the information in the narrative, the applicant provides a detailed description of the Washington STEM Center and the Washington STEM initiative concept paper from December 2009. Overall, given the information in the application and the synopsis provided by the STEM priority section of the grant, the applicant has demonstrated the requirements for these priority points.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>Yes</b>
<b>Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b> Mentioned only for future reference to aid the applicant (this did not impact the scoring of the grant): Appendix A (and several other appendices) is a narrative within a narrative and provides good information for individuals reading the RTTT application. However, there were several instances where information was contained in the Appendix A narrative, but not the grant narrative (and vice versa). It would have been helpful to have the background and other information from Appendix A (and other lengthy appendices) presented and/or summarized consistently in the appropriate sections of the grant narrative, thus aiding in the reviewing of the application. As it was, the reviewer (or any other individual reading the grant) would need to consistently "flip" back and forth between Appendix A (and other appendices) for additional		

information in several sections of the grant narrative to have a full understanding of the Washington model. A very concise reminder of what is in Appendix A could be included in each narrative section, where appropriate. Similarly, it is difficult for the reviewer when a narrative section refers to a FUTURE narrative section, as it requires the reviewer to read ahead of where they are and complicates the review process. Regardless, these factors did not negatively impact the scoring of the application, but is provided as general feedback.

In general, it seems that much of the application (particularly section D) has delayed timelines for the RTTT reforms, meaning the majority of reform will happen towards the end of RTTT funding. This suggests that the state is several years from moving past planning and into implementation, which, in turn, limits the impact that the state's reform efforts will have in at the national level in the near future. There is also little emphasis on rapid, swift, and efficient reform efforts - many of the sections within the grant application involve creating workgroups, committees, or other planning bodies, but little information is provided about implementing actual plans (i.e., focus is on development, not implementation). This suggests that the state would be well-behind other states in the RTTT competition that have well-developed and ready-to-implement plans for RTTT reform.

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

Grand Total	500	293
-------------	-----	-----



# Race to the Top

## Technical Review Form - Tier 1

### Washington Application #4550WA-5



#### A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>25</b>
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	3
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	18
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	4

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

(A)(1)(i)

The applicant has set forth a coherent and comprehensive statement of its vision for using Race to the Top (RTTT) funds to promote a reform agenda implementing goals across all four education areas described in the ARRA. Central to the state's application is a series of "innovation clusters" that are aimed at promoting and supporting local district and partner initiatives and spurring innovations in student achievement through changes in classroom, school, and district educational practices. Fifty percent of the participating LEAs committed to participate in at least one optional/competitive innovation cluster. Unique to this state, 86 percent of the participating districts included a principal representative signature to demonstrate school-level leadership commitment to the state's plans. The state's RTTT plans build on its 2010 Education Reform Plan that includes a vision, four goals, five capacities, and nine outcome measures, but there are indications that the education reforms envisioned by RTTT may not be as compatible and overlapping with the state's plan as the state suggests. The aggressive agenda outlined by the state will strain the capacity of any state attempting to do so much for so many students in so many diverse districts, and a key concern is whether the applicant has the statewide capacity and the political and bureaucratic will to re-organize and re-focus all that will be necessary to drive its reform agenda to fruition over the next several years, especially given that much of the state's plans for ensuring great teachers and leaders is not required under the Memoranda of Understanding with participating LEAs. A score in the "medium" range is awarded.

(A)(1)(ii)

The applicant's Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with its participating LEAs do not require commitment to implement all of the elements included under the U.S. Department of Education's Model MOU. Instead, significant changes are made to Exhibit 1 of the Department's Model MOU. Specifically, numerous elements of (D)(2) regarding the design, implementation of, and uses of teacher and principal evaluations are redefined or not required. Element (D)(3) regarding equitable distribution of teachers and principals is not included. The commitment to element (D)(5) is mislabeled as related to (D)(3). The State's Innovation Clusters are optional and a unique addition to the state's Partnership Agreements, but they cover several reform elements envisioned as required elements of RTTT plans under the Model MOU.

Additionally, the state's Partnership Agreement contains extra language not in the Model MOU that nothing in the agreement should be construed to alter or otherwise affect employees' rights under collective bargaining agreements, although the LEAs and collective bargaining agents are expected to confer and negotiate in good faith over issues that go beyond current collective bargaining agreements. This significantly waters down the state's ability to rely on the local unions as committed partners to their reform

agenda and indicates that implementation at the local level of the state's RTTT plans may be more difficult than the numbers of required signatures collected may suggest.

The MOUs represent a set of commitments of mixed strength by the 265 participating LEAs to implement all portions of the state's RTTT plans. Signatures were obtained from 100% of the LEA superintendents, 90% of the local school board presidents, 69% of the applicable local teachers' union leaders, and 86% of principals' representatives, demonstrating broad but not universal leadership support with the participating LEAs. Union support may be an issue in parts of the state and impede implementation. Given that way the nonperformance clause is written, a district could end up implementing few of the reforms envisioned under RTTT and still not be found in noncompliance despite receiving full funds to implement the state's plans. A score near the bottom of the "medium" range is awarded for this subsection.

(A)(1)(iii)

The state has provided incomplete data on increasing student achievement under the state's assessments and on decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups. For example, three pages are included of unexplained data in Appendix (A)(1)-5 that do not clarify if they relate to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) or state assessments and do not provide overall data, only data for subgroups. The subgroup achievement gains that are predicted in the body of the application appear overly optimistic—a uniform four percentage points of gain across almost every subgroup every year for the next 10 years. This is wildly optimistic and not grounded in any explanation in the application. As a result of the largely uniform anticipated percentage gains, it does not appear that achievement gaps will narrow much, although it is impossible to tell given that overall and white subgroups scores are not provided so no comparison is possible.

Limited overall data is provided on high school graduation rates and increases in college enrollment.

The state's incomplete and overly optimistic goals in the areas described above seem likely to have some statewide impact, due to the commitments collected from 90% of the state's LEAs, covering 95% of the state's schools, 97% of the state's K-12 students, and 98% of the state's students in poverty. But how great that impact will be on raising academic achievement is largely unknowable due to the gaping holes in this part of the application. A score in the "low" range is provided.

<b>(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>14</b>
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	7
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	7

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

(A)(2)(i)

The applicant's existing capacity is a key area of concern with this application. The State has focused on setting up Steering Committees and Workgroups of senior leaders overseeing the state's RTTT reform agenda, and it plans to develop a new Office of Education Reform and Innovation in the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction with a lean and central staff. It is not clear, however, how strong and deep the network of existing and new personnel and partners are who this new office will need to rely upon, especially for the scaling up of teacher and principal supports. The state admits that it has historically had fractured professional development delivery, and the creation of a Professional Development Cooperative (see section (D)(5)) will help alleviate but likely not solve the state's capacity problems in this area.

The application fails to inspire considerable confidence that the state will be able to achieve an effective and efficient oversight and implementation of a RTTT grant if one is awarded. The small staff of the new Office of Reform and Innovation has one dedicated full-time equivalent for grants and fiscal management. The State's budget seems relatively well designed to address most of the state's reform plans, but the

statewide capacity to manage all the aspects of the grant and to provide effective supports and training to LEAs, teachers, and principals may be too limited.

Significant attention is provided to coordinating the state's RTTT budget with other federal and state funds, but almost nothing is included that addresses the state's ability to sustain the reform in the application beyond the RTTT grant period, despite numerous timelines going well beyond the grant period. A score in the lower part of the "middle" range is provided.

(A) (2)(ii)

The state's plan was developed with input from and open engagement with a broad group of stakeholders. Several dozen letters of support for the state's RTTT plan were provided, including from the State's teachers unions and other diverse, critical stakeholders, although some stakeholders mentioned wishing the state's reform plan had been more aggressive and others were relatively tepid in their level of support. A score in the "medium" range is awarded.

<b>(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>10</b>
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	3
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	7

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

(A)(3)(i)

The applicant demonstrates that it has made considerable progress in implementing reforms focused on the four education reform areas, and has positioned itself to build upon those reforms with RTTT. These reforms, however, appear to have had little impact on improving academic achievement of the state's students over time. The state's policy foundation has enabled the state to design a relatively ambitious set of reforms into the RTTT program (with some noticeable exceptions where certain reforms in the Model MOU were not pursued) to take the state's K-12 system to a higher level of achievement. This progress has been supported by considerable alignment of federal and state funding in recent years. A score in the "middle" range is awarded.

(A)(3)(ii)

The applicant provides NAEP data showing a mix of increases and decreases overall and among subgroups since 2003, with most achievement gaps remaining roughly the same or increasing. The achievement gap for 8<sup>th</sup> grade English Language Learners (ELLs) grew alarmingly worse since 2009, but the achievement gap for students with disabilities on NAEP 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading shrank considerably. In general, the state's NAEP math scores remained the same in 4<sup>th</sup> grade and increased in 8<sup>th</sup> grade, between 2007 and 2009 and the state's NAEP reading in 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade either slightly decreased or increased between 2007 and 2009.

On the state assessments, there have been steady increases overall and by subgroups in science since 2004, although the achievement gaps remain significant. Since 2006, overall math achievement at various grade levels has improved modestly, but the achievement gaps for math have remained comparable to, if not higher than for, science. Since 2003, state reading scores have increased in some grade levels and decreased in some others, and the achievement gaps have been declining slightly.

The state's graduation rates have remained fairly steady, or flat, with slight increases and decreases since 2003-2004. This is also true across most subgroups.

Overall, the state has demonstrated relatively meager improved student outcomes overall and by subgroup since 2003. The state's analysis of the underlying reasons for these disappointing student outcomes,

despite a decade of previous education reforms, is sparse and weak. A score in the top of the "low" range is awarded for this subsection.

Total	125	49
-------	-----	----

**B. Standards and Assessments**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>25</b>
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	5
<b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>(B)(1)(i)</p> <p>The applicant is a member of the Common Core State Standards Initiative, involving 48 states, 2 territories, and the District of Columbia. Full points are awarded for this subsection. Requested documentation is complete.</p> <p>(B)(1)(ii)</p> <p>The State legislature has given the Superintendent of Public Instruction the authority to adopt the Common Core standards in math and English language arts on a provisional basis by August 2. Implementation of the standards may not occur, however, until after the state legislature has an opportunity to review the standards in the 2011 legislative session. The state superintendent has committed to provisionally adopting the common core standards in July 2010. Points are awarded in the top of the "low" range to reflect the provisional adoption of the Common Core standards, given that final adoption by the state board will not occur until 2011.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5
<b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>(B)(2)(i)</p> <p>The state is a governing member of a multi-state consortium, the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium, formed to create and adopt high-quality assessments aligned with the Common Core State Standards. Full points are awarded for this subsection.</p> <p>(B)(2)(ii)</p> <p>The Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium has 32 states participating in it. Full points are awarded for this subsection.</p>		
<b>(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		

(B)(3)

The applicant provides a detailed, thorough, and fairly high-quality plan for how participating LEAs will deliver standards-aligned instruction, and for how the state will deliver comprehensive LEA supports for standards and high-quality assessment implementation. The plan focuses on the adoption and alignment of standards and new assessment systems with the Common Core standards, the development of resources for implementing the standards and assessments, the systemic delivery of high-quality professional development materials, and increased statewide capacity for delivering college and career readiness programs. The Regional Implementation Support Network and the Washington State Professional Development Cooperative will be heavily used to support educators in the implementation of the new standards.

A detailed and sequenced timeline is provided that identifies key activities relevant to the implementation of standards-aligned instructional systems in the state. The state's timeline for implementing new assessments no sooner than 2013-2014 appears protracted, however, and the state has not always met its targeted rollout dates. A score in the "medium" range" is awarded.

Total	70	48
-------	----	----

**C. Data Systems to Support Instruction**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
(C)(1) The applicant currently has 12 of 12 America Competes Act elements in its statewide longitudinal data system. Several elements will be enhanced over the next couple years, but the required functions exist. Full points are awarded for this section.		
<b>(C)(2) Accessing and using State data</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
(C)(2) The State sets forth an average-quality plan for ensuring that data from the State's longitudinal data system (CEDARS) are accessible to, and used to inform and engage, key stakeholders. Emphasis is placed on data governance, identifying key policy and research questions to be studied using the data collected, conducting a gap analysis of the current system relative to legislative expectations, and enhancing the infrastructure of the K-12 statewide longitudinal data system over the next five years. A score in the "medium" range is awarded.		
<b>(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	4
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	4
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	5
<b>(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		

(C)(3)(i)

The applicant has a unique, detailed plan for how it will use data to improve instruction. It will pilot two state-supported local instructional improvement systems and analyze the relative efficacy of each of the computerized systems, prior to statewide adoption of one of the systems in the fall of 2012. The application is not particularly clear on the extent to which LEAs will be able to modify the statewide system to meet their local needs. The final statewide system will incorporate the tools and formative, benchmark, and summative assessments developed by the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium. A score in the bottom of the "high" range is awarded.

(C)(3)(ii)

The state department of education will work to overcome an existing challenge with its professional development system: limited opportunities provided to teachers and other educators by smaller, rural, and remote school districts. A statewide education data coordinator will be responsible for developing and implementing professional development statewide relating to the use of instructional improvement systems. Well-trained regional data coaches will initiate local school and district training. The state's plan is not always specific on how supports will be delivered at the local level. A score in bottom of the "high" range is awarded.

(C)(3)(iii)

The data from the instructional improvement system will be made available for research projects with appropriate safeguards to protect student and employee rights to privacy. The process by which researchers request data from the state will be clarified, and guidance will be provided to school districts concerning how to comply with data requests from researchers and other individuals. A score in the "high" range is awarded.

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

**D. Great Teachers and Leaders**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>15</b>
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	6
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	4
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	5

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

(D)(1)(i)

Legislation enacted in 2010 expands the eligibility of providers of teacher and principal preparation in the state beyond institutions of higher education (IHEs), while providing for a process for approving new high-quality programs for both teacher and principal preparation. The state's Professional Educator Standards Board is already working with potential new providers, including Teach for America and The New Standards Project to establish potential sites under the Alternative Routes to Teaching Program. The new legislation includes all five of the elements listed in the definition of alternative routes to certification (as defined in the RTTT notice). "High" points are awarded for this subsection.

(D)(1)(ii)

The state has had four types of alternative routes in operation since 2002, two aimed at paraprofessionals and two designed for recent graduates and career changers that employ an entirely field-based mentored internship, either as a teacher of record or intern. A principal route is newly established but not yet in use. "Medium" points are awarded for this subsection.

(D)(1)(iii)

The state has a detailed process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage. Recently passed legislation now requires multiple state entities to engage with school districts in data analysis and planning on the current and projected status of the state's educator workforce for the next school year. The state also has several programs aimed at addressing teacher shortages, and several outreach initiatives aimed at recruitment of effective candidates into alternative routes to becoming a teacher or principal. The state's plan seeks to improve the state's previous scattershot approach to unanticipated teacher shortages, and it focuses on creating tighter linkages among preparation options, recruitment programs, financial incentives, and the state's school districts. "High" points are awarded for this subsection.

<b>(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>19</b>
(i) Measuring student growth	5	2
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	7
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	6
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	4

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

D(2) GENERAL

The state has provided a low- to medium-quality plan with no measurable targets to ensure that participating LEAs have teacher and principals performance evaluation systems that focus on student learning and growth and provides the data and targeted preparation, training, and professional development necessary to achieve the state's RTTT goals.

(D)(2)(i)

Recent legislation provides for new evaluation criteria for teachers and principals, including criteria addressing the use of student data to inform instruction. The state is committed to developing student achievement and student growth tools based on the Colorado Growth Model. The exact approaches to be used are to be determined, and therefore annual targets have not yet been set related to any metrics for the teacher and principal evaluation systems. A score in the "average" range is awarded. The state has the will and a process for arriving at a way of measuring student growth, but the specifics are not yet determined.

(D)(2)(ii)

The state has recently passed a new law requiring the design and implementation of rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that will differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (it is not determined how significant a factor growth will be, however). Teacher and principal involvement will occur in the design of all aspects of the teachers and principals evaluation systems. A score in the "medium" range is awarded.

(D)(2)(iii)

Under the new teacher and principal evaluation amendments, the state will conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback, as well data on student growth for their students. Few details or specifics are provided. A score in the "medium" range is awarded.

(D)(2)(iv)

This is one of the weakest areas of the application, due to the design of the partnership agreements with the local districts, which do not require all aspects of this subsection. The new state teacher and principal evaluations, once implemented, will provide a rigorous basis for evaluating teacher and principal performance and making decisions about appropriate assessments, professional development, and some decisions concerning employment (although it's not clear exactly what kinds of employment decisions from the application). The state's Innovation Cluster will provide opportunities for some willing districts to experiment with changes in the state compensation policy, but this is an optional part of the Partnership Agreements. The participating LEAs are not required to use the evaluation to inform decisions about whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) or to remove ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals. As a result of skipping large parts of this subsection (not performance measures are provided at all nor a baseline for any of the 10 (D)(2) criteria, a score in the "low" range is awarded for this subsection.

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

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

(D)(3)(i)

The state has set forth a plan with a baseline but no annual targets to ensure the equitable distribution of teacher and principals. The action steps described in this subsection do not add up to a fully coherent and focused plan to ensure that students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools have equitable access to highly effective teachers and principals. The plan details the data and information that will be collected to help the state understand district-by-district staff strengths. The state is also implementing a series of activities that are the focus of its current Teacher Equity Plan (TEP) and will provide support and technical assistance to districts implementing the TEP locally. The Innovation Cluster will provide models for districts seeking to design systems that address the placement of teachers and principals in rural, high-poverty, and/or low-achievement schools. The state's performance measures for reducing the number of ineffective teachers and principals in these schools are surprising, given the long lag time the state needs to set a baseline and reach annual targets that will presumably stretch well beyond the RTTT grant period. The baseline is set at only 3% ineffective teachers and principals in both high- and low-poverty schools in 2013-2014 and no annual targets beyond that are set. It appears that the state is indirectly claiming it does not have a problem at all with ensuring equitable distribution, and perhaps the lack of coherency and focus in the plan follows from that underlying issue. A score in the "middle" range is awarded.

(D)(3)(ii)

The state has a number of programs aimed at increasing the number and percentage of teachers in hard-to-staff subjects and areas. The annual targets for (D)(3)(ii) seem appropriate, given the state's inability to set a baseline until 2013-2014, but not overly aggressive, given that by the end of 2013-2014, only 80 percent of math, science, special education, and ELL teachers are expected to be rated effective or better. A score in the "medium" range is awarded.

<b>(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5</b>
(i) Linking student data to credentialing programs and reporting publicly	7	3
(ii) Expanding effective programs	7	2

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

(D)(4)(i)

The State commits to linking student achievement and growth data to teachers and principals using the new evaluation system passed into law in 2010 when the new system of teacher and principal evaluations is implemented by the end of 2013-2014. The state will also link measures of impact on student achievement and growth to 100 percent of teacher and principal preparation programs by the end of 2013-2014. This mean that no linking of data from the new evaluation system with the state's preparation programs will occur until the very end of or after the RTTT reporting period. The narrative does not address principal preparation programs. A score in the low end of the "medium" range is provided.

(D)(4)(ii)

The state has a low-quality plan, which it claims will fundamentally redesign its preparation program accreditation system if RTTT funding is awarded. The emphasis will shift from relying on professional judgment and infrequent site visits to continuous improvement. But not until 2016, long after the end of the RTTT grant period, will the state finally link financial incentives for programs and candidates tied to program effectiveness. A score in the "low" range is awarded.

<b>(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>9</b>
(i) Providing effective support	10	6
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	3
<b>(D)(5) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
(D)(5)(i)		
The state provides a series of steps the state legislature has already taken to provide professional development. Through a detailed plan for establishing the Professional Development Cooperative, the state shows how it plans to move forward with steps promoting on-going, effective, data-informed professional development, coaching, induction, and common planning and collaboration time to teachers and principals. A score in "middle" range is provided.		
(D)(5)(ii)		
The state plans to focus its efforts on measuring, evaluating, and continuously improving the effectiveness of its professional development supports by focusing on expected innovations in the areas of compensation, evaluation, and preparation through the Professional Development Cooperative and the Teacher and Leader Development and Effectiveness Innovation Cluster. Those LEAs who opt to be involved in the cluster will serve as exemplars in the design of new innovations addressing recruitment, preparation, licensure, and professional growth. Few details are provided about how professional development supports to teachers and principals will systematically be the focus of system-wide continuous improvement efforts. A score in the lower end of the "middle" range is awarded.		
<b>Total</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>61</b>

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

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

The state has legal authority to intervene in persistently lowest-achieving schools and in districts that are Required Action Districts. Full points are awarded.		
<b>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>31</b>
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	3
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	28
<b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>(E)(2)(i)</p> <p>The state is currently developing rules to implement new legislation requiring the adoption of criteria for identifying the state's persistently lowest-achieving schools and designating schools districts for required action, as well as a timeline for the process. Points are awarded in the "medium" range, given the lack of details available about these new rules and the timeline for implementation.</p>		
<p>(E)(2)(ii)</p> <p>The state provides a detailed plan and timeline for supporting its LEAs in turning around the state's lowest-achieving schools. The state will conduct an academic performance audit and provide technical assistance to districts that will implement one or more of the four federal intervention models. Required evidence of the state's actions with schools in corrective action since 2004-2005 is provided. Points are awarded in the "high" range.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>41</b>

**F. General**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6</b>
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	4
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	2
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>(F)(1)(i)</p> <p>The percentage of total state revenues available to the state used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education increased from 44.2 percent in Fiscal Year 2008 to 45.4 percent in Fiscal Year 2009. "High" points are awarded.</p>		
<p>(F)(1)(ii)</p> <p>The state distributes funding to school districts through formulas and grants in a way that appears to assure equitable funding that recognizes the variable costs to districts and the special needs of disadvantaged students. In addition to the state's allocations to school districts in the state's Apportionment Program based on the number of students in each school district, some categorical funding is allocated to districts based on identified student need, not local funding capacity. Local levy funding is strongly limited by a state levy lid law, and the state partially equalizes local levy funding by providing local effort assistance to property-poor school districts. Additional comprehensive school funding legislation was enacted in 2009 and 2010. The state provides limited evidence that its policies results in equitable funding in practice, however. Points in the "medium" range are awarded.</p>		

<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	0
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	0
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	0
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	0
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	0
<b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>(F)(2)(i) The state has no charter school law.</p> <p>(F)(2)(ii) The state has no charter school law.</p> <p>(F)(2)(iii) The state has no charter school law.</p> <p>(F)(2)(iv) The state has no charter school law.</p> <p>(F)(2)(v) The state provides no evidence that it has legislation enabling LEAs to operate other public schools that are both innovative and autonomous. There are several types of innovative schools addressed in (F)(3), but no mention that they share any of the "autonomous" qualities of charter schools. No points are awarded.</p>		
<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>(F)(3) The state highlights that parents have the ability since 1990 to take their children out of the resident school district if a financial, educational, safety, or health condition of the student would be improved. It also highlights certain flexibilities given to school districts in 1992 that have permitted the funding of performance-based schools and programs. School districts in this state are also encouraged to contract with alternative educational service providers to provide programs for students who are likely to be expelled, who have been suspended, who are academically at risk, or who have been disciplined repeatedly. Last, the state highlights its online learning programs, innovation high school academies in small school districts, and skills center and high school programs allowing students to take classes at community and technical colleges for both high school and college credit. Points in the "high" range are awarded.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>11</b>

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>
--	------------------	---------------

<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>The state has created rigorous courses of study in STEM content areas in recent years and has set forth plans to integrate STEM content areas across grades and disciplines. The STEM Innovation Cluster is a significant part of the state's plan to scale up evidenced-based practices and programs that have been demonstrated to be successful in increasing achievement in STEM content areas. Last, the state has a number of programs focused on encouraging underrepresented students to participate in STEM study and careers. This comprehensive approach merits the awarding of points for meeting the competitive priority.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>Yes</b>
<b>Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>The state's application has numerous significant weaknesses and does not include all of the reforms envisioned by the Department of Education's Model MOU, but it sufficiently and coherently addresses the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria to merit consideration for funding under RTTT.</p>		
<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>

<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>265</b>
--------------------	------------	------------



# Race to the Top

## Technical Review Form - Tier 1

### Washington Application #4550WA-4



#### A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>50</b>
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	3
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	36
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	11

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

The State has described a moderately robust and ambitious comprehensive plan for reform. The Education Reform Plan Framework demonstrates a thoughtful and connected organizational approach to Washington's unique conditions, strengths and challenges. The State has identified its strengths and areas of weaknesses so that it can target reform effectively and efficiently. The Reform Plan Framework addresses each of the 4 ARRA areas and includes additional state needs. The reform plan will help the State transition from being a compliance monitoring agency to a customized technical assistance and professional support agency. This change will enable the state education agency to become a resource center for best practice and content specialists supporting districts and regions with specific reform challenges. The state plan provides a focus on data management, professional development, local instructional improvement systems (IIS), addressing ongoing student achievement gaps; enhancing student and educator prowess in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM); preparing students for success in college and beyond, aligned P-13 standards curriculum and assessments, great teaching and leadership, student performance accelerated through innovation, transformation and support, success factors for student families, classes, schools and LEAs.

The four state specific reform goals are for all Washington students to: (1) enter kindergarten prepared for success; (2) compete in math and science nationally and internationally; (3) attain high academic standards regardless of race, ethnicity, income or gender; and (4) graduate able to succeed in college, training and careers.

Part of the reform plan is to create the Professional Development Cooperative, which will act as a hub tying all of the reform components together into a comprehensive sustainable plan implemented state wide with goals and outcomes at the student and school level. The State also talked about early warning system for dropout prevention called Dropout Early Warning Intervention System (DEWIS) to assist with matriculation and graduation interventions. Capacity to change student success is rooted in evidence based services which need to be sustained at the LEA and school based level. The Reform Plan includes Innovative Clusters in four distinct areas: improving Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM); developing great teachers and leaders; jump starting improvement in struggling schools; and improving college and career readiness, as well as reducing achievement gaps. These innovation clusters will promote and support educational reform initiatives and support sustained improvements in student achievement through best proactive and research based strategies. The reform plan includes a variety of goals outcomes and capacities that cut across the required four reform elements.

The State has received solid state wide LEA support. 90% of LEAs have committed to participate in the application (265/295), and these LEAs educate 97% of the students statewide and include 98% of students

in poverty, and include 95% of the schools statewide. The Partnership Agreement included 90% of local school board signatures, 69% of union presidents, and 86% of principal signatures (a unique requirement to this state's MOU). 50% of the LEAs that are engaged agreed to participate in one of four innovation clusters of school reform that are mentioned above. The Partnership agreements enforces a strong commitment by the LEAs statewide. The Innovation Clusters present a creative manner of establishing LEA based cluster to build best practice to improve student progress. Clusters establish a network of like minded schools/LEA to pilot innovation, report on best practice and help solidify the LEA commitment to the reform plan.

The State has commitment from a strong majority of LEA as noted above in percentages and has outlined data from NAEP and state wide assessments. Data from NAEP shows a solid stability of no significant of movement across grades and content. State wide assessments show greater potential in moving student performance. The Partnership Agreement ( MOU) is clear on the participants roles and responsibilities and distinguishes between required and optional components. The LEAs do have ability to opt out on certain state reform agenda, weakening the reform movement. Some LEAs do not have signatures from key supporters.

<b>(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>21</b>
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	14
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	7

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

The State presented The Leadership and Governance Concept Map. Included is the Office of Education Reform and Innovation (OERI), a critical component to capacity building and implementation will be supported by a steering committee and a Workgroup for Educational Reform. The Steering Committee will direct strategic decisions and policy from a governor, state school superintendent and State Board of Education level. Workgroup for Education Reform will trouble shoot and evaluate the ongoing reform implementation. The Quality Education Council is a multi participant organization developed through legislation to advise on matters of education. Members include elected official (elected officials with equal number of democrat and republican representation, school board members, businesses, philanthropies, parents, and state agencies). Eight full time positions are budgeted to supervise and manage the reform movement. OERI is competently structured to have offices to address not only the key reform elements of Race To the Top areas, but the supports necessary to ensure implementation and quality control through bench mark and outcome monitoring. The State has 100% commitment in all four core elements and sub elements as provided by the state data summary table.

The State has established a broad group of stakeholders to help with the reform movement across regions, businesses, communities and schools. SEA lists about 10 different partners. Deeper and more varied partnerships would ensure that the reform effort impacts more students, teachers, administrators throughout the state. The State has demonstrated support from other government and non government agencies, Commitments have been to assist with data systems, professional development and staffing initiatives.

No mention is made of sustainability after the reform funding has ended. The State does not mention a system for LEA accountability or how the state will monitor the LEA commitment to the MOU.

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

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

The State has demonstrated reform in each of the 4 ARRA key areas over a 25 year period. The State has provided historical examples of reform efforts that touched on each of the four reform elements. The State demonstrates a long standing commitment, even through administration changes, to education reform and the need to maintain a vigilance on continuous quality improvement. A variety of commissions and workgroups have been created to guide successful reform in areas of curriculum standards, Science Technology Engineering and Math (STEM), Career and Technology Education (CTE), human capital campaigns, including recruiting and retaining staff, evaluations and most importantly using evidence based best practice to inform and guide day to day teaching and learning. The State demonstrates organizational and system capacity to increase student achievement through its OERI. The State talks about subgroups, but did not talk about students specifically with high risk needs (substance abuse, mental healthy, cultural minorities). SEA does demonstrate partnership with other state agencies to ensure that wrap around services are available to students and parents in their communities to support health lifestyles and support for educational supports. SEA described their use of curriculum based assessments and curriculum based performance assessments to track students learning. Mention was made of inclusion of LEP and students of poverty and minority status including American Indians.

The State described the variety of organizational systems and assessments created over time to enhance teaching and learning and utilize data based decision making to inform student, staff, school, content, regional and LEA needs.

The state will pilot a kindergarten assessment to measure skill acquisition and predictors for future success in learning. Eight career and college readiness interventions were presented to promote gains for the 21st century workforce (Advancement via Individual Determination -AVID, Upward Bound, College Success, Math Engineering Science Achievement- MESA, Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs - GEAR UP, ACT 6, College Spark, Leadership and Scholarship Initiative), demonstrating thorough commitment to this goal. The State has demonstrated other commitments to reform through the dual enrollment program serving 24,000 students in Tech prep and the Running Start Program - serving almost 20,000 students. These programs enable students to earn dual credit for one high school course or by enrolling in a technical or community college and earning both college and high school credit for the same course. *Essential Academic Learning Requirements* (EALRs) were developed and benchmarks -points in time which are used to measure progress - were tied to grade level.

STEM commitment with community partners is wide and deep and includes recognition of using teleconferencing to reach remote regions where businesses may not be present. Included is the need to create a pipeline for talent for STEM teachers.

The State has demonstrated gains in both NAEP and state assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics as demonstrated by the presented data. Although some sub group scores either decreased or were stagnant, they were not determined to be of any statistical significance. Sub groups also made gains in math and reading/language arts. Graduation and dropout rates have remained constant with some minor gains and losses through the years. Sub groups have experienced a decrease in dropout rates. The State has clearly made sufficient gains in all targeted achievement elements across student demographics as a whole.

The state has not shown steady progress in student achievement. In some areas student achievement and graduation rates went down over a period of time. No evidence was presented explaining causes of progress that were achieved.

Total	125	90
-------	-----	----

**B. Standards and Assessments**

	Available	Tier 1
(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards	40	35

(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	15
<p><b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b></p> <p>The State has joined the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and National Governors Association (NGA) Common Core Standards consortium. 48 states and 3 territories belong to this group. Standards are being developed to ensure effective teaching and learning demonstrated through student progress is implemented. Standards are benchmarked to international standings to ensure competitive workforce development. Standards include higher order thinking, career and college readiness, use of evidence based practices.</p> <p>Standards were provisionally adopted in July with statement of full adoption in August. There was no description stating that provisional adoption would lead to adoption. It is unclear if the standards adoption can be reversed. There is no outline of what the adoption process means in terms of the Partnership Agreement with LEA and the duties and responsibilities among both SEA and LEA around the adoption process. Full implementation can not proceed until Education Committees of house and senate review in the 2011 sessions. State Superintendent must report out to the legislature comparing new and current standards including differences, timelines and the cost to the state and districts. The ambiguity around the states provisional adoption results in not earning full points, as it is unclear if the provisional adoption can be reversed leading to not meeting the criteria.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5
<p><b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b></p> <p>The State has engaged in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC), to which 32 states are members. The assessments are aligned to the Common Core Standards. Additional content areas will be added to the assessment series (science) through engagement with National Research Council. The current content areas are English, language arts and math and are internationally benchmarked. Standards and assessments are aligned with college and career readiness and include higher order thinking skills. Standards and assessments were developed using evidenced based research and aligned to other economically and educationally advanced countries. The State team members are involved in the various work groups focused on Psychometrics, reliability, standard setting, reporting, external validation and formative benchmarking to name a few.</p>		
<b>(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>
<p><b>(B)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b></p> <p>The State has outlined the responsible parties, timelines and associated goals with both standard and assessment implementation. The State demonstrates the organizational and systemic capacity to design, implement and evaluate the transition process to new standards and assessments, in cooperation with the LEAs, as outlined in the Partnership Agreement (MOU). Plan included the recognition of update and enhanced technology systems, training for staff in the use and application of data management, as well as the need for a centralized office to make mid course corrections and modifications as provided through stakeholder feedback.</p> <p>Reform plan includes the collaboration with IHE for not only teacher training aligned to standards and assessments but also to assist with the LEA/School/Teacher based implementation. Commissions have been developed to guide technology, training, staffing and financial needs to support the transition. LEA ties the transition to standards and assessments to the achievement goals for students through 2018. Also</p>		

included is the supporting documentation of engrossed house and senate bills showing legislative support of the key reform efforts.

The State plan includes the use of the Regional Implementation Support Network and the Statewide Professional Development Cooperative to design and implement the transition to the Core Standards and the use of the SBAC assessments. These two bodies will enable the state to leverage professional development capacity among state, regional, and local professional development providers. These bodies will also design plans to implement and sustain evidence-based instructional practices and innovations.

The ultimate goals are to have, at all levels of the system, on-going, multi-level professional development; data systems; web-based resources; repositories of best practices, tools, and processes; and professional learning communities to ensure student achievement. To measure the Common Core Standards, the State of Washington is participating in the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium which will bring summative and formative assessments to help lead and inform teacher, student and classroom interventions.

The State transition plan to new standards and assessments includes four overarching goals: (1) to Adopt and align standards and assessment systems with the common core standards (2) Develop resources for implementation of common standards and aligned comprehensive assessment systems, (3) Support systemic delivery of professional development materials, teacher training, ongoing instructional system support, (4) Increase statewide capacity for delivering comprehensive and aligned college and career readiness programs. The plan does include the target goals, timelines and responsible persons. A Network Liaison will be hired for overall facilitation and coordination among the players involved to ensure a coordinated state wide approach with flexibility to meet needs of each region.

The State has laid out a plan that addresses elements as required but failed to describe effectively how these elements will be connected, implemented and evaluated to ensure a successful transition process. The support at the LEA level did not appear to be sufficient to assist with implementation at the school and LEA level.

Total	70	60
-------	----	----

### C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
The State demonstrates the incorporation of the America COMPETES Act into the longitudinal data management system (LDS). All 12 components of The Act are included in the longitudinal data system. Comprehensive Education Data and Research Systems (CEDARS), is the comprehensive data management system for the collection, connection and analysis of student, teacher, school, and LEA data variables.		
<b>(C)(2) Accessing and using State data</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
In August 2009, the State improved upon their LDS and introduced CEDARS. This is the system to collect and manage all data. This system is comprised of thirteen data files that each district must submit to the state education agency at least monthly. CEDARS captures PK – Grade 12 enrollment, demographic and program participation data as well as student and teacher schedules, high school course grades, and more extensive program participation data. CEDARS will also generate reports (data dashboards, alerts, formatted reports and extracts) in web portals that will enable educators, administrators, policy makers, researchers and the general public to access the data .		

The State describes the utilization of this data to inform a variety of the reform efforts ranging from daily instructional support to teacher training and to research organizations and finally developed into a report card for public dispensation. The state reform plan presents a system that will allow data to be used in a comprehensive manner to inform instructional delivery, assessment remediation, sub group performance tracking, human resource recruitment and technical assistance in areas of low performance. Data will also be used to track lessons learned and best practices for academic interventions but also organizational and systems improvement reform efforts.

The Washington State K-12 Education Research and Policy Question Analysis report lays out a very detailed and comprehensive report on data and the questions that should and need to be asked about teaching and learning to drive the data collection and management process. This report is very thorough and covers variety of topics and data points impacting students and their school performance. The State is using this report as the guide to ensure that data collection and dissemination will be useful for teachers, schools and larger educational community (parents, businesses, researchers, policymakers).

<b>(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>14</b>
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	4
(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)**

The State presented 3 improvement systems for LEAs to engage in voluntarily. They are District Improvement Assistance, District Improvement Assistance Plus, and Summit District Improvement Initiative. These systems will provide technical assistance to LEA's for identifying and utilizing instructional improvement systems (IIS), based on each districts unique staff and student needs. The Close the P-13 Achievement Gap is one of several system initiatives to provide a comprehensive approach to addressing instructional needs. Two different IIS will be piloted in 70 schools in phase 1, and phase II will be statewide adoption for SY 2012. SEA does have a model for regional support ensuring that instructional specialists are distributed throughout the state and can respond to specific regional issues and needs, including academic intervention, student support services, family support networks.

180 districts that are members of the State Information and Processing Cooperative have access to the Washington Educator Data Decisions System. This data system provides teachers and administrators access to student assessment results, including pre-formatted reports, and an ad-hoc query tool. For the districts that are participating in Washington's Summit District Improvement Program, access to Teachscape will be made available. Teachscape is an instructional improvement system that includes access to assessment information, online-professional development, and other instructional tools.

Researchers, according to the state plan will have access to web-based components to include instructional materials, formative assessment tools and processes, and benchmark assessment tools that may be used in the school district; state-level summative data; Student growth data based on the state's new summative student growth data system; and to the early warning dropout intervention system. The Education Research and Data Center will also provide data for researchers. This Center provides early learning, K-12, higher education, and employment data to researchers, legislators, and other individuals. One of its primary goals is to provide information to school districts regarding the success of their students in college and the workplace.

The State made a commitment to school districts to provide professional development opportunities using data coaches in the Educational Service Districts. The data coaches will assist educators in the use of instructional improvement systems, understanding the application of their findings through district, school, and classroom-level instructional decision-making. State data is readily available for public consumption from the SEA website. Individual requests for data are accepted and the data provided. SEA named over

60 separate requests for data in 2007. Requests come from in and out of state university research purposes, graduate students, institutions of higher education (IHE), public education interest groups and social demographic interest groups.

State K-12 LDS is designed in such a way to provide maximum support to teachers, schools, and LEAs by drilling down to identify root causes for not meeting outcomes goals. This drill down also connects to the identification of targeted interventions for prevention, remediation and intervention for students in need of academic and other school support systems, including those that are not directly academic content focused.

The State has identified instructional improvement systems in the reform plan to support instructional delivery, organizational management, and build highly effective schools. In doing so, the state has also provided a plan that provides a variety of professional development activities to assist educators and districts in building data based decision making capacity and sustainability. All critical data is available to research organizations for purposes of educational research including effectiveness of strategies and interventions as related to student achievement. The State has described the process of increasing IIS, but did not describe a coherent plan for the implementation at the LEA level, therefore did not earn full points.

Total	47	43
-------	----	----

#### D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14</b>
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	5
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	5
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	4

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

The state has passed several statutory regulations that increase alternative routes to certification. The most notable being State Senate Bill 6696. This legislation increases providers for alternative certification beyond institutions of higher education to include private providers. It also requires that all alternative path providers, including IHE must offer one or more of the four models starting in 2011. The State also demonstrates that the alternative pathways meet the five sub elements as required in The Race to the Top definition. Legislation has also increased the standards for the state teacher subject mastery tests for the WEST -E ( Subject Matter test) and the WEST -B ( basic skills).

Since 2002, there have been four models for alternative certification. Two are for para-educators and the other two for recent graduates and career changers. All pathways are based on field-based mentored internship, either as teacher of record or as an intern. The alternative routes meet specific design criteria that include: performance-based mentored internship of one year or less, based on field-based mentored internship, Teacher Development Plan that identifies program requirements based on assessment of the intern's prior experience and education, and adjusts program length accordingly, mentoring, including training specifically designed for intern mentors, and are not credit driven, and cost is based on program package completion (less expensive and shorter) and not credit earning ( more expensive and longer).

The state is working with several non IHE partners to increase program options –Teach for America (TFA) and The New Teacher Project (TNTP). The State supports innovative partnerships with high tech businesses and LEAs to recruit high caliber Science Technology Engineering and Math (STEM) teachers with fellowship grants. TFA has a partnership with one LEA focused on a cohort of teachers to work in low achieving high poverty turnaround schools.

The State has engaged with New Leaders for New Schools and Public Impact to expand alternate leadership paths for certification. The State will recognize out of state providers as part of the "consortium" of alternative path providers. The State also provides unique opportunity for career and technology education (CTE) teachers to be certified based on their years of experience in their field. Subject mastery can lead to dual certification in CTE area as well as core content area, based on teacher Praxis II scores (content area scores) and degree majors.

Financial incentives are available for candidates who agree to teach in critical shortage areas (special education, math, science, English proficiency). The State predicts alternate routes could lead to 47% of teacher preparation completers compared to the current 7%. Seven alternative route programs are operating in 11 sites as partnership sites for alternative certification has produced 1100 teachers. 97% meet service requirements related to their scholarship obligation. Alternative routes rank 4th of 21 programs in producing shortage area teachers, and candidates complete their requirements in half the amount of time compared to traditional pathways. The State shows data that alternate route surveys from mentor teachers and principals rate these teachers as better prepared and equally prepared as traditional route. No qualitative data is provided linking alternative route teachers and principals to turnaround successes in any fashion ( student, teacher, school, or organizational gains).

The State engages with several state personnel organizations to predict human capital needs, available talent pool, and roadblocks to recruiting and retaining talent. The Education Data Research Center (EDRC) is leading a state wide effort to coordinate human capital needs based on teacher preparation, and workforce data. The goal is to identify current and future teacher and principal needs. These needs will lead efforts for recruitment, certification and trainings to increase teachers for shortage areas through recruiting new staff and enabling current staff to acquire additional endorsements. IHEs are also responsible for strategic planning to meet regional needs for certification programs. Partners have been included that bring pipeline of teaching talent to under served regions and content areas (AmeriCorps and Reading Corps).

Principal alternate pathways and preparation for low achieving schools, although discussed, did not appear to be numerous. No deep and meaningful documentation is present to show intense innovative reform for principal certification through alternative methods. Qualitative data is missing showing effectiveness of this pathway of leadership. Descriptive outline or concept map was not provided.

The Retooling initiative is innovative allowing for highest level teachers to acquire certifications in critical shortage areas. Incentive is an annual stipend of 3,000\$. 410 teachers have added certifications through this pathway. No other value added data is available to determine if these teachers are evaluated as highly effective.

The SEA does not currently have any non IHE providing services for alternative certification. Only one option exists for principals - The Leadership Academy and the description for the Academy is vague and brief.

<b>(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>29</b>
(i) Measuring student growth	5	2
(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	10
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	6
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	11

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

Senate Bill 6696, Section 202 (supported by three state education associations), provides for new evaluation criteria for teachers and principals. Included in the evaluation process is the requirements for the use of student data to inform instruction. The criteria are to be defined through the rubrics of a four-level rating system. A timeline is set forth for the implementation of the new system and all school districts are required to use the new systems in 2013-14. The Partnership Agreement identifies the new evaluation

system, explicitly using student data, as a required component for participating districts. The Senate Bill also extends the provisional period for new teachers from two to three years, and any teacher using a professional growth activity must link that work to one of the evaluation criteria. Teachers in their third year of provisional status will be evaluated on an as needed basis to better inform both the teacher and the district about the decision to move the teacher to continuing status.

In August 2009, the State improved upon their LDS and introduced CEDARS. This is the system to collect and manage all data. This system is comprised of thirteen data files that each district must submit to the state education agency at least monthly. CEDARS captures PK – Grade 12 enrollment, demographic and program participation data as well as student and teacher schedules, high school course grades, and more extensive program participation data. CEDARS will also generate reports (data dashboards, alerts, formatted reports and extracts) in web portals that will enable educators, administrators, policy makers, researchers and the general public to access the data .

The State describes the utilization of this data to inform a variety of the reform efforts ranging from daily instructional support to teacher training and to research organizations and finally developed into a report card for public dispensation. The state reform plan presents a system that will allow data to be used in a comprehensive manner to inform instructional delivery, assessment remediation, sub group performance tracking, human resource recruitment and technical assistance in areas of low performance. Data will also be used to track lessons learned and best practices for academic interventions but also organizational and systems improvement reform efforts.

The state has developed a plan for the development of evaluations for teachers and principals. The design includes representatives from each field, as well as from state education associations and other vested stakeholders with expert knowledge in performance evaluations and the respective job duties. The proposed evaluations will use multiple rating categories and will include a sufficient amount of student achievement/growth data. The implementation plan includes a pilot phase of participating schools, and each year after the pilot additional schools will phase in use. Each year updates will be made to the evaluations after pilot feedback is incorporated.

The use of student level data is critical to the reform plan to change student achievement for the better. Through professional development in data based decision making and data management for instructional improvement, the State goal is to have the use of data accomplish the following: (1) inform instruction and program supports; (2) link the effects of instructional strategies on student learning; and (3) provide feedback to educators about their practice. Two teams of trainers will be assembled to deliver a trainer-of-trainer, one for administrators and one for teachers. The State presented a sufficient chart of the program development of evaluations including goals, action items, staffing needs and timelines.

In the ENGROSSED SECOND SUBSTITUTE SENATE BILL (E2SSB) 6696), *Minimum Criteria For The Evaluation Of Certificated Employees, Including Administrators -- Procedure -- Scope -- Penalty*, are the details regarding teacher and principal evaluations. Specifics are provided for the number of evaluations annually (typically 2), the length of observations, the timeline for feedback, and the processes for new employees. Also clearly documented are the processes for supporting teachers who are rated as unsatisfactory, and the options if sustained improvement is not observable. The Bill also provides detailed information on the training for all evaluators, as well as the intensive supports offered to staff who do not meet satisfactory ratings

The State has used evidence based research as the foundation to build new effective teacher performance rubrics. The Standards and Indicators for Teaching and Learning, provided in the appendix, clearly details expectations for each rating category. The transparency of the standards clearly outlines the use of student data. The Standards cover the key areas of reform expected in The Race to the Top criterion.

*Principal Leadership in a Performance-Based School*, is the equivalent document for Principals that the Standards and Indicators for Teaching and learning is for teachers. This document clearly details the expectations of administrators and also aligns with the six Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards.

The State ensured that the Longitudinal data systems were designed in a way to ensure timely use of student data to help inform evaluations.

In the ENGROSSED SECOND SUBSTITUTE SENATE BILL (E2SSB) 6696, are the following details:

- *Conditions And Contracts Of Employment -- Determination Of Probable Cause For Nonrenewal Of Contracts -- Nonrenewal Due To Enrollment Decline Or Revenue Loss -- Notice -- Opportunity For Hearing*, outlined the standard operating procedures and policies for the retention or dismissal of staff based on evaluations:
- *The Teacher Assistance Program -- Provision For Mentor Teachers*, detailed the mentoring process for teachers as well as the supports necessary for the teachers who complete mentoring.
- *Bonuses -- National Board for Professional Standards Certification (NBPSC)* outlines the system in place for teacher rewards who earn NBPSC. This provides an additional measure for increasing high qualified teachers and rewarding them in a way to assist with retention.
- *Credit on Salary Schedule for Approved In-Service Training, Continuing Education, or Internship -- Course Content -- Rules*, explains the process how educators are rewarded for their active involvement in professional development.
- *Learning Improvement Days -- Eligibility -- Reports*, details how professional development will be provided, expectations for goals and direct connections to student learning and achievement for three specific content areas; mathematics, science, and reading.
- *Mathematics And Science Instructional Coach Program --Evaluation -- Reports*, identifies the projects in place to increase the number of content areas coaches to support school and teacher capacity to increase the number of rigorous courses in these content areas

*Professional Development Learning Opportunities -- Partnerships*. This missive details the plan to create partnerships with educational service districts or public or private institutions of higher education, to deliver professional development learning opportunities for educators.

*State Leadership Academy-- Public-Private Partnership -- Reports*. A public-private partnership to develop and implement a leadership academy to focus on the development of leadership characteristics and the effective practices and skills necessary for effective administrators as instructional leaders.

The State's *Continuum of Teacher Preparation, Induction and Career-long Professional Development*, provides a detailed continuum of the supports and expectations of both the employee and the local school system. The concept map uses four elements of support for teachers; (1) Preparation (Preservice), (2) Induction Support and Assessment (Years 1-2), (3) Teacher Professional Certificate Process (Years 3-5), (4) Career-Long Professional Growth (Years 5+).

The State does not tie all of the sections together demonstrating a coherent plan for improving educators performance using student data. The evidence reads as a theoretical guide and not an actual plan for implementation. A clear approach for measuring student growth is absent. There is no evidence describing the use of evaluations and how this will inform key decisions. The State did not provide any annual targets and descriptions of professional development were vague. Discussion of using student data was not targeted and far reaching.

<b>(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>14</b>
(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools	15	8
(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas	10	6

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

The State has set forth a comprehensive plan to analyze data to ensure that students in high poverty and or high minority schools have equitable access to effective teachers and are not served by ineffective teachers at higher rates than other students. The State has set forth with a reform plan that starts with the LEAs required to submit a plan that geomaps staff by evaluation scores and highly qualified certifications status details. This plan enables the State to assist the LEA in identifying regions and or schools with certification

and or performance concerns. Once this data is analyzed, a variety of resources can be allocated to help address deficits.

The State does support consortiums of LEAs to create innovative schools and skill centers to provide unique programs and services to students which would otherwise be cost prohibitive to any one district, thus increasing ability to provide effective educators and programs typically underdeveloped.

The State plans on increasing the teaching force in critical content areas and in high need low performing schools. They present an 8 pathway Teacher Equity Plan to ensure that unique needs of the LEA are being met with state support and technical assistance. It is unclear how the State will assist the LEAs in ensuring that highly effective staff are assigned to content and schools, as dictated by instructional and organizational need. The State discusses the need to expand the capability to provide technical assistance to LEAs that have an unbalanced structure of teaching distribution. It is not clear how this will be accomplished.

To increase the number of highly effective teachers the state has authorized that teachers who earn National Board of Professional Teacher Certification (NBPTC) to be provided additional compensations for teaching in high need schools. The State also targets intensive professional development as an intervention to increase professional competencies so that current teachers can increase their performance evaluation standings and be counted as part of the highly qualified workforce - so in effect they are increasing quality of the current talent pool.

The State has also entered into partnerships with a number of organizations to help identify areas of shortage as well as identify systems to address the shortages. Partnerships have also been created with providers of preparation programs. The State has initiated planning to design programs to specifically meet regional targeted areas.

The development of the Innovation Cluster for Teacher and Leader Development provides an additional means to increasing teaching and learning knowledge of the current talent pool. This cluster will allow LEAs to train and place highly qualified teachers and administrators in low performing schools. The purpose of the cluster is to pilot evidence based strategies to change, for the better, student performance and organizational operations. Systems will have autonomy and state support to design effective models to support key reform areas using teacher and leader training as an intervention.

Lacking in the state plan are opportunities for teachers to be trained to work with students who belong to the unique high risk subgroups (substance abuse, mental health, juvenile justice, teen parenting, youth in poverty, health conditions, etc). The State does not clearly describe how the necessary data will be collected for distribution of staff decisions. Annual targets are not set until late in grant period (2013-2014) and the targets that are set for that time have no accompanying discussion details why these targets are set.

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

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

The State has developed a comprehensive plan that can link teacher and principal data back to the credentialing program. Included in this data management system are other linked variables such as student data linked to each staff member, as well as additional data variables linked to staff and students so that a connection web can be built evaluating data in different ways to determine effectiveness of the preparation program. The data management system would allow the state to rank preparation programs and provide incentives for those that produce the highest quality and eliminate those that produce ineffective teachers. The State is part of a consortium of 14 states using a CSSO lead measure of teacher effectiveness for individual students and then back mapping this to the preparation programs

The State is participating in the piloting of a national Teacher Performance Assessment, (TPA) lead by the Council of Chief State School Officers, American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, Stanford University and the University of Washington. This classroom-based assessment of teaching effectiveness, incorporating student-based evidence, will be piloted beginning in the 2010-11 school year and required for all candidates for residency teacher certification in the 2012-13 school year. A teachers score on the TPA is anticipated to be a valid measure of teaching effectiveness. Aggregate data from the TPA will be linked back to the preparation program the candidate completed. The TPA and Portfolio will enhance the state and LEAs ability to track and analyze trends in staff performance linked to preparation programs, certification content areas, duty assignments (region, school, class), and professional development needs. This process will help the state shape institutions of higher education (IHE) in building more effective training programs that can be targeted towards specific content, school, region and LEA needs.

The ProTeach Portfolio will be the sole determinate for continued teacher licensure starting in 2011. The Professional Educator Standards Board has been awarded a grant from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation for value-added research study linking the ProTeach Portfolio to student gains.

The State does discuss the desire to expand effective programs and remove ineffective programs and have "cohort" style programs that can serve specific needs in specific schools and regions (district centric residency). The plan does not detail how many programs they want to see expanded for either staff classification.

<b>(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>14</b>
(i) Providing effective support	10	7
(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support	10	7

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

The State acknowledges the short comings in their current system (unchanged for 20 years) of professional development and therefore must engage in reform movement around staff support and training focused on student achievement. The State has initiated a 2 year pilot with a research partner (Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession), supported by \$4 million to guide effective best practices in mentoring, coaching and new teacher support. State legislation calls for Learning Improvement Days to be limited to math, science or reading activities with stated goals for application in classroom with expected results in student learning. Funds are provided for the assignment of a math and a science specialist in each of the Educational Service Districts (regionalization of LEA). The State Leadership Academy, a public private partnership, is tasked with preparing future leaders across the state. It is not mentioned if this Academy will also provide current evidence based professional development to current principals and or current principals who are evaluated as not highly effective. The Academy does take an applied problem solving approach so learning is enhanced with real life scenarios for practical engagement. \$40 million has been allocated for two years of math and science training and is related to adoption of new standards and assessments. Data coaches are also assigned by region to work with other specialists in training LEA staff in data based decision making and knowledge management.

Several reform efforts are underway in regards to professional development and new teacher induction. The Professional Development Cooperative (PDC) is tasked with leading the comprehensive reform effort with private partners to identify needed professional development and providing that through a sustained, consistent and targeted approach with the ultimate outcome for student achievement. These efforts will cut across regions, LEA, school clusters, and across the state education departments of instruction. One important goal is the sustainability for LEA to have internal capacity for professional development therefore "train the trainer" models are a main focus in learning support.

Important organizational note is that the Professional Development department is housed in the Office of the Director of Education Reform and Innovation, making this a key strategy for statewide efforts and change management. The critical outcome is to measure, prepare and deliver evidence based practices at the local level - drilling down as far as possible to impact teacher/leader quality and student outcomes. The PDC has 7 functions for guidance in its mission, included in these functions are some critical components

beside professional development; evaluation pilots, federal school reform models, commitment to the lowest performing schools through technical assistance, warehousing best practices and lessons learned, trend and data analysis, and solicitation and evaluation of service providers.

The State has also created the Teacher and Leader Effectiveness Innovation Cluster, which is a voluntary strategy to engage LEA's in reform efforts by encouraging innovation and creativity addressing the 4 ARRA reform areas as well as regional and localized needs. The cluster will focus on two main areas, compensation and evaluation and preparation. State also indicates that further work is needed in the area of measuring and evaluation of teacher and leader supports so they can better ensure serves are appropriate and effective. Feedback systems are in place as are LDS to connect targeted areas back to staff and the training they receive.

The State has detailed throughout the grant the commitment and plan for data and knowledge management and the impact that it has on reform efforts at state, regional, LEA, school, staff, student and community level. The State Professional Development Cooperative will be responsible evaluation, but it is not clear how they will perform this duty. There are no further details to determine if this assessment process is sufficient and effective in capturing valid evaluation information. There is limited evidence of principal support.

Total	138	80
-------	-----	----

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

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>

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

Senate Bill 6696 into law. Part 1, Sections 101 through 114 of the legislation authorizes the state agency to intervene directly in school districts with the state's persistently lowest-achieving Title I and Title I eligible schools. The law becomes effective June 10, 2010. The State can not intervene directly in the school.

The State details the Senate Bill 6696 that authorizes the state education agency (SEA) to intervene directly in school districts with the states lowest achieving schools ( Title I and Title I eligible) - effective date June 10, 2010. The intervention is defined as a partnership between the LEA and the state to ensure that the school uses one of four intervention models. LEAs under this partnership are called Required Action Districts and must submit an improvement plan. Prior to action plan the SEA will have an independent auditor conduct an academic performance audit.

The State does not make clear the full extent of the ability to intervene with partial take over, full take over, removing school from home LEA, and intervening with the LEA as well. It is not clear if the SEA has absolute power to implement any sort of options other than reallocating federal funds, approving the admission/removal from the Required Action District, and ensuring that one of the four models is adopted, and authorizing the academic audit.

<b>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>35</b>
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5
(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	30

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

The State has outlined the process for identifying low performing schools. This process is supported by Senate Bill (SB) 6696. Schools will be identified in accordance with federal guidelines and must meet persistently low achieving schools of the lowest 5%. The criteria will be determined by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). OSPI will conduct an academic audit by independent

reviewers who are turnaround reform specialists. Audit will contain review of an extensive array of school based data variables including but not limited to student performance of assessments, mobility, feeder patterns, professional development, teaching and learning monitoring, community and family involvement and unique circumstances.

In response to the academic audit the LEA must develop a plan that addresses audit findings as well as identify one of the four intervention models to be adopted and demonstrated focus on student performance gains, including financial and resource allocation that will move school out of Required Action District. Plans are developed with an implementation timeline over 3 years. The state does not connect the accountability framework to the technical support offered through turnaround reform of instructional and organizational practices.

The State has a detailed plan for the supports needed to change the climate and culture in low performing schools so that instructional success is the main focus with supplemental strategies supporting the goal of ambitious student achievement, as outlined in their performance target section for student achievement by 2018.

The state describes a process in which the persistently low achieving schools will be identified, including the Title 1 and non eligible Title 1 schools. The state has a plan for schools to voluntarily engage in a School Improvement District (In 2010, 18 school districts received school improvement funds). In addition, a subset of school districts with persistently lowest-achieving schools will annually be identified as Required Action Districts. Schools in both the voluntary and required processes must implement one of the four school intervention models.

The adoption of the criteria for identifying the state's persistently lowest-achieving schools and designating school districts for required action, as well as a timeline for the process will be proposed this summer. Final rules will be adopted in the fall of 2010. The first group of Required Action Districts will be selected for intervention in January 2011. The plan demonstrates organizational capacity with the creation of the Performance Management and

The Turnaround Office will be responsible for the identification of the state's persistently lowest-achieving schools and will provide oversight for district/school improvement and accountability. This office will also be authorized to allocate funding and other resources, as well as provide evaluation services and technical assistance,

The implementation of the Washington Performance Management Framework will assist with the assessments of need to determine the range of services and supports needed for districts/schools based on performance and growth/gains on annual state assessments and other performance measures. The State's Improvement and Implementation Network will provide technical assistance to eligible schools and districts in cooperation with the Performance management Framework.

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

**F. General**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7</b>
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	4
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	3
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
The state shows that gains were made in public funding for education across categories. Public education gains 1%, while higher education gained .1%, with all education gaining 1.2% from 2008 to 2009. Over a 3 year period spending increased 119% (2006-2009).		

Funding is provided to LEA based on apportionment - using the student population as base for funding staff positions and other resources. Categorical funding is based on student need not on local contributions. Levy lids are capped to ensure equity between LEA as well as funding assistance for poverty districts impacted by poor property. The SEA does have a system for equitable funding between high need LEA's and other LEA's, but does not describe a similar equity funding system at the school level within LEA's.

What is not detailed is the comparison of student enrollment gains or losses with the revenue increases. Spending is also not detailed showing where the increase in revenue is allocated.

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

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

Historically, Washington has not approved legislation to support and or fund charter schools. The State presents a chronological summary of efforts to initiate charter school operations, that have failed. The first effort was attempted in 1995 and the last in 2004. Since there is no state wide support scores resulted in zero.

Throughout the proposal, the State has talked about alternative schools to serve very high at risk youth. No direct mention was made about expanding these schools. The State does recognize the need for alternative schools to assist with dropout intervention, matriculation, school engagement and academic remediation for very specialized populations. 270 alternative schools are operating up from 122 in 1996-1997. Description exists in how and why the schools are called alternative. The SEA does mention, throughout the proposal the need of new school models to implement reform statewide and in regions where resource allocations are difficult.

The State describes a variety of innovative and magnet schools but does not describe if they meet the Race to the Top elements of innovative and autonomous. No evidence has been provided supporting the operation of innovative and autonomous schools by the LEAs.

<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
---	----------	----------

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

The State has shown reform conditions in areas of behavioral interventions (PBIS), state agency partnerships and the need for student support services. Each of these areas brings a unique approach to the reform effort. PBIS shifts school culture and climate for staff and teachers into a phase of growth and encouragement with accountability. Partnerships with other state agencies that provide services to youth, helps build a system of comprehensive student supports and helps strengthen the reform effort statewide. These partnerships also brings in additional reform resources without having to use R2T funds and also brings existing student services into schools and communities where they previously may not have been operating. SEA also talks about the need for expanding student services from the LEA point of view. This creates a network of employees who can identify and catch students with signs of school struggles (internal) or other struggles that are impacting their school progress (external).

The State also provides history of legislative moves that have created a foundation for reform. Although the historical context may not be truly ground breaking or robust, the efforts are important in change management. The State moved from compliance to accountability in the early 1990's. The State

implemented system for parents to move a child from LEA for financial, educational, safety or health condition of the child would improve. In short an "adoption of students from other LEA's" was established. SEA also describes how the state moved from compliance to accountability, in effect, creating a opportunities to design creative and innovative pathways to meet individual student needs, and can be waived from certain regulatory requirements (associations and bargaining units). Tribal schools are also in existence to serve the 29 registered tribes in the state.

The State also allows LEA to create inter-district cooperative for a variety of purposes. The main goal is to create programs to meet the needs of students. The LEAs can create Innovate Cooperative Academies and Skill Centers - allowing for better use of resources in LEAs with limited funding or geographical barriers. The State also has system in place for dual credit earners. This potion allows for students to earn dual credits, either multiple high school credits or both high school and college credits by attending community colleges/technical schools (Running Start) and or taking Science Technology Engineering and Math (STEM) classes or Advanced Placement (AP) classes.

Total	55	14
-------	----	----

### Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM

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

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

The State presents a consistently strong presentation of increasing Science Technology Engineering and Math (STEM)curriculum. LEAs were implementing STEM prior to R2T grant request. The State has presented a plan that includes support from the state STEM Center to assist with a consistent and sustainable approach to integration of STEM and the ancillary supports necessary for rigorous instruction (community based partnerships, highly qualified staff, and financial backing). In place are recruitment strategies for STEM teachers, programs for dual enrollment so students can earn college and high school credit and or Career and Technology Education (CTE) credit through rigorous STEM classes. Partners state wide have been recruited to assist with student mentoring and bridge programs providing high quality access to applied learning in businesses to prepare 21st century workforce. The State has recognized that multimedia forums are necessary to bring STEM to teachers and students in remote areas. Washington State Leadership Academy will train leaders using STEM as a model. The State has engaged in several STEM projects that target under represented students including young women and girls. Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement (MESA) program coordinated by the University of Washington, is one such program that works with underrepresented student populations. The State plan also provides opportunities for participating school districts to participate in the optional STEM Innovation Cluster, with supporting funds.

STEM implementation will span the PK- 12 grades and include an approach introducing students to high quality high engagement real life STEM challenges and projects (Lead the Way, Robotics, DigiPen). SEA /LEA will also endorse the creation of innovation schools that dedicate studies to STEM. There is a lack of mention for how the SEA and LEA's will bring STEM to traditionally underrepresented high risk student subgroups, which lack exposure because of qualifying requirements that exclude participation.

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

### Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

	Available	Tier 1

<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>Yes</b>
<p><b>Absolute Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b></p> <p>The State has provided documentation to address all 4 ARRA areas, as well as demonstrated that the State Education Agency (SEA) and the participating LEA are utilizing a systemic approach to their reform agenda to address student learning. The State has garnered a sufficient percentage of LEAs to participate and commit to the MOU. These LEAs serve a vast majority of the student population. The State provides sufficient budgetary analysis that supports the state wide plan working with LEA's. Sufficient LEA's are participating in the SEA model to positively impact student achievement, addressing subgroups, including graduation rates. Through organizational and operations management reform, the state is able to support LEA needs and maintain much focused attention to student achievement and growth. The State did address the plan for closing achievements gaps across all students and among student sub groups. The State also detailed the plan for increasing student matriculation and graduation rates while reducing cohort dropout rates across all students and student sub groups. The State has a sufficient agenda to ensure that students are prepared for post high school options, as addressed through curriculum and assessments standards and other state specific courses and tests. The State has met the criteria for absolute priority.</p>		
<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>342</b>



# Race to the Top

## Technical Review Form - Tier 1

### Washington Application #4550WA-10



#### A. State Success Factors

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>30</b>
(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda	5	1
(ii) Securing LEA commitment	45	24
(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact	15	5

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

(i): The State has not set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that clearly articulates its goals for implementing reforms in the four education areas described in the ARRA. The reasons are:

- The State does not make a convincing case that its four Washington Education Reform Plan goals and the four ARRA Reform Areas are so similar that its pursuing its Reform Plan goals will result in the State's fully addressing all the ARRA areas.
- The State does not make a convincing case that the strategies and activities it proposes including relying on Innovation Clusters will appropriately address each of the ARRA Reform Areas—especially in the form and manner specified in the RTTT Application.
- The State's reliance on Innovation Clusters to address several of the ARRA Reform Areas makes likely that the State will move in disjointed and inconsistent ways toward implementing these reforms.
- The State's reliance on the Clusters makes it impossible to judge the extent, the timing, or the overall effects of their operations. For the same reasons, it is impossible to judge the likelihood that the State will achieve its Performance Targets where it relies in whole or part on Clusters.
- The state wide impact of the State's agenda is limited because of the low percentages of LEAs who have agreed to implement certain of the reforms. The pertinent percentages are:
  - 30 percent of participating LEAs addressing the Effective Educators area,
  - 18 percent of participating LEAs addressing the Turn Around of the Lowest Achieving Schools area,
  - 40 percent addressing the increasing of graduation rates-college/career readiness, and
  - 30 percent addressing the RTTT STEM Competitive Priority.

Such percentages do not meet the standard of state wide impact described in the RTTT Application.

The State's initial "Outcome Measures and Targets" described in its introduction to its Narrative address the State's Washington Education Reform Plan goals instead of addressing the ARRA Reform Areas. The State's predictions for achieving these Targets are not credible for the following reasons:

- The student achievement trend data from 2003 to the present which the State makes available show that the State is regressing. These trends contradict rather than support the idea that the State's Targets are achievable--both on an annual basis or on a cumulative basis by the end of the four year life of the RTTT grant.
- The State's approach to identifying and scaling up its reforms makes unachievable the state wide impact necessary to achieve its Targets—especially in the first several years of

the RTTT grant when the State will be reorganizing and experimenting with reform at the Cluster level.

- Goal 1: Entrance into a full-day Kindergarten is not a "student outcome" as that term is understood in the RTTT Application.
- Goal 2: That the State predicts/aspires to the same percentage increase in scores for in both Math and Science and at three different grade levels strongly suggests these targets were arbitrarily chosen without regard to the nature of the learners, the challenges faced by the educators, the nature of reforms to be applied, when reforms would commence, or how long it would take for them to make an impact.
- Goal 3: The goals for closing achieving gaps are not credible for the same reasons described in the comments on Goal 2.
- Goal 5: The goals for increased participation and success in AP exams are not credible for the same reasons.
- The State's history in education reform does not support the State's conviction that LEAs, schools, experts, and stakeholders acting individually or in combination (including the "Clusters") will conceive and implement innovations that will substantially impact the stipulated student outcomes. Beyond the State's history, the citation to the work of William Porter and the analogy to Silicon Valley (among other locations) is not an adequate foundation for the State's confidence.
- There is too little said regarding the means by which successful Cluster innovations would be scaled up to affect student outcomes state wide to believe that this would occur—especially within the timeframe of the RTTT grant.
- Because significant strategies and activities for improving student outcomes are left to be devised by the Clusters, the State has not demonstrated that, overall, its plans—especially those that will emerge from the Clusters—are consistent.

The State's agenda earns a score in low range.

(ii) The commitments of the participating LEAs documented by the State do not signal strong commitment to the State's plans and effective implementation of reform in the four education areas. The primary reasons are

- The low percentages of commitment to all or significant parts of three of the ARRA Reform Areas and the STEM Competitive Priority as described at (A)(1)(ii) in the State's Narrative and analyzed in the fifth "bullet" in the Comments for (A)(1), above, and
- The Innovation Cluster approach does not credibly lend itself to consistent, state-wide implementation of all four of the ARRA Reform Areas. The reasons for this conclusion are as described in the Comments to A (1) above.

In addition, the terms and conditions in the State's "Partnership Agreement" which was substituted by the State for a Memorandum of Understanding and the Scope of Work descriptions include the following provisions which are problematic as described:

- The "Collective Bargaining" clause could result in any participating LEA that could not successfully bargain with its local union to implement any aspect of the plan (including the more sensitive areas regarding evaluations and their uses) to not implement that aspect but remain in compliance with the Agreement as whole. This in turn would prevent the State from invoking any of the remedies for "LEA Non Performance."
- Areas which would have a significant impact on the implementation of the 4 ARRA Reform Areas have been carved out as "optional." These include engaging in state wide implementation of reforms, integrating STEM in content areas, providing incentives for working in hard to serve areas or high needs schools, providing a career ladder to reward highly effective educators, preventing low performing schools from getting worse, specific initiatives to close achievement gaps, specific initiatives to increase college/career readiness, participating in comprehensive efforts to student achievement in STEM.

- Making a “conditional” commitment to a specific part of the State’s plan merely indicates “interest” and commits an LEA to nothing.
- The Partnership Agreement is null and void if the State does not get the RTTT funding. This appears to negate the State’s assertion in the Narrative that it and the LEAs are indeed committed to the State’s reform plan regardless of RTTT funding.

Because of the concerns regarding the Partnership Agreement and the Scope of Work noted the State earns points in the middle range.

(iii): In Table A- 9 included in the State’s Narrative, summary data presented indicate that participating districts as defined by the State serve 90 percent of LEAs, 95 percent of schools, 97 percent of students, and 98 percent of students in poverty. For the reasons indicated in the comments above, these otherwise highly impressive numbers are not likely to result in the State’s plan having a broad statewide impact.

The State provides no amplification to what is offered in summary fashion in Tables A-2 through A-5 about how it will positively affect student achievement, achievement gaps, graduation rates, or college enrollment or why the stipulated improvements will occur. The State’s response earns points in the mid range.

<b>(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>16</b>
(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement	20	10
(ii) Using broad stakeholder support	10	6

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

(i): The Stat’s plan for building capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain its plans earns a score in the mid range because:

(a): The State says that its current leadership structure is fragmented and a “challenge.” It will create a competent structure focused on implementing its plan. The commitment of the State’s top leaders, the Governor, the Superintendent, the Chair of the State Board of Education, and the Chair of Educators Standards, to meet six times a year to receive reports and give overall direction to the reform effort is notable and meets the requirement for “strong” leadership. To the same effect is the creation of a Workgroup for Education Reform and Innovation because it includes the second tier of top leaders plus a new Director to convene the group. They, too, will meet frequently and will provide overall operational direction to this effort. The State’s plans for implementation teams at the State level are equally competent. The lines of authority and tasking are clear and direct.

(b): As the State says, the fragmentary nature of the State’s previous approach to governing and operating K-12 education makes organizing to perform in a more centralized fashion very demanding. The State’s Table A-11 gives the State’s timeline and lists the major tasks for the required restructuring. This list and the time lines are appropriate and reasonable.

The State also addresses the delivery of supports labeled as examples in the RTTT Application. It will provide these supports by adding three new staff members who will perform “three additional cross cutting functions” as part of the new Office of Education Reform and Innovation (OERI). One new staffer will support and monitor the Clusters as well as scale their best practices state wide. Another of the new staff members will be coordinate professional development delivery across nine service districts and address the current, fractured profession development delivery approach. This effort will “ensure the right services and technical assistance are delivered at the right time—practices that will be developed in the first 90 days following ...award notification.” The third new person will bring together the information technology, instructional management system, accountability, report card, and assessment functions—operations which had previously provided by two different sides of OSPI.

It is not credible that new positions in a new office function working to centralize an historically fragmented culture will be able to deliver what is promised as promised. For this reason, this part of the State’s plan is not high quality.

(c). The State's plans for grant administration, budget monitoring, and measuring performance are clear and direct. Because of the fragmentation that is likely to occur when Clusters begin to create and implement reforms, it is unlikely that the Office of Education Reform and Innovation (OERI) will be able to implement its "performance management approach" as quickly as presumed by the State's plan. This is because the commonalities required are the antithesis of what will emerge from the Clusters. Otherwise, the structure being created is likely to enable the State to meet its obligations under this sub criterion.

(d): The State describes its use of RTTT grant monies for specific projects in its "Budget Narrative Parts I and II" project by project. Comments regarding those specific uses will be inserted when appropriate under the applicable sub criterion. In its introduction to its Budget Narrative, the State notes that it has used 12.3 million dollars of "its" RTTT allocation to assure that each participating LEA received a per capita allocation each year of the grant. The State does not explain how doing so enables it to accomplish its plans or meet its Performance Targets. That very large sum of money could have been used by the State for direct implementation of its plans so as to positively affect its Goals. This prevents this aspect of the State's plan from being of high quality.

(e): The State does not address how it will use its resources to continue the reforms after the grant has ended in its response to this sub criterion.

Overall, the State's plan under this sub criterion earns a score in the mid range.

(ii):

(a). As noted the terms of the State's Partnership Agreement and Scope of Work make it difficult to determine what specifically LEAs, teachers, and principals are agreeing to do. The support among local teachers' representatives and by local principals is not extraordinarily broad. The letters from the state wide leaders of the two groups focus as much or more on the RTTT money which might be forthcoming than on the nature of the reforms and why they support them.

(b): The other letters of support come from potential implementation partners and advocacy groups. Almost all note their approval of the passage of State's most recent reform law, SB 6696, which parallels but does not duplicate the ARRA reforms. A few letters lament that the State's RTTT application is not "stronger."

The State will not gain substantially from such tepid support. The State earns points in the mid range.

<b>(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>10</b>
(i) Making progress in each reform area	5	3
(ii) Improving student outcomes	25	7

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

(i): In recent years the State made significant progress in two of the four ARRA areas--standards and assessments, and data systems. In the "effective educators" area, the State created alternative pathways for teaching licenses for mid career professionals and educator paraprofessionals. The State recently passed legislation moving it toward meeting ARRA requirements for use of student growth measures. In the area of turning around low performing schools, the State Board has begun to create a statewide accountability system, and the State began providing new services and supports to schools needing improvement under NCLB. The new legislation gives the State new powers to intervene in low performing schools and LEAs. In most instances, the initiatives that required funding were paid for with State monies or private grants. The State earns points in the mid range.

(ii): The State was asked to respond to questions that can be summarized as, "Since 2003 has State improved student outcomes overall and by sub group? Can the State explain the connection between the data and its actions? The measures that the State was to address at a minimum were NAEP test results, ESEA-mandated, state created test results, graduation rates, and achievement gaps in each of these areas.

The State provided incomplete data, and its Narrative does not offer a methodical, systematic or complete discussion. In its Conclusion, the State provides a bleak cumulative assessment of its situation and, by implication, of results being produced by its education system. What can be drawn from what is offered is the following:

- Overall, the State has not improved student outcomes significantly either overall or by sub group.
- At a time and in a State whose economy requires a highly educated work force, the State's education system is not producing nearly enough graduates who meet this label.
- Major gaps exist among sub groups of students on virtually all the specified measures.

The State earns points in the low range.

Total	125	56
-------	-----	----

## B. Standards and Assessments

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>20</b>
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards	20	20
(ii) Adopting standards	20	0
<b>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>(i) (a) and (b): Washington is working with a consortium of forty-seven states to develop common standards that will meet the RTTT requirements. The State provides additional information that leads to the conviction that the standards produced will be of the highest quality and appropriately bench marked. The State earns the highest points available. [20]</p> <p>(ii) As of the submission of its application, the State had not adopted the standards. Washington's Superintendent of Public Instruction has committed to provisionally adopting the standards under applicable State law in July 2010. Applicable legislation gives final adoption authority to the Legislature, however, and the State indicates that "Final" adoption will not occur until "Spring 2011." Given that the legislature could refuse to adopt or could modify the standards and given that adoption is delayed beyond 2010, the approach does not meet the applicable requirements under RTTT. Accordingly, the State earns "no points."</p> <p>Note: State's SEA (aka "OSPI" and ancillary groups have scheduled activities and built strategies around the provisionally adopted standards commencing with provisional adoption in July and taking significant implementation steps before the "Spring 2011" deadline for final Legislative adoption. The "OSPI" and ancillary groups have scheduled activities and built strategies around the provisionally adopted standards commencing with provisional adoption in July and taking significant implementation steps before the "Spring 2011" deadline for final Legislative adoption.</p>		
<b>(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>
(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality assessments	5	5
(ii) Including a significant number of States	5	5
<b>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>(i): Washington is working with consortium of states to develop common, high quality assessments aligned with the standards described above. The assessments will meet the applicable RTTT requirements.</p> <p>(ii): The consortium includes 32 states.</p>		

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

20

11

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

The state proposes a plan for collaborating with its participating LEAs to support the transition to the standards and assessments which earns a mid range score. The reasons for this judgment are:

- The State has set four operational goals, three of which are clear and logically linked to achieving reform predicated on standards which meet RTTT standards. The fourth goal labeled building state wide capacity is not so clearly linked for reasons to be noted below.
- The key activities under the first three goals-- adopting the standards, aligning them, and developing resources—are reasonable with one exception. The timeline for adopting of the standards which extends to the Spring of 2011 so the Legislature can pass final judgment appears to add time without adding value. That the Superintendent can move forward based on his provisional adoption mitigates the delay.
- Key activities under the first three goals are reasonably described and responsibility for each is clear and appears to have been given to the entity or entities most able to complete them.
- The State has noted in its narrative that professional development and support has been delivered in a fragmentary way causing inconsistencies. It is implied that these inconsistencies contribute to lack of progress on student outcomes. The State says that it is important to move to a unified and consistent approach to professional development as part of its reforms under RTTT.

What is promising about the State's approach is its creation of a new entity, the Network Leadership Team, to coordinate and focus the professional development previously provided by the State. Below the state level, however, there will be seven State/Regional Support Directors/Teams interfacing with 9 regional groups ("ESDs") each of which is composed of six divisions. One person in a new "Network Liaison" position will be charged with achieving vertical and horizontal consistency among these many entities. On its face it is unlikely that one person will be able to do this given the number of entities and providers with which s/he will have to interact. In summary, the State's approach to fostering consistency and focus is not credible given the prevailing culture of fragmentation, and its goals in this regard do not appear achievable under the plan put forward.

- What is proposed under "Phase IV: "...Increasing Statewide Capacity" raises additional concerns. They are:
  - There is no rationale presented by the State linking its pilot kindergarten assessment process to student outcomes which are to be achieved through RTTT.
  - Because the Math readiness test is being developed for "interested" juniors and seniors, the initiative is not likely to have meaningful state wide impact. It is worth noting that the project was not funded by the State when budget short falls forced the State to prioritize.
  - The last activity one of three focus areas for Innovation Clusters projects is the most problematic. In total the State proposes spending \$13.4 million. Under this sub criterion, and unspecified portion of these millions will be devoted to three objectives—"1) Closing the P-13 Achievement Gap-Early Learning, 2)Closing the P-13 Achievement Gap-Achievement/Drop Out, and 3)Increasing academic rigor to enhance College and Career Readiness."

Most educators would not recognize or know what was being referred to by the term "P-13 Achievement Gap." Typically, "achievement gap" refers to one or more specific demographic sub groups and their performance in a discreet subject, a specific performance achievement, or a specific test. The State's use of "increasing rigor" despite its referring to aspects of a graduate's college/career readiness is equally nebulous.

The State intends to fund any of the following entities, LEAs, regional consortia, and/or public private partnerships and to give them "great leeway in outlining a project design."

This approach is not consistent with RTTT requirements. There is no way to know who will do what for what reason or in what time frame. There is no way to judge what impact, if any, any of the initiatives to be proposed will have on the specified student outcomes.

In summary, the State proposes plans for three phases of its approach to supporting the transition to standards and assessments that meet RTTT quality standards. The plan for the fourth phase and one which will use over half the proposed allocation under "(B) Standards and Assessments" does not. The State earns points in the mid range.

~

<b>Total</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>41</b>
--------------	-----------	-----------

### C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>The State provides information indicating that its statewide longitudinal data systems include all of the America COMPETES Act elements.</p>		
<b>(C)(2) Accessing and using State data</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>The State describes in summary form a methodical approach to enhancing the systems it now has monitoring student performance. The State has earned sizeable additional grants to enhance its system. The State has joined a consortium with two other States which enables it to use a model of student growth ("Colorado Growth model") now.</p> <p>The State does not explain why given the above that "full implementation" of the growth model will not take place until 2013. The State does not offer any specifics regarding its "ensuring" access and use by the divers groups of stakeholders mentioned in the Application under this sub criterion. The quality of the plan is mid range.</p>		
<b>(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>14</b>
(i) Increasing the use of instructional improvement systems	6	5
(ii) Supporting LEAs, schools, and teachers in using instructional improvement systems	6	3
(iii) Making the data from instructional improvement systems available to researchers	6	6
<b>(C)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>(i): The State indicates that about forty percent of its LEAs do not have a local instructional improvement system (LIIS). Those systems that are being used offer a wide range of capabilities. The State plans to develop a model LIIS for those districts that have none and describe a timeline for its use that culminates in the system meeting the State's requirements for assessment, analysis, and reporting capabilities available in 2012. The State has promised the LEAs with LIIS's to enhance them. It is not clear whether the latter</p>		

group of LEAs or some among them could move more quickly so that aspects of RTTT such as evaluation of educators, turning around of low performing schools, or improving student achievement could occur at a faster pace than is now contemplated. Despite this one area of which is not clear, the plan earns a score in the high range.

(ii) The State provides a clear structure for the dissemination of professional development. It is based on a concise description of what each person in the dissemination chain is to do.

Despite the State's desire to reform the current fragmented approach to professional development, there is no mention of coordination or consolidation of what exists with what is proposed. How dissemination and implementation will occur within schools is not described. Except for brief mention of annual work plans, there are no Performance Targets or timelines which set expectations or create progress benchmarks for any one below the Regional Data coaches or after November 2011. The statement that Coaches will "initiate school/district training" is not a plan that meets RTTT standards. The plan earns points in the mid range.

(iii) Based on information provided here, the State appears to currently be in compliance with what is contemplated by RTTT requirements under this criterion. The simplification planned by the State will make currently available data more easily accessible, and the timeline for doing so is ambitious. Given this, it appears that researchers will have ready access to more and more sophisticated data in the future in the same time frame as that for participating LEAs. The State's plan earns points in the high range.

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

#### D. Great Teachers and Leaders

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>11</b>
(i) Allowing alternative routes to certification	7	4
(ii) Using alternative routes to certification	7	4
(iii) Preparing teachers and principals to fill areas of shortage	7	3
<b>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>(i): The State passed legislation which authorizes non IHE's to operate alternative certification program, and the State currently has four alternative certification routes authorized by statute. With the passage of this legislation, the State will have alternative routes meet all the RTTT criteria. The State makes brief reference to existing alternative routes for principals but does not give enough information about them to measure them against RTTT requirements. These approaches earn points in the mid range.</p> <p>(ii): The State is producing a large number of teachers through its existing alternative certification routes. It is not producing principals by these means.</p> <p>(iii): The State has several sources of data for identifying areas of teacher shortage. There is not enough information to reach a conclusion on identification of principal shortages. In its Narrative, the State summarizes its efforts on addressing the shortage or shortages as "scattershot strategies that did not ensure that increased production actually met demand." The State's current approach earns a score in the medium range.</p>		
<b>(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>13</b>
(i) Measuring student growth	5	1

(ii) Developing evaluation systems	15	4
(iii) Conducting annual evaluations	10	2
(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions	28	6

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

(i) The State does not establish clear approaches to student growth and measure it for each student. The State will use multiple approaches to the development of what are likely to be many measures of student growth. Which ones, if any, will actually be used depends on a variety of factors.

For these reasons, the State sets no annual Performance Targets. All Targets are labeled "TBD" meaning "to be determined." The only time parameter that currently exists is written into the State's new reform legislation, E2SSB 6696. It stipulates that all LEAs will be using an evaluation system including measures of student growth if the measures are "available" and/or if they are "relevant." The Narrative includes a statement such measures "do not exist in all subjects." The State does not offer any explanation of when student growth would be irrelevant, who would decide, and on what criteria.

The State will pursue large numbers of measures, and it will involve five distinct groups plus individual LEAs in developing them. The State itself is already using the "Colorado Growth Model" in its state wide longitudinal data system and will refine it by 2012-13. It will encourage LEAs piloting one or more state created evaluation systems to develop their own measures. The State's OSPI is required to develop potential model evaluation systems. The State will encourage participants in the "Teacher Leader Development and Effectiveness Innovation Cluster" to develop measures. It will create a Technical Advisory Committee of assessment professionals, teachers, and principals to create measures apparently with a focus on areas that are not tested. It expects School Improvement Grant schools and districts to "work on" evaluation systems and measures.

The State's rationale for scattering the responsibility and accepting an extraordinary range of models is that educators and some legislators want it this way. That is not a sufficient or compelling reason given that the likely results will be a high level of inconsistency among LEAs, a difficult if not impossible job for State monitors, and a continuation of the less than effective instruction the State's students currently receive. For these reasons, the State's approach earns a score in the low range.

(ii): The State does not have a high quality plan or ambitious but achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs design and implement an evaluation system meeting the prescribed requirements. This is because:

- Although LEAs can join various State recognized groups, ultimately the State is relying on each LEA to develop its own system. This means which LEAs will do what, when, and how cannot be ascertained from the Narrative.
- Where the State does attempt to describe and account for development activities in its Narrative, it focuses on LEAs which will create and pilot their own evaluation systems and report to the State. The number of LEAs that will proceed through this process is not known—just 60 of 265 (23 percent) participating LEAs have expressed "interest."
- The State's OSPI will also develop one or more models. It is not clear from the Narrative, to what extent, if any, that process will differ from that of the pilot LEAs.
- There is no description of what, when, or how the Clusters, the SIG schools, or the TAC will proceed regarding development of their systems.
- The Performance Targets which are proposed are not annual targets as required under RTTT, and they only apply to the pilot LEAs or OSPI.

The State's "Explanation" summarizes the results of its approach by noting that LEAs are to begin reporting evaluation data in 2010-11, that the percentage of LEAs actually reporting data will be "very low" as late as 2013-14, and that on 2013-14 when all districts are required to implement the new teacher and principal

evaluations, “[t]here may be teaching assignments for which student growth measures are not yet available or in place.” The State’s score is in the low range.

(iii) The State’s statutory framework and the State’s RTTT plan stipulate that annual evaluations will be required for all teachers and principals by 2013-14. The approach which the State has taken, however, does not make this goal reasonably achievable. Moreover, the State’s approach is likely to result in great variation in the kinds of systems and measures of student growth which will be used. Moreover, as noted in the Narrative and as contemplated by the applicable legislation, there will be instances where student growth not data will not be included. The State’s plan earns a score in the low range. [2]

(iv) The State’s Narrative does not provide specific responses geared to the sub categories of the Application, “(a)”-“(d).” In addition, the Narrative does not contain the kind of methodical description of key goals, key activities, rationales for activities, timelines, or allocation of responsibilities that are required under the RTTT Reviewer Scoring Model. Other pertinent comments:

(a)&(b): Under the Cluster initiative cited, the State proposes to give \$20.4 million in grants to “districts willing to explore new policies and practices by implementing new programs and procedures [which] will serve as exemplars in the design of new career continuum(s) that address recruitment, preparation, licensure, and professional growth. This Cluster includes two areas of emphasis: Compensation and Evaluation and Preparation.” (Budget Narrative, p. Budget-24)

Those to be funded are “districts [sic] employees to challenge the usual practices of thinking about teacher and leadership development and related human resource and financial resource connections.” The results are to be “bold and scalable results with clear implications for changes in policy and practice statewide.”

It is unlikely that those to be funded would have either the time or the expertise to address the combination of legal, fiscal, and technical issues which will arise. Their day to day assignments make unlikely that they would have the background or perspective to craft state wide solutions. The balance of the State’s approach to providing support and infrastructure for them lacks any specificity beyond the hiring of facilitators. There are no timelines. For these reasons, it is highly improbable that State will realize the goals/results it seeks. For the same reasons, the extraordinary level spending is not justified.

(c)&(d): The State’s response to the requirements under these sub categories is to convene a state-level group of stake holders who will “analyze” matters pertaining to employment decisions and due process The group will do this work “during the phase-years of the new evaluation. In short, the group is not asked to deliver anything specific, and there are no deadlines.

The State’s approach earns points in the low range. [4]

<b>(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>6</b>
(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)**

(i): The State indicates that it is primarily the responsibility of individual LEA governing boards to address the equitable distribution of staff. The State describes only one existing initiative to place effective teachers in high needs schools—its bonuses for National Board Certified Teachers who opt to work in “challenging schools.” This is not a broad-based program, and the State does not claim that it is having any state wide impact on student outcomes.

The State indicates that it has no competent data on which to judge equitable distribution or the effectiveness of teachers. The manner and pace at which the State intends to develop such data is such that it is unlikely to have competent data before the end of the RTT grant. As it develops such data, the

State plans to teach LEA officials and principals to use it. The State proposes no concrete plans for using the data to launch its own initiatives. (For reasons already stated, the State's optimism that a Cluster will positively affect equitable distribution is ill founded and detracts from the quality of this plan.)

The State sets no annual Performance targets. Given the declining performance of its student on NAEP, the State appears to drastically underestimate the percentage of ineffective teachers it will have in the last year of the grant. Given the State's passivity and its emphasis on local responsibility, the State earns points in the low range.

(ii): The State describes no activities that will provide concrete results regarding the number and percentage of teachers serving in hard to staff subject areas, specialty areas or in State-identified areas of special need.

The State sets no annual Performance Targets. Given the pace and its approach to defining "effective" teachers, it is unlikely that there will be a standard definition by which the State could determine that it had met its stated goals for school year 20013-14. Given the overall declining pattern of student performance reported by the State, its estimate that 80 percent of its teachers teaching the specified courses will be effective even in the general sense of the term is improbable. The State's plan earns points in the low range.

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

**14      2**

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

7      2

(ii) Expanding effective programs

7      0

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

(i); The State says that it will begin to collect data from a system based solely on classroom observations starting in 2013-14. The State says it will use this system as the determining factor for whether to award its initial (i.e. probationary) teaching license. It says that it will begin collecting data from a portfolio based teacher evaluation system in 2012. The latter system will determine whether a probationary teacher will earn the State's equivalent of tenure.

Student growth data as defined under RTTT will not be collected under the former system. It is not clear whether or to what degree such data will be considered under the latter system. This portion of the State's plan does not refer to principals in any way. Neither of the teacher systems meets the requirements under this sub criterion, and the State provides no Performance Targets. The State's approach earns points in the low range.

(ii): The State's plan does not contain activities or Performance Targets which respond to the requirements under this sub criterion. The State earns points in the low range.

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

**20      10**

(i) Providing effective support

10      5

(ii) Continuously improving the effectiveness of the support

10      5

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

(i): Dissatisfaction is expressed in the Narrative with the past practices for professional development in the State. In a pejorative tone, they are described as "determined by personnel at the school level with one professional development activity isolated from the next." It is implied that course taking for professional development by teachers had devolved in part to an effort to boost salaries at State expense.

In response, the State has recently begun to focus its funding on math, science, and reading activities and to staff capacity at LEA and OSPI levels for delivering math and science professional development. The State also has recently begun to support a "Leadership Academy" which uses the case method of instruction. Each of these meets one or more of the requirements under this sub criterion for data-informed professional development that is job-embedded and on-going.

The only Performance Target for this focus and consolidation effort is modest--to raise the number of teachers receiving training on data use from 200 to 4500 by 2013-14. This would raise the respective percentages of the total teachers so trained from 0.3 of one percent to eight percent.

The State also plans to create a new Professional Development Cooperative. The State describes a coherent internal structure for the organization of the PDC. It adequately describes the linkages and functions of the PDC relative to the Research Implementation Support Network leadership team and other State and regional providers. The role and function of the PDC Coordinator and web developer are rationally related to the mission of the PDC and to one another. Housing the PDC Coordinator in OSPI gives her/him the clout of the single most powerful of the apparently many institutions which include public education within the State. This positioning provides him/her with ready access to the agency's other staff.

The State provides a timeline for the "cooperative activities" that the PDC will engage in each year of the grant. By following an annual routine of identifying and delivering "a range of services," coordinating and brokering contractual services, and providing technical assistance, PDC will provide centralized consistency to the procurement and delivery of professional development.

There are however, no Performance Targets of any kind. There are no concrete plans to provide any of the services described in the RTTT Application as examples. To leave the kind and content of professional development to the LEAs to identify and request is simply to repeat what the State lamented in its prologue to this response. Leaving such matters to the Clusters is, for the reasons already given, highly problematic. The State's plan, therefore, earns points in the mid range.

(ii): Because the PDC's mission includes evaluation of services, it is likely to bring consistency to that function. To the limited extent that the State intends to focus the content of the professional development it pays for (versus that which it proposes to pay for with RTTT funds), the PDC will be able to enforce the State's expectations and standards. Contrary to the assertion here that the Cluster will contribute substantially to measuring, evaluating, and improving professional development, the detailed description of what the Cluster will do in the Budget Narrative does not include those tasks.

The State's plan earns a score in the mid range.

Total	138	42
-------	-----	----

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

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
(1): The State gained the statutory authority under E2SSB 6696 as of March 2010 to intervene in its persistently lowest achieving schools as defined under RTTT. Because the State's intervention in low performing school is governed by the "Partnership Agreement," its authority to intervene in them is not direct. For these reasons, the State's score is in the mid range.		
<b>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>
(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools	5	5

(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools	35	35
<b>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>(i): The State has a high quality plan and appropriate targets for its identifying persistently lowest achieving (PLA) schools and LEAs for intervention. The process will begin in January 2011. [5]</p> <p>(ii): The State will require its identified schools to follow its established Required Action Plan protocol. The "RAP" requires identified schools to implement one of the four RTTT turn around models.</p> <p>There is a primary provider of support, the Performance Management and Turnaround Office (PMTO). It is also the primary monitor of the effort and performance of the turnaround schools and LEAs. The data presented by the State including the endorsements of outside professionals indicate that the PMTO has been successful in improving schools previously targeted for RAPs.</p> <p>The mission of the PMTO is clear. It focuses on a relatively narrow range of data ("common leading indicators") to measure progress and success. The data coincide with what is emphasized under RTTT— student achievement, gaps, graduation, and refocused district/school infrastructure. PMTO assesses PLA schools and LEAs formatively, on an interim basis, and on a summative basis.</p> <p>PMTO delivers school and LEA support through its Washington Improvement and Implementation Network (WIIN). Generically, the support tracks areas consistent with RTTT criteria—quality standards, assessment, and curricula, evaluations using achievement data to increase educator effectiveness. PMTO/WIIN tailors the professional development which is offered/mandated through audits and data analysis. The support appears to be "job-embedded."</p> <p>In the area of turnaround, the State is highly consistent with RTTT. Because authority for identification, monitoring, and evaluation of the PLAs is unitary, PMTO's approach to each is consistent. Because of this consistency, because the supports provided have been data-driven, and because there has been an emphasis on systemic improvement, the work of the PMTO has been successful.</p> <p>Because of the PMTO's previous history of success, the goals the State sets in its Performance Targets can be judged achievable. The State's goals for the first cadre of mandated turnarounds are reasonably ambitious. For all these reasons, the State's plan earns points in the high range. [35]</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>45</b>

**F. General**

	Available	Tier 1
<b>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>
(i) Allocating a consistent percentage of State revenue to education	5	5
(ii) Equitably funding high-poverty schools	5	3
<b>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>(i): According to the State, the percentage of the total revenues available to the State which it used to support public education increased from 44.2 percent in FY 2008 to 45.4 percent in FY 2009. The State earns points in the high range.</p> <p>(ii)(a). The State asserts that it provides equitable funding for its LEAs. It does not indicate how it determines what equitable funding is. It does not demonstrate how its approach to funding, grants, lids, etc. result in equitable funding however defined.</p>		

(b): The State does not provide an explicit discussion of funding among schools within the same LEA. Therefore, it is not clear that equitable funding among schools is achieved.

For these reasons the State's responses earn points in the mid range.

<b>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>0</b>
(i) Enabling high-performing charter schools "(caps)"	8	0
(ii) Authorizing and holding charters accountable for outcomes	8	0
(iii) Equitably funding charter schools	8	0
(iv) Providing charter schools with equitable access to facilities	8	0
(v) Enabling LEAs to operate other innovative, autonomous public schools	8	0
<b>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>(i)-(iv): Washington has no charter school law. This requires that the State receive "0" points under each sub category. [0]</p> <p>(v): The State offered no response under this sub category in its Narrative. [0]</p>		
<b>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>(F)(3) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>The State provides much general information that is suggestive of its creating conditions favorable to education reform or innovation. It does not, however, provide specific information which links these conditions to increased student achievement, increased graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps, or other important outcomes beyond an expanded array of schools of choice. The State's response earns points in the medium range.</p>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>11</b>

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

	<b>Available</b>	<b>Tier 1</b>
<b>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</b>		
<p>i. The State has taken positive steps before making this Application which serve this goal. They are strengthening STEM standards, enhancing assessments, and increasing the number of credits in math required for graduation;</p> <p>Throughout its Application, the State describes plans and initiatives which are likely to result in there being more rigorous courses of study in the mathematics, the sciences, technology, and engineering (STEM).</p> <p>These include the State's beginning to monitor its workforce including the numbers of STEM certified teachers coupled with a mandate for public IHEs to address shortages through recruitment and the development of teacher preparation programs focused on STEM. They include the current emphasis within existing teacher preparation programs, especially alternative certification programs, on producing STEM</p>		

teachers. They include an emphasis on recruiting persons into teaching with backgrounds which lend themselves to becoming STEM teachers, and they include the State's recent decision to focus the professional development which it provides to LEAs on science and mathematics instruction. They include soliciting LEAs to join the Teacher/Leader Cluster with the objective of those LEAs engaging in STEM teacher preparation.

The State's plan to create a STEM web portal will provide additional STEM resources for teachers, students, and the larger community. This will likely to result in more rigorous courses of study in STEM.

Starting this year, the Superintendent of Public Instruction has begun to focus on the issues of math and science instruction, hiring of STEM teachers, adding math training to the preparation of early childhood providers, and setting minimum minutes of science instruction in elementary schools and increasing professional development for math and science. The attention of the Superintendent to these matters is likely to result in more rigorous courses of study in STEM.

The State's plans to support an expansion of Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement (MESA), Project Lead the Way, and similar STEM focused programs is likely to have the effect of increasing the availability of rigorous courses of study in STEM.

The State's STEM Cluster initiative is problematic. The primary issue is that the State proposes to invest \$15 million on the STEM Clusters to develop and "scale up" "promising practices." It does not attempt, however, to describe with any more specificity what will be done, by whom, why, when, and with what results. Such an approach does not meet minimal standards for plan description. This is especially troubling because of the amount of money involved. Moreover, the State cannot point to any history of Clusters producing the results it seeks either in-State or elsewhere. Accordingly, it cannot be judged that the STEM Cluster initiative is likely to increase the availability of rigorous courses of study in STEM.

ii. The State has created numerous partnerships with experts, museums, IHEs, research centers, and similar organizations to provide teacher support and training designed to enable the teachers to integrate STEM content, deliver more effective and relevant instruction and offer applied learning opportunities for students. They include involving such organizations in current and proposed alternative teacher certification programs and their on-going involvement in Title II teacher training. Although the State's plan for what the Washington STEM Center will do and how it will be done is vague, the Center will involve partnerships with the Institute for Biology, Leadership Assistance for Science Education Reform (LASER), and the Hanford nuclear facility.

iii. A number of the State's initiatives are likely to result in more students being prepared for advanced study and STEM careers than currently. These initiatives include expanding MESA, Project Lead the Way, robotics programs, and the like. The expansion of teacher preparation in STEM and the enhanced professional development in STEM are likely to produce more STEM- prepared students. The addition of schools with STEM themes and the creation of STEM focused Innovation Academies are likely to have the same effect. With the exception of MESA, none of these approaches is directed specifically to the preparation of underrepresented students, and there is no mention of targeting women or girls.

As noted about three-quarters of the RTTT funds requested under this Priority will be directed by the State to its STEM Cluster. For the reasons stated above, this approach is not likely to produce the results required under "i," above. Similarly, the State does not provide sufficient information on which to responsibly conclude that the STEM Cluster initiative will result in more students being prepared for STEM careers.

Taking all of the above into consideration and repeating the caveats regarding the STEM Cluster initiative and the weak focus on STEM preparation of underrepresented students, it appears that the State has met the competitive priority.

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

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

	Available	Tier 1
<b>Absolute Priority - Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform</b>		<b>No</b>

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

The State has not set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that clearly articulates its goals for implementing reforms in the four education areas described in the ARRA. The primary reasons are:

- The State does not make a convincing case that its four Washington Education Reform Plan goals and the four ARRA Reform Areas are so similar that pursuing the Reform Plan goals will result in the State's fully addressing all the ARRA areas.
- The State does not make a convincing case that the strategies and activities it proposes including relying on Innovation Clusters will appropriately address each of the ARRA Reform Areas—especially in the form and manner specified in the RTTT Application for Phase 2 Funding.
- The State's reliance on Innovation Clusters to address several of the ARRA Reform Areas makes likely that the State will move in disjointed and inconsistent ways toward implementing these reforms.
- The State's reliance on the Clusters makes it impossible to judge the extent, the timing, or the overall effects of their operations. For the same reasons, it is impossible to judge the likelihood that the State will achieve its Performance Targets where it relies in whole or part on Clusters.
- The state wide impact of the State's agenda is limited because of the low percentages of LEAs who have agreed to implement certain of the reforms. The State's predictions for achieving its "Outcome Measures and Targets" are not credible.

The commitments of the participating LEAs documented by the State do not signal strong commitment to the State's plans and effective implementation of reform in the four education areas. The primary reasons are

- The low percentages of commitment to all or significant parts of three of the ARRA Reform Areas and the STEM Competitive Priority.
- The Innovation Cluster approach does not credibly lend itself to consistent, state-wide implementation of all four of the ARRA Reform Areas.

The terms and conditions in the State's "Partnership Agreement" and the Scope of Work are problematic because:

- The "Collective Bargaining" clause could result in any participating LEA that could not successfully bargain with its local union to implement any aspect of the plan (including the more sensitive areas regarding evaluations and their uses) to not implement that aspect but remain in compliance with the Agreement as whole. This in turn would prevent the State from invoking any of the remedies for "LEA Non Performance."
- Areas which would have a significant impact on the implementation of the 4 ARRA Reform Areas have been carved out as "optional." These include engaging in state wide implementation of reforms, integrating STEM in content areas, providing incentives for working in hard to serve areas or high needs schools, providing a career ladder to reward highly effective educators, preventing low performing schools from getting worse, specific initiatives to close achievement gaps, specific initiatives to increase college/career readiness, participating in comprehensive efforts to student achievement in STEM. Making these activities optional undercut the intended effects of RTTT.

- Making a "conditional" commitment to a specific part of the State's plan merely indicates "interest" and commits an LEA to nothing.
- The Partnership Agreement is null and void if the State does not get the RTTT funding. This appears to negate the State's assertion in the Narrative that it and the LEAs are indeed committed to the State's reform plan regardless of RTTT funding.

<b>Total</b>		<b>0</b>
--------------	--	----------

<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>251</b>
--------------------	------------	------------